



TRIANGLE in ASEAN: Safe and Fair Labour Migration

ILO DC/SYMBOL: RAS/15/05/AUS, RAS/22/54/AUS & RAS/16/01/CAN

Type of Evaluation: Clustered

Evaluation timing: Final

Evaluation nature: Independent

Project countries: ASEAN, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand, & Viet Nam

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

SDG(s): SDG 5, 8, & 10

Date when the evaluation was completed by the evaluator: 17 June 2024

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

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

ILO Technical Office(s): MIGRANT

Joint evaluation agencies: N/A

Project duration: DFAT, November 2015-September 2025; GAC, January 2016-September 2024

Donor and budget: DFAT, AUD 24 million, GAC, CAD 9.5 million

Name of consultant(s): Chris Morris (Lead), Souphavone Dalavong, Aye Thet Oo, and Ngoc Thanh

Name of Evaluation Manager: Phumphet Chetiyononth

Evaluation Office oversight: Pamornrat Pringsulaka, ILO RO-Bangkok; Naomi Asukai, ILO Evaluation Office

Evaluation budget: US\$43,814

Key Words: [Migration](#), [Gender Equality](#), [Disability Inclusion](#), [Domestic workers](#), [Migrant workers resource centre](#), [Forced Labour](#), [ASEAN](#), [Cambodia](#), [Lao PDR](#), [Malaysia](#), [Myanmar](#), [Thailand](#), [Viet Nam](#)

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

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms.....	4
List of Tables and Figures.....	5
Executive Summary.....	6
1. Background and Project Description.....	13
1.1 Background	13
1.2 Project Description.....	14
2. Evaluation Background	16
2.1 Purpose, Scope, and Clients of the Evaluation.....	16
2.2 Evaluation Criteria and Questions.....	17
2.3 Methodology	18
2.4 Norms, Standards and Ethical Safeguards	21
2.5 Limitations and Potential Sources of Bias	21
3. Findings	22
3.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit	22
3.2 Coherence and Validity of Design	31
3.3 Intervention Progress and Effectiveness	34
3.4 Efficiency of Resource Use	46
3.5 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements	49
3.6 Impact Orientation and Sustainability	51
3.7 Gender Equality and Disability Inclusion	59
4. Conclusions, Recommendations, Lessons Learned and Emergent Good Practices.....	64
4.1 Conclusions	64
4.1.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit	64
4.1.2 Coherence and Validity of Design	65
4.1.3 Intervention Progress and Effectiveness	65
4.1.4 Efficiency of Resource Use	65
4.1.5 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements	66
4.1.6 Impact Orientation and Sustainability	66
4.1.7 Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination	66
4.2 Recommendations	67
4.3 Lessons Learned	71
4.4 Emerging Good Practices	71
Annex 1: Evaluation TOR	1
Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix	16

Annex 3: Current Status of the Programme’s Outcomes and Outputs	23
Annex 4: List of Interviews and Focus Group Discussions Conducted.....	28
Annex 5: List of documents	39
Annex 6: Lessons Learnt and Good Practices	40
Annex 7: Country Summaries	46
Annex 8: Stories of Change.....	51
Annex 9: Sample Interview Guides	57

Acknowledgements

I would like to express sincere gratitude to all the stakeholders who participated in the evaluation including migrant workers, civil society representatives, trade union leaders, employer representatives, government officials, ASEAN Secretariat representatives, representatives of the development partners, and ILO Officials. Their viewpoints, stories, recommendations were of vital importance to the understanding the implementation of the programme and I thank them for sharing their experiences with me.

I'm also very appreciative of the work done by Souphavone Dalavong, Aye Thet Oo, and Ngọc Thanh Nguyenngoc, the consultants in Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Viet Nam. The efforts in conducting interviews and focus group discussions and delivering high quality notes was very helpful in ensuring the voice of stakeholders in these countries were included in the report.

I am also appreciative of the support of the Evaluation Manager, Phumphet Chetianonth, Regional Evaluation Officer, Pamornrat Pringsulaka, and the Senior Evaluation Officer, EVAL, Naomi Asukai, for oversight and feedback on the inception and final reports. Additionally, the support of the TRIANGLE regional team of Anna Engblom, Andreas Schmidt, Rebecca Napier-Moore, and Marja Paavilainen in preparing documents for review, arranging the logistics of the data collection mission, and contacting relevant stakeholders, was invaluable, as was the work that Veth Vorn, Chonticha Tangworamongkon, Vongtavanh Sayavong, Nguyen Thi Mai Thuy, and Wai Hnin Po did in arranging the data collection missions in their respective countries of implementation of TRIANGLE in ASEAN.

Chris Morris

chrisjohnmorris@gmail.com

May 2024

List of Acronyms

ACRA	Association of Cambodia Recruitment Agencies
ACE	ASEAN Confederation of Employers
ACMW	ASEAN Committee on the Implementation of the ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers
AFML	ASEAN Forum on Migrant Labour
AIMR	Annual Investment Monitoring Report
ATUC	ASEAN Trade Union Council
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ASEAN-ACT	ASEAN-Australia Counter Trafficking
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
CTUM	Confederation of Trade Unions Myanmar
CPO	Country Programme Outcome
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
ECOT	Employers Confederation of Thailand
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FPRW	Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work
GAC	Global Affairs Canada
GEDI	Gender, Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Branch
GEDSI	Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion Strategy
GCM	Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration
ILC	International Labour Conference
ILMS	International Labour Migration Statistics
ILO	International Labour Organization
KII	Key Informant Interview
LEBA	Lao Employment Business Association
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRC	Migrant Worker Resource Centre
MTUC	Malaysian Trades Union Congress
MWAC	Migrant Workers Assistance Centres
NPAC	National Programme Advisory Committees
NPC	National Programme Coordinator
OPD	Organisation of Persons with Disabilities
ROAP	Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
RPAC	Regional Programme Advisory Committee
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SOGIESC	Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, Gender Expression and Sex Characteristics
TFAMW	Task Force on ASEAN Migrant Workers
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNCRPD	United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
VAMAS	Viet Nam Association of Manpower Supply
WEGES	Women's Empowerment and Gender Equality Strategy

List of Tables and Figures.

Table 1 : Interview Sample per category.....	20
Table 2: Interview Sample per location.....	20
Table 3: List of ILO Convention Ratifications per Country	27
Table 4: CPOs reported on for each biennium.	30
Table 5: Programme expenditure as per 2023 annual report.....	47
Table 6 : Recommendations	70

Executive Summary

Background

The TRIANGLE in ASEAN: Safe and Fair Migration programme is an amalgamation of two projects supported by Australia's Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and Global Affairs Canada (GAC) aimed at advancing migration governance in the ASEAN region that were merged in 2018.

The overall goal of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme is to maximise the contribution of labour migration to stable and inclusive growth and development in the ASEAN region through more equitable distribution of benefits. The programme has the following outcomes set out in the results framework and theory of change:

- Intermediate Outcome 1 (Protection): All migrant workers are better protected by labour migration governance frameworks.
- Intermediate Outcome 2 (Development): Policies and programmes enable all migrant workers to contribute to and benefit from economic and social development.
- Intermediate Outcome 3 (Mobility): Labour mobility systems are gender-transformative and increase the efficiency of labour markets.

The programme is implemented regionally in close coordination with the ASEAN Secretariat and has national activities in six countries, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand, and Viet Nam. It is managed by a regional programme team of 4 programme and 2 finance and administration staff, and at the national level in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Thailand by National Programme Coordinators (NPCs) and Finance and Administration Assistants.

Present Situation of the Programme

The programme is funded by GAC until September 2024 and DFAT until September 2025 (the programme was originally funded until September 2027, but due to funding shortfalls the ILO and DFAT agreed to a truncated timeline for this phase of the programme). In the 2023 annual progress report, the programme was reported as being substantially on-course to achieve the outcomes of the programme, including most of the output and outcome indicators.

Purpose, Scope and Clients of the Evaluation

This was a final evaluation. Given both the pending completion of this phase and the potential for a further phase, the evaluation focused both on assessing the progress towards achieving programme objectives and identifying lessons learned and potential investments into labour migration programmes after the current phase of TRIANGLE in ASEAN ends. The evaluation covered the entire phase of the programme from inception in 2015 until the time of data collection in March 2023 including programming in all countries of implementation and at the regional level. The main clients of the evaluation are the management of TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme, MIGRANT, the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) and ILO country offices, as well as the development partners of DFAT and GAC. Secondary users include the ASEAN Secretariat, regional and national employers', workers' and civil society representatives.

Methodology

The evaluation utilised a mixed methods approach, relying mainly on qualitative data collection, that was triangulated with quantitative data the programme had collected through its monitoring processes. Methods included a desk review, key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), and the collection of stories of change. The evaluation consisted of a team leader and three national consultants for Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Viet Nam. The team leader conducted a data collection mission to Cambodia, Indonesia, and Thailand, and conducted remote interviews with stakeholders from Malaysia, regional partners, and individuals who could not be interviewed in-person on the data collection mission. The national consultants conducted in-person and remote KIIs and FGDs in their respective countries.

A total of 305 individuals participated in the evaluation in (179 women, 126 men) participated in the evaluation in 103 individual and group interviews and 28 FGDs.

Findings

Overall, the programme has registered considerable achievements in strengthening migration governance in the ASEAN region and empowering migrant workers to identify and demand their rights and access decent work. The strong partnerships and development of trust over the lengthy implementation period have been significant drivers of this. The needs related to migration governance in ASEAN are large and continuation of the programme beyond the current phase is important and offers the potential for sustained achievements in the future, tackling existing and emerging challenges in the region.

Relevance

The relevance of the programme towards the needs of migrant workers, governments, employers, trade unions, and CSOs in the ASEAN region was found to be high. The programme has been relevant at several levels, including supporting the ASEAN Committee on the Implementation of the ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers (ACMW) to implement its Action Plan (2018-2025) to Implement the ASEAN Consensus on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers, building technical capacity for national governments to draft and implement gender-responsive migration policies, and supporting provincial level actors to provide timely information and legal support for migrant workers. The programme also has significant alignment with ILO conventions, ASEAN regional frameworks on labour migration, the sustainable development goals (SDGs), and the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM). The lack of NPCs in Malaysia and Viet Nam since 2019, and no national level programming in Indonesia and the Philippines does mean certain gaps are not addressed by the programme.

Key Finding 1: The multi-faceted design has ensured relevance at the regional, national, and provincial level.

Key Finding 2: The programme aligns with the priorities of national governments and supports the dissemination of national policy to the provincial levels.

Key Finding 3: The programme addresses needs at the grassroots level, specifically linked to access to information and access to justice.

Key Finding 4: The Covid-19 response was not only effective but helped increase awareness among government stakeholders of the important role that CSOs and Trade Unions play in supporting migrant workers.

Key Finding 5: The programme has some gaps that have a minor impact on relevance including the geographical scope, the lack of provision of security training and mental health support for frontline MRC workers, and some bureaucratic challenges concerning outreach activities.

Coherence and Validity of Design

The programme has utilised the ILO's comparative advantages effectively. The convening power of the ILO was identified as contributing to improved dialogue and the inclusion of workers' employers' and civil society organisations (CSOs) in key fora on migration governance at the national and regional level. This was supported by the ILO's technical expertise on international labour standards and its normative framework. The programme has also built comparative advantages during the period of implementation, notably the trust it has developed with the ACMW and other regional and national stakeholders, and the reputation for quality support the migrant worker resource centres (MRCs) have built.

Key Finding 6: The convening power of the ILO is seen as a significant strength of the programme by the tripartite constituents and CSOs.

Key Finding 7: The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has been able to collaborate effectively with other ILO programmes. Not all stakeholders are able to distinguish between TRIANGLE in ASEAN and other ILO's programmes on migration.

Key Finding 8: Some of the partners have built on synergies with other projects and thematic areas they work in.

Key Finding 9: There is room to expand collaboration with other programmes, particularly those working on trafficking-in-persons.

Intervention Progress and Effectiveness

The programme is on-track to achieve its planned outcomes. It has achieved several successes at all levels of the programme that has been backed by key strengths. The ability of the programme to ensure data from the grassroots level influences policy discussions and decisions at the regional and national level, and that these policies are then implemented at the local level, supports these achievements.

Key Finding 10: The programme is on-track on almost all of its planned outcomes at the current stage of the programme.

Key Finding 11: Although substantially valid, the classification of some indicators should be reviewed, and the enabling factor of improved migrant worker empowerment is missing from both the results framework and theory of change.

Key Finding 12: Key achievements include, the development of women's groups, several changes in national policies, the adoption of ASEAN declarations, guidelines and tools, the development and refinement of the MRC model, contributing to the expansion of the body of evidence on migration, and improvements in social dialogue and tripartite plus relationships. These achievements have been facilitated by the strengths of the programme, including strong attention to gender and non-discrimination, the convening power of the ILO, the involvement and capacity building of CSOs, the

multi-faceted nature of the programme, and the programme's length and flexibility that have contributed to strong and trustful partnerships.

Key Finding 13: Key challenges the programme has faced include budgetary limitations, persistent limited awareness among some key duty bearers about gendered differences faced by migrants, coordination between key ministries, and national follow-up of the AFML process, and the military coup in Myanmar in 2021 and the subsequent challenges in programming there.

Efficiency of Resource Use

The programme has been implemented efficiently, utilising a tight budget to achieve substantial results, although some partners identified the constraints in implementing agreements as impacting quality to a certain degree. The amalgamation of the Australian and Canadian projects into one programme has been a success, strengthening the flexibility and coherence of approach, and supporting cost savings.

Key Finding 14: The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has utilised a tight budget effectively, following value for money principles. The distribution of resources appears reasonable.

Key Finding 15: The amalgamation of the two projects has strengthened the programme, allowing more flexibility to respond to programming needs, more resources for project activities, and savings on administrative costs. Aligning the two funding periods would strengthen efficiency by providing greater certainty to the ILO and the programme partners. The budgetary shortfall that led to the removal of NPCs and Admin and Finance Assistants in Malaysia and Viet Nam, has reduced efficiency.

Key Finding 16: Allowing greater flexibility in the budgets for implementing partners and increasing budget areas in lines might support increased quality of performance and thus improve efficiency.

Effectiveness of Management Arrangements

The ILO has set up an effective management system, backed by strong planning documents and a robust monitoring and evaluation system. The programme team was praised by most stakeholders for the quality and timeliness of the support it provides, and while the programme is quite staff-heavy, this is justified both by the level of technical support provided for policy making, and the fact the programme team develops many of the knowledge tools itself, rather than relying on outside consultants.

Key Finding 17: The programme is effectively managed with clear roles and responsibilities and a high satisfaction among partners about the level of support given to them by NPCs and the regional team.

Key Finding 18: The monitoring and evaluation system is comprehensive and supports the adaptive management in the programme. It can manage the collection of data for a diverse range of sources. Continuing to strengthen the capacities of MRC partners to collect data, particularly focused on the changes the programme is contributed is needed.

Impact Orientation and Sustainability

The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has contributed to several important impacts including at the national and regional policy making level, and directly for migrant workers at the grassroots level. However, the challenges remain in the region and migration levels are expected to continue to increase. As such, continued programming from the ILO that supports the ASEAN Secretariat, national governments, and other tripartite plus constituents is needed.

Key Finding 19: Changes in national and regional policies have been supported by the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme and should contribute to durable changes.

Key Finding 20: The MRCs have contributed to the empowerment of many migrant workers, particularly women's groups. Considering empowerment more broadly in all activities could be considered.

Key Finding 21: Ownership of the programme was strong by stakeholders at all levels of the programme.

Key Finding 22: While there is some evidence of stakeholders making financial or other commitments to continuing the work if support from the ILO were ended, responses on this were mixed, and there would be some reduction in the level of activities in many areas.

Key Finding 23: Although there has been significant progress, considerable efforts are still needed to address existing and emerging needs for migration governance. A future programme phase would help address these. Priorities identified during the evaluation included continued work on the portability of social security and skill recognition, continued support to Myanmar and Lao PDR, the inclusion of Indonesia and the Philippines, full teams in Viet Nam and Malaysia, addressing emerging issues of forced labour such as scam centres, and climate change.

Gender Equality and Disability Inclusion

The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has applied a twin-track approach to gender equality and women's empowerment since the start of programming, including a target of devoting 20% of its programme budget to gender specific activities. It has over-achieved this target, with 25.4% of budget being utilised in this manner since 2015, and more recently around 30% in the last two years. While gender blind attitudes do continue to exist among some stakeholders, attitude change and significant results in gender sensitive policy making have been achieved. More recently the programme has focused on improving its attention to disability inclusion, and although it is too early to see significant results, the planned approaches and willingness of key stakeholders to engage on this, along with the consultation with organisations of persons with disabilities shows a strong potential to provide innovative programming that showcase good practices to other ILO programmes.

Key Finding 23: Attention to women migrants is a significant strength of the programme.

Key Finding 24: There is some evidence of changes in attitudes towards gender identity and sexual orientation.

Key Finding 25: The disability inclusion work is new to the programme. However, there is already evidence in some locations of awareness of the need to strengthen capacities and improve programming on disability inclusion. This provides a solid platform for innovative approaches from the programme in the future.

Key Finding 26: In addition to ensuring programming is disability inclusive, TRIANGLE in ASEAN has the opportunity to be a model for the ILO internally on how a programme can holistically address different indicators in the ILO's Disability Inclusion Policy and Strategy and the United Nations Disability Inclusion Strategy.

Key Finding 27: Gender budgeting has been a useful tool for the programme to monitor its work on gender equality. Highlighting the different percentages of the budgeting is for gender equality, SOGIECS issues, and disability inclusion would strengthen this further. The programme should share

experiences of gender budgeting to and TRIANGLE in ASEAN's implementing partners other offices in the ILO.

Recommendations

1. Fund a further phase of the programme.
2. Align funding periods if possible.
3. Review the classification of results framework indicators and adjust during the design of any future phase.
4. Revisit the theory of change when developing the next phase of the programme and build in descriptions of how the outcomes interact and include areas that are currently missing from the programme.
5. Support campaigns focused on the ratification of C189 and C190.
6. Identify if there are funding opportunities that would allow the joint funding of NPC positions in Malaysia and Viet Nam.
7. If funding can be identified, expand the programme to include national activities in Indonesia and the Philippines.
8. Continue to ensure a strong focus on sectors and topics that support gender transformative policies.
9. Continue to roll out disability equality training and build the capacity of partners on disability inclusion as well as identifying other areas in the operational side of the programme where disability inclusion can be improved such as procurement, recruitment, and the accessibility of publications.
10. Develop short key message briefings to accompany select knowledge products.
11. Clarify with partners that migrants without IDs are still eligible to attend programme events. Ensure that this is understood by the finance team.
12. Continue to identify ways to partner with ASEAN ACT.
13. Continue to share the successes of the programme with other regional and country offices, and globally through HQ, and among programme partners.
14. Provide security training and PSS support for front-line CSO and trade union workers.
15. Where feasible provide funds for implementing partners to train their partners.
16. Work with national governments to provide more opportunities for non-government partners to participate in AFML related activities throughout the year.

Lessons Learned

- While ensuring there is not wastage in implementation agreements is positive, if the budget is too tight it can harm quality and end up reducing efficiency as a result.
- Where budgetary restrictions in a regional programme limits national staffing, identifying programmes to share staffing positions with, at least mitigates some of the gaps caused by the shortfall.

Good Practices

- The development of women's migrant groups is an important support function for women's empowerment.
- Ensuring a regional programme has strong connections to grassroots implementation strengthens the credibility of the intervention as it supports the collection of evidence at the

grass-root level that supports evidence-based programming and advocacy at the national and regional level.

- A long programme with flexibility from its donors strengthens trust and helps build relationships, and ultimately improves the quality of the end product.
- The exposure of CSO officers and government officials to OPD representatives at an early stage in disability inclusion programming strengthens awareness of common challenges and solutions, and helps ensure programmes follow the 'nothing about us, without us' principles.

1. Background and Project Description

In January 2024, the International Labour Organization (ILO) commissioned a final evaluation of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme. This evaluation report introduces the context in which the intervention is taking place, describes the methodology of the evaluation, presents the findings from the evaluation, and gives recommendations, lessons learned, and good practices.

1.1 Background

Labour migration is a complex global phenomenon with a myriad of interlinking issues impacting its governance at multiple levels. Migration is a significant contributor to economic development and household income within the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) region. Significant economic and social disparities between ASEAN countries are a driver of migration and as a result, both countries of origin and destination are present within the region. Approximately 7.1 million of the 9.2 million migrants living in ASEAN member states come from other member states within ASEAN¹. The number of people migration from and within the ASEAN region has tripled since the 1990s and is highly likely to continue to rise in the future fuelled by, among other things, demographic factors such as aging, income disparities, climate change, and conflicts.

Managing migration flows and improving migration governance is an important priority of ASEAN Member States. Two regional instruments have been signed by ASEAN leaders, the ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers, 2007 (Cebu Declaration) and the 2017 ASEAN Consensus on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers (ASEAN Consensus). The Cebu Declaration included mandating the formation of the ASEAN Committee to Implement the Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers (ACMW). The ACMW is an ASEAN sectoral body responsible for implementing the 2007 Cebu Declaration and 2017 ASEAN Consensus. While ASEAN has made significant advances in migration governance in the past decades, much still needs to be done to ensure that effective labour migration governance systems are put in place, and the development potentials of labour migration has been maximised.

While migration has provided substantial benefits to regions, countries, communities, and individuals, and is an important part of global development, its complexity has led to serious challenges about the protection of human and labour rights of migrant workers, particularly those with limited agency and precarious status.

Labour migration supports economic growth in countries of destination. It also reduces unemployment concerns in countries of origin and remittances sent home by migrant workers are often an important part of family income. For many migrants it provides the opportunity to obtain better paying jobs and develop new skills which support financial security, resilience, and independence. Remittance flows have supported lifting many families in the region out of poverty.

However, many migrants are subject to exploitation. It is estimated that nearly three quarters of migrants from Asia who are exploited are from South-eastern Asia². Limited economic and social opportunity in their countries of origin, combined with inadequate protection and regulation of labour rights, often leads to migrants finding themselves in situations where they are subject to

¹ ASEAN Secretariat (2022). ASEAN Migration Outlook

² Migration Data Portal (2023). Migration data in South-Eastern Asia, retrieved from <https://www.migrationdataportal.org/regional-data-overview/south-eastern-asia>

exploitation and abuse, including threats or actual violence, sexual and gender-based harassment and violence. Exploitation happens throughout the migration cycle. Prior to recruitment many migrants pay excessive fees to recruitment agencies and take on substantial debts to finance these payments, as well as receive incomplete or inaccurate information about jobs, laws, and opportunities in countries of destination. During migration, many migrants work in sectors with inadequate labour protection and enforcement, often subject to long hours and poor standards of occupational safety and health. Many are underpaid, experience wage theft, and may be subject to forced labour. Migrant workers' freedom of organisation and rights to collective bargaining are also often limited due to legal provisions in the countries of destination, not being seen as a priority by workers' organisations, and from threats from employers against unionising. On return, many migrants struggle to access social security systems

Women, persons with disabilities, and diverse sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression and sex characteristics (SOGIESC) migrant workers are particularly at risk of protection concerns. Discriminatory laws banning women from migrating in certain professions in countries of origin and mandatory health checks and regulations in countries of destination that prevent persons with disabilities obtaining visas and work-permits, lead to more irregular migration among these groups. This heightens the risk of exploitation and poor working conditions. De facto bans on migrant workers with diverse SOGIESC also exist leading to either reduce mobility or hiding their identity during migration, which can lead to reduced agency to access decent work conditions due to threats of exposure. A desire to escape discriminatory laws in countries of origin can also push migrant workers with diverse SOGIESC into irregular migration if regular channels are not available to them.

The importance of gender responsive migration governance is recognised in ILO conventions and policies and global frameworks. In addition to ILO labour migration conventions³ and Core Conventions, the ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration (2006) and the General principles and operational guidelines for fair recruitment and Definition of recruitment fees and related costs (2019) provide guidance on rights-based gender responsive labour migration governance. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration (GCM) are two key international frameworks guiding migration governance. Various SDG goals include targets related to safe and orderly migration, decent work, and gender equality, which are all relevant to labour migration. The GCM recognises the importance of rights-based approaches, international cooperation, and the rule of law and access to justice in migration governance and is designed to be gender responsive and provide a framework for governments to ensure national level policies and management are aligned with international normative standards.

1.2 Project Description

The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme is an amalgamation of two projects aimed at advancing migration governance in the ASEAN region that were developed in 2015 and 2016. Individual grant agreements were signed with the Australian Government's Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and Global Affairs Canada (GAC). Recognising the complimentary nature of the two projects, the ILO and the two governments agreed to merge the projects into one programme. An inception report detailing the merger was approved in 2018. An updated inception report was agreed in 2022.

³ Migration for Employment Convention (Revised), 1949 (No. 97), Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provisions) Convention, 1975 (No. 143) and Private Employment Agencies Convention, 1997 (No. 181).

The overall goal of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme is to maximise the contribution of labour migration to stable and inclusive growth and development in the ASEAN region through more equitable distribution of benefits. A theory of change has been developed for the programme that includes three intermediate outcomes designed to support the overall goal. These are:

Intermediate Outcome 1 (Protection): All migrant workers are better protected by labour migration governance frameworks.

Intermediate Outcome 2 (Development): Policies and programmes enable all migrant workers to contribute to and benefit from economic and social development.

Intermediate Outcome 3 (Mobility): Labour mobility systems are gender-transformative and increase the efficiency of labour markets.

The outcomes were initially under-pinned by a cross-cutting Women's Empowerment and Gender Equality Strategy (WEGES). Recognising the intersectionality of discrimination faced by many migrants of diverse identity, the WEGES was replaced by a Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion Strategy (GEDSI) that also seeks to ensure disability inclusion and SOGIESC identity are also mainstreamed into programme activities. The programme has adopted a twin-track approach, mainstreaming GEDSI, as well as dedicating at least 20% of the programme's budget to specific GEDSI activities.

Current Status of the Programme

The programme is funded by GAC from 2016-2024 and by DFAT from 2015 to 2027. However, because of a DFAT funding shortfall, the ILO has agreed with DFAT to reduce the length of the programme to September 2025. This will allow TRIANGLE to continue its operations at the current level (both activities and staffing) throughout its lifetime. The programme works nationally in six countries, (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand, and Viet Nam), and engages all member states of ASEAN, as well as working at the regional level with the ASEAN Secretariat, the ACMW, employers' organisations, workers' organisations, and networks of civil society organisations (CSOs).

Programme Management

The programme has a regional team of four international professional staff based in Bangkok. The Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) who is responsible for overall oversight of the programme and provides technical backstopping for Cambodia, Myanmar, and Viet Nam. The Senior Programme Officer is responsible for ASEAN regional activities and backstopping activities in Malaysia. The Technical Officer oversees the GEDSI implementation and provides backstopping for Thailand. The Monitoring and Evaluation and Knowledge Management (M&E) Officer manages the monitoring, evaluation, and learning for the programme, oversees the knowledge management, and backstops country activities in Lao PDR.

The programme has National Programme Coordinators (NPCs) in four countries, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Thailand. NPCs were also based in Malaysia and Viet Nam until 2019 but following the restructuring of the activities and budgets, these positions were ended, and core activities are implemented with oversight from the regional team in Bangkok. An NPC has been jointly funded with other ILO programmes in Viet Nam since 2023 (with TRIANGLE in ASEAN providing three months salary). In addition, there are six Finance and Administration Assistants, one in each of the countries the NPCs are based in and two in the regional office in Thailand.

The technical backstopping unit is MIGRANT, with support provided from the Regional Migration Specialist in Decent Work Technical Support Team for East and South-East Asia and the Pacific and specialists in Geneva. Where relevant, other technical support is provided from the Decent Work Technical Support Team, such as the specialists in skills and employability, statistics, and workers' and employers' activities, as well as Geneva, such as INWORK, FUNDAMENTALS, SOCPRO, and the Disability Inclusion team in the Gender, Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (GEDI) department.

Programme oversight is conducted by the Regional Programme Advisory Committee (RPAC) and National Programme Advisory Committees (NPACs) in Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Thailand. In Malaysia, TRIANGLE participates in the annual reviews of the Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP). As a result of the coup d'état in Myanmar in 2021 and the subsequent UN guidelines on engagement, the NPAC is conducted without representatives of the military de facto government. The Australia funded component of TRIANGLE in ASEAN was approved as an ASEAN cooperation project in 2022. The Canada funded component of TRIANGLE in ASEAN was approved as an ASEAN cooperation project already in 2017, and was re-approved following the costed extension in 2022. At the time of Canada's initial endorsement, ASEAN endorsement was not a priority for Australia and was not pursued. Summaries of the individual countries of implementation can be found at Annex 7.

2. Evaluation Background

2.1 Purpose, Scope, and Clients of the Evaluation

This was a final evaluation and thus has a focus on accountability in assessing the progress towards achieving programme objectives. Given that DFAT funding will continue until 2025, the evaluation also had formative lesson learning objectives to understand what lessons learned and good practices should be prioritised for the remainder of the programme, and what are the potential investments into labour migration programmes after the current phase of TRIANGLE in ASEAN ends.

The objectives of the evaluation set out in the terms of reference (TOR) were:

1. To determine the progress in achieving the end of programme outcomes and to what extent gender equality and empowerment of women were mainstreamed throughout the programme.
2. To assess the implications of the merger of the two separate DFAT and GAC funded projects into the joint TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme.
3. To identify challenges which should be addressed or avoided during the remainder of the TRIANGLE programme, or in future investments in migrant labour programmes.
4. To document lessons learned, and good practices that should be prioritized going forward, as well as to provide recommendations for areas that can be strengthened and to inform the DFAT and GAC decision in considering future migrant labour investments.

Scope

The evaluation covered the period of implementation from the inception of the programme in November 2015 until the present. It included country-specific implementation in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand, and Viet Nam, as well as the regional activities within ASEAN.

The evaluation included data-collection visits to Cambodia, Indonesia, and Thailand for the team leader. In-person data collection took place between March 5 and 27, 2024, including 5 days in Cambodia, 10 days in Thailand, and 2 days in Indonesia. Cambodia and Thailand were selected as example countries of implementation where was possible for the evaluator to see a significant

sample of work/partners/beneficiaries related to the programmes. As Cambodia is a country of origin and Thailand is a country of destination, the selection helped showcase TRIANGLE in ASEAN's activities at both ends of the migration corridor. The selection of these two countries was justified by the fact that of the countries with a remaining national implementation team, they have a significant volume of activities and are logistically feasible for the evaluator to visit. The team leader would most probably not have been granted a visa for Myanmar and the volume of activities in Lao PDR is less than Cambodia and Thailand. The same is the case in Malaysia and Viet Nam that do not have NPCs or Finance and Administrative Assistants. The team leader also visited Indonesia to meet with regional stakeholders and the development partners.

Evaluation activities in Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Viet Nam were carried out by national consultants the ILO recruited for the evaluation in March and April 2024. The team leader, with the support of TRIANGLE in ASEAN's NPCs and Regional Monitoring, Evaluation, and Knowledge Management Officer, worked closely with the national consultants to ensure common understanding of the data collection tools and clarity on the findings of the interviews.

Remote interviews were also conducted to ensure inclusion of stakeholders who could not be interviewed in person. Remote data collection took place between February and May 2024. This included interviews with development partners, regional stakeholders, national stakeholders in Malaysia, and some evaluation participants in Cambodia and Thailand who either worked in locations not included on the trip schedule or were unavailable to be interviewed in person. Online interviews were also conducted by the national consultant in Myanmar where the security situation prevented in-person interviews.

Evaluation Clients/Users

The main primary clients of the evaluation will be the management of TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme, MIGRANT, the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) and ILO country offices, as well as the development partners of DFAT and GAC.

Secondary users will include programme stakeholders at both the regional and national level. At the regional level, this includes the ASEAN Secretariat, ACMW, ASEAN Trade Union Council (ATUC), ASEAN Confederation of Employers (ACE), and Task Force on ASEAN Migrant Workers (TFAMW), as well as other regional partners who have participated in the project. At the national level, it includes the tripartite constituents, other line ministries with responsibilities linked to migration, civil society organizations, and academia. Other UN agencies and international NGOs may also be secondary users of the evaluation.

2.2 Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The evaluation criteria for the evaluation were relevance and strategic fit, coherence, intervention progress and effectiveness, efficiency of resource use, effectiveness of management arrangements, impact orientation of sustainability, and gender equality and disability inclusion.

Evaluation questions were proposed in the TOR. These were reviewed by the evaluation team leader during the inception period and some questions consolidated together. Revisions were made to the questions after the first draft of the inception report was presented to the ILO, DFAT, and GAC, and a final slate of questions agreed.

Evaluation questions are listed at the start of the findings for each criterion. More details on sub-questions, means of verification, data sources, data collection methods, and data analysis for each

question is contained in the evaluation matrix submitted as part of the inception report. A copy of this can be found at annex 2 of this report.

2.3 Methodology

Approach

The evaluation followed a mixed methods approach, using mainly qualitative techniques, but also incorporating quantitative monitoring data the programme has collected. This included desk research, key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), the collection of stories of change, and findings workshops with key programme stakeholders. The approach utilised the principles of democratic evaluation by ensuring participation of a broad range of stakeholders and ensuring those with less agency had the opportunity to have their voice heard in the evaluation. The sampling ensured migrant workers and officials of their representative organisations were included in the evaluation. Separate FGDs were held for men and women migrants to reduce potential power imbalances and limit the risks of women not being willing to share issues particularly relevant for them. Two organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs) were also included in the evaluation sample. As the programme has only just started specifically focusing on disability inclusion, identifying migrant workers with disabilities who have utilised the migrant resource centres was not possible, although migrants with disabilities were interviewed in Myanmar.

Inception Period

An initial briefing was held with the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme team for the team leader to begin the evaluation. This included a summary of the programme and discussions about available documents and the initial ideas for data collection. Following this briefing, a shared folder of key programme documents was set up by the M&E Officer to allow the team leader to conduct a desk review.

Individual briefings were arranged with each of the regional management team, which combined with the review of the key documents shared with the evaluation team leader allowed the development of the first draft of the inception report. The draft included the evaluation matrix detailing how evaluation questions would be assessed, a proposed methodology, and draft interview guides. This was submitted to the ILO who also shared it with the development partners and collated feedback for the team leader. Adjustments were made based on the feedback and a final version agreed.

During the inception period, the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme team also recruited national consultants to conduct data collection in Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Viet Nam. Briefings of programme activities in these countries were held with the consultants, the team leader, and TRIANGLE in ASEAN's M&E Officer. Follow up calls and emails between the team leader and the consultants ensured there was a common understanding of the interview guides.

Briefings with the NPCs of Cambodia and Thailand were also held for the team leader to both gain an understanding of the programme's activities in Cambodia and Thailand, and to discuss the schedule for the evaluation mission.

Data Collection

Data collection was split into four main approaches. The desk review of key documents not only served to introduce the team leader to the programme but also provided data points that could be triangulated against the other findings during the evaluation. As such, the documents were regularly

revisited throughout the evaluation. The other three main approaches were in-person KIIs and FGDs by the team leader in Cambodia, Indonesia, and Thailand, remote KIIs before, during, and after the data collection mission by the team leader, and KIIs and FGDs by the national consultants in Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Viet Nam.

The following techniques were used during the evaluation:

- **Key Informant Interviews**

Individual and group KIIs were held with various stakeholders including government officials, representatives of employers' and workers' organisations, civil society organisation (CSO) officials, including OPDs and women's organisations, migrants who work in domestic work, migrant worker resource centre (MRC) staff, ILO officials, and representatives of DFAT and GAC. Where needed, the ILO provided interpreters for the interviews to allow the subjects to speak in their mother tongue if they preferred.

- **Focus group discussions**

FGDs allowed for the inclusion of more participants in the evaluation. FGDs were held with former and current migrant workers in all countries of implementation except Malaysia. Separate FGDs with men and women were held to mitigate any power imbalances that may have prevented women in particular from sharing their views and stories with the evaluation team.

- **Collection of stories of change**

During the KIIs and FGDs, the evaluation team asked the participants what changes they had experienced or witnessed as a result of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme, and particularly what they felt the most significant of these were. Participants were asked if they had examples to describe these, and where feasible, the evaluation team noted down these examples to provide stories of change. These examples are utilised in the evaluation report to demonstrate what evaluation stakeholders, particularly migrant workers value from the programme. The full collection is at annex 8 of this report.

- **Presentation of findings**

An initial presentation of findings was made to the TRIANGLE in ASEAN management team on the last day of the data collection mission. This only included reflections from the team leader's data collection during the mission and in the online calls that had to that date been conducted. The data from the national consultants had not been submitted by this time, and various online interviews remained outstanding. This session helped the team leader to validate some of the data and facilitate initial feedback and discussions with the programme team.

More comprehensive presentations of the findings were held following the development of the first draft of the report, and feedback was utilised to refine the report.

- **Sampling**

Sampling was purposive and based on involvement in the programme and availability to participate in interviews. An initial list of suggested stakeholders was compiled by the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme team and shared with the team leader who reviewed and made additional suggestions. The team leader also suggested categories of stakeholders for the FGDs. Additionally, suggestions for interviews were made by various evaluation participant during the interviews, and where feasible, these participants were included in the evaluation.

A total of 305 individuals (179 women, 126 men) participated in the evaluation in 103 individual and group interviews and 28 FGDs. This included 184 (88 women, 96 men) participants in KIIs and 121 (91 women, 30 men) participants in FGDs. 126 migrant workers (93 women, 33 men), 17 workers' representatives (3 women, 14 men), 6 employers' representatives (1 women, 5 men), 53 government officials (19 women, 34 men), 3 ASEAN Secretariat officials (1 woman, 2 men), 57 CSO and other partners officers (34 women, 23 men), 5 UN officials (2 women, 3 men), 10 development partner officials (9 women, 1 man) representatives, and 28 ILO Officials (17 women, 11 men) participated in KIIs and FGDs. This included 77 in Cambodia (40 women, 37 men), 23 in Lao PDR (11 women, 12 men), 3 in Malaysia (2 women, 1 men), 77 in Myanmar (52 women, 25 men), 47 in Thailand (31 women, 16 men), and 37 in Viet Nam (20 women, 17 men), as well as 36 regional stakeholders (20 women, 16 men), and 5 based in Geneva (3 women, and 2 men). The evaluators did not ask the participants if they identified as having a disability, but at least 6 persons with disabilities participated in the evaluation.

Category	Women	Men	Total
Migrant Workers	93	33	126
Workers' Representatives	3	14	17
Employers' Representatives	1	5	6
CSO and Other Partner Representatives	34	23	57
Government	19	34	53
ASEAN Secretariat Representatives	1	2	3
UN Officials	2	3	5
ILO Officials	17	11	28
Development Partner Officials	9	1	10
Total	179	126	305

Table 1 : Interview Sample per category

Country	Women	Men	Total
Cambodia	40	37	77
Lao PDR	11	12	23
Malaysia	2	1	2
Myanmar	52	25	77
Thailand	31	16	47
Viet Nam	20	17	37
Regional	20	16	36
Geneva	3	2	5
Total	179	126	305

Table 2: Interview Sample per location

Data Analysis and Reporting

Following the completion of data collection, the data from the desk review, KIIs, and FGDs was analysed and coded, and an initial draft of the report submitted to the ILO and the development partners for feedback. A second draft of the report was produced based on the initial feedback and the draft shared with all the stakeholders who had participated in the evaluation. Following feedback on the second draft, and feedback from the presentation of results, the report was finalised and submitted to the ILO for approval.

2.4 Norms, Standards and Ethical Safeguards

The evaluation was conducted in line with ILO's Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluation: Principles, Rationale, Planning, and Managing for Evaluations (2020). The evaluation also adhered to the UN Norms and Standards (2016), paying attention to the 10 norms laid out in the guidance. The evaluation was conducted independently with impartiality ensured by recruiting an evaluator not previously involved with implementing the project.

All KIIs and FGDs began with an explanation of the evaluation and informed verbal consent, including explaining the confidentiality of responses, was asked from participants. Data in the report has been anonymized to ensure confidentiality. Participants in FGDs were asked to respect the confidentiality of other participants.

2.5 Limitations and Potential Sources of Bias

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

Not being able to travel to all programme locations: The programme involves stakeholders from several countries, but the timeframe of the evaluation only allowed for visits to 3 countries by the Team Leader. Additional data collection was carried out either remotely or by national consultants. The Team Leader worked closely with the national consultants to ensure clarity of understanding of the question guides and purpose of the evaluation and interacted with the consultants throughout the data collection period. This helped minimised risks of data gaps and differences in quality of data between countries.

There is always the potential for a loss of nuance or understanding as a result of non-verbal cues being missed during remote data collection and the evaluation being biased towards the countries where the Team Leader undertakes the in-person data collection. However, the Team Leader was experienced in remote data collection and sampling ensured a broad range of stakeholders were included in the evaluation which allowed options to triangulate the data from these interviews with other data. A comparison of the findings from the interviews conducted in person and those conducted remotely suggested that the data from the remote interviews was valid and accurate.

Language: Many of the KIIs and FGDs conducted by the Team Leader were conducted through an interpreter. This also presented the potential for misunderstandings during the interviews. Although the ILO's interpreters are usually highly experienced, there were problems with the interpreters identified by the company contracted by the ILO in Bangkok. The quality of their interpretation and limited knowledge of the ILO led to difficulties in two interviews. As a result, the Thailand NPC sat in on one interview to gauge the quality of interpretation. Although this is not usually done to maintain the independence of the evaluation, the benefits of assessing the quality of interpretation outweighed the negative impacts, and allowed for the ILO to request a change in interpreter, for in-person interviews and in remote interviews utilised the interpreter who supported the evaluation in Chiang Mai and Mae Sot, whose interpretation was of high quality. The CSO officials who participated in the group interview were asked prior to the interview if the presence of the NPC was ok for them.

Gender: As the data collection in the different countries was conducted by individual consultants, diversity of gender was not possible. The team leader was a man, which raised potential problems of gender power dynamics leading to women (particularly women migrants) being less willing to reveal information to the evaluator. The evaluator was experienced in gender responsive evaluations and ensured the interviews were conducted in a sensitive manner. The use of men and women only FGDs also provided opportunities for women to have their voice heard without potentially feeling concerns

about speaking in front of men in their communities. The interpreters contracted by the ILO were all women, which meant women migrants were directly talking to a woman and then having their words translated for the team leader, which mitigated these concerns to an extent. The national consultants contracted by the ILO to support the Team Leader were all women providing a gender balance among the team, even though not in the individual countries.

3. Findings

3.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit

Key Findings

1. The multi-faceted design has ensured relevance to at the regional, national, and provincial level.
2. The programme aligns with the priorities of national governments and supports the dissemination of national policy to the provincial levels.
3. The programme addresses needs at the grassroots level, specifically linked to access to information and access to justice.
4. The Covid-19 response was not only effective but helped increase awareness among government stakeholders of the important role that CSOs and Trade Unions play in supporting migrant workers.
5. The programme has some gaps that have a minor impact on relevance including the geographical scope of TRIANGLE in ASEAN not including Indonesia and the Philippines, the lack of provision of security training and mental health support for frontline MRC workers, and some bureaucratic challenges concerning outreach activities.

Evaluation Questions

- To what extent are the outcomes of TRIANGLE in ASEAN consistent with beneficiary requirements, country needs, regional and global priorities, and development partners' strategies and priorities?
- What has changed in the context (including ASEAN priorities) since TRIANGLE in ASEAN started in 2015 and how did TRIANGLE in ASEAN respond and adapt?

The evaluation found the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme to be highly relevant to the needs to different stakeholders. Most stakeholders who participated in the evaluation shared appreciation for the programme meeting their needs. This aligns with the mid-term evaluation in 2019 that identified similar findings. Given the significant context changes since 2019, this continued relevance speaks to the ability of the ILO to adapt the programme to emerging needs and of the flexibility of the development partners in allowing different approaches as and when the situation required it.

Relevance to different groups

- Multi-faceted

The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme is designed to operate at many levels and identifies connections between these levels. As a result, it can convene policy level discussion at the regional level and support national governments in revising policies and guidelines related to labour migration, whilst also ensuring the programme addresses the direct needs of migrant workers at the grassroots level and strengthens the capacities of provincial-level duty bearers to support individuals and families in communities. The design and implementation of the programme has supported an elevator style approach where the needs and inputs from the grassroots and provincial level are utilised in national

and regional policy level debates and the decisions taken at these levels then impact migrants at the grassroots level, through operationalising regional declarations, guidelines, frameworks, and recommendations at the national and local levels.

“The ASEAN AFML is just one of the programmes that ILO is supporting. They have programmes on the ground in the countries. This helps give them perspective so when they come to supporting the regional collaboration, they are bit more grounded as a result. They know the nuances of these countries as a result. The expectations are not just based on an ideal but on practicalities from the ground programmes.” (Regional Stakeholder)

- Migrant Workers

One of the major vehicles for supporting migrant workers through the programme are the migrant worker resource centres (MRCs). TRIANGLE in ASEAN supports 23 MRCs, in the six countries of national level implementation. The MRCs are a model developed in the first phase of the programme that have been refined and adapted by the ILO and utilised in several other projects in the region. Different modalities exist for the MRCs dependent on the country and needs of the migrants. They are run by CSOs, trade unions, and government departments. In countries of origin, the MRCs provide pre-departure information and an avenue for grievance management. In countries of destination, they provide support for migrants through raising awareness of rights and national laws, supporting mediation with employers and government officials, and providing avenues for grievance mechanisms. The challenges of obtaining information were shared by a migrant worker in Viet Nam:

“It is difficult to identify reliable sources of information (outside of the MRC). Because there is a lot of different information about working abroad (such as: private companies, touts advertising many attractive programmes with high salaries, quick exit or guaranteed exam passing), but workers do not know if there are any risks. For example: Is the business trustworthy or is the business a scam; Is the job as described or will the job be changed after entry; Is the commitment on salary, income, accommodation... true as shared?” (Women Migrant Worker- Vietnam)

The migrant worker quoted above indicated, along with all her peers in the FDG, that the information provided by the MRC was more complete and accurate than information available from other sources, such as family, friends, or companies. This matched the testimony of migrant workers in other countries. Migrant workers who have used the MRCs in both countries of origin and destination indicated to the evaluation team that the MRCs had provided them with information and other support they would have been unable to access otherwise. Some of the migrant workers were able to compare their experiences to pre and post utilising or being involved with the MRC. In Cambodia, the team leader met members of a women’s migrant group organised through an MRC, many of whom had migrated several years ago. They are now involved in spreading information about safe migration. They shared their belief that knowledge in the community on how to avoid being scammed by unauthorised brokers and awareness of the documentation needed had increased as a result of the work done by the MRC.

Access to justice is a considerable need for migrant workers, given their vulnerability to exploitation and abuses. The MRCs have provided an avenue for the migrant workers to be able to access justice and receive compensation and were identified as being highly relevant for the workers who have been able to utilise these services. The programme has supported migrant workers in the six countries of national level implementation to received \$11.9 million in compensation. This is both an indicator of the demand for, and the effectiveness of, the MRC services.

- Alignment with Government Needs

The programme has both aligned itself with national government policy frameworks and also helped shape them. Government officials who spoke to the evaluation team were broadly positive of the programme and keen to stress the relevance of the technical support their governments had received. They believed this helped meet the needs of their countries with regards to migration governance. In many countries, the technical support given to developing policies and guidelines was considered crucial in the progress that has been made in recent years. Examples included the support given to the development of Law 69 in Viet Nam, the Labour Migration Policy in Cambodia, and the Agreement 1050 on the Management of Employment Service Enterprises and the Regulations of the Lao Employment Business Association (LEBA), that are pending adoption in Lao PDR⁴.

Strengthening provincial capacities was another key area of the programme identified by government stakeholders. Many government stakeholders acknowledged that knowledge of migration governance and capacities to address these challenges was limited among provincial departments. TRIANGLE in ASEAN has included a strong focus on working with selected provincial areas where there are high levels of migration and worked with the provincial governments to expand capacities. In Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Viet Nam, the programme has supported running of MRCs by provincial government departments (in addition to Myanmar prior to the coup), as well as in Cambodia and Lao PDR, encouraging provincial departments to engage with trade unions and CSOs in locations where non-state actors, rather the government, are running the MRC.

- Alignment with ASEAN priorities and ACMW's Action Plan (2018-2025) of the ASEAN Consensus

The regional component of the programme was also seen as relevant to governments, employers' and workers' organisations, and CSOs. Several government officials referenced the ASEAN instruments, such as Declarations, Guidelines, and AFML recommendations, as being useful in helping to drive policy development in their countries. The ASEAN Declaration and its Guidelines on Portability of Social Security Benefits for Migrant Workers in ASEAN as well as the ASEAN Declaration and its Guidelines on Protection of Migrant Workers and Family Members in Crisis Situations were the most regularly cited ASEAN instruments, which may mainly be a function of it being developed in the last few years and addressing a topic that has been discussed among states recently. The relevance of the regional component of the programme extends beyond the 6 countries where national level activities take place to the governments of other Member States. Examples of Brunei Darussalam submitting requests to the ILO through the annual ACMW meeting, and the support given to relevant Timor-Leste officials to attend the ACMW activities as observers were raised as examples of the breadth of the programme.

The programme has supported the priorities of the ACMW through support to the ACMW 2016-2020 work plan and, subsequently, the Action Plan of the ASEAN Consensus, which covers 2018-2025. Between 2016 and 2023, TRIANGLE in ASEAN supported 16 completed ACMW activities, 7 ongoing activities, and has committed to supporting 4 more activities. The ILO is among the main providers of external support to the ACMW, and within the ILO, TRIANGLE in ASEAN has been the lead programme providing support along with the Safe and Fair and Ship-to-Shore programmes. A

⁴ This is referred to as the Lao Employment Services Agency (LESA) in many of the programme's reports and briefing documents. It was recently agreed to change its name to the Lao Employment Business Association and thus the evaluation report uses this name throughout.

table detailing the ACMW activities the programme has supported can be found at annex 7 in the regional section of the country summaries.

Stakeholders also believe that TRIANGLE in ASEAN has been instrumental in ensuring a more inclusive approach at the ASEAN level by advocating for the involvement of workers' and employers' organisations and CSOs. In many individual member states, civil society space has been shrinking and this makes it challenging for CSOs and trade unions to have a voice in policy development. The AFML and other ACMW activities have provided a platform where civil society and trade unions are able to participate, engage in mutual discussion with government counterparts and have their views heard in a manner that is often not possible at the national level.

"The AFML is not like other forums such as the Abu Dhabi Dialogue and the Colombo Process. At the AFML, everyone can speak without applying to. You can just put up your hand and speak. The governments have panels to reply to questions as well." (CSO Representative)

- Employers

ACE and several national federations such as the Employers Federation of Thailand (ECOT), the Association of Cambodian Recruitment Agencies (ACRA), and until it merged with ACRA in 2023 the Manpower Association of Cambodia, and Viet Nam Association of Manpower Supply (VAMAS), have been involved in the programme. At the regional level, the programme has facilitated the engagement of ACE in the AFML and other regional activities supported by the programme, and bipartite dialogue with the ATUC. At the national level, the programme has focused on address fair recruitment through interactions with recruitment agencies and their representative organisations. The programme was instrumental in the setting up of the LEBA in Lao PDR, and regionally has had 382 recruitment agencies sign up to new codes of conduct.

There has been less involvement with other areas of the private sector, such as the companies that employ migrants. Labour attaches are also a resource for migrants in countries of destination that could be engaged more deeply by the programme. This was noted by several stakeholders as an area that could be more comprehensively addressed in the future.

- Workers' Organisations

Workers' organisations also reported the programme to be relevant to their priorities. The programme has worked with ATUC, supporting increased involvement of trade unions in ASEAN processes as well as the bipartite dialogue with ACE. Trade unions have also run MRCs in Cambodia, Malaysia, and Myanmar. Trade union representatives indicated that the protection of migrant workers is becoming increasingly accepted by trade union federation affiliates as a fundamental part of their mandate. This is a marked development since the beginning of the programme, and is still a work in progress, with some trade unions still seeing migrant workers as a threat to employment and working standards of national workers, and other trade unions being quite constrained on their engagement as a result of national legislation restricting the organisation of migrant workers. TRIANGLE in ASEAN has supported the engagement of trade unions by encouraging the appointment of focal points on migration within trade unions, learning from the lessons identified in the review of the challenges related to previous bilateral memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between trade unions.

- Civil Society Organisations

The programme has had a strategy of explicitly including CSOs in the programme and moving beyond the ILO's traditional focus on the tripartite partners to a tripartite plus model. This is partly as a

recognition of the experience on migration and connections to grassroots communities that CSOs working in this field have. Officials from CSOs involved in the programme believed that TRIANGLE in ASEAN is relevant to helping them meet the needs of the migrants they work with. The recognition that the CSOs receive at national level planning events and the regional AFML, as well as other regional meetings, is one element of this, but additionally, the CSOs have played a key role in setting up and running MRCs, organising women's migrant groups, and supporting Migrant Workers and their families to access grievance mechanisms. TRIANGLE in ASEAN has supported the strengthening of capacities of CSOs to implement these activities and ensure a high level of quality of support for migrant workers.

- Alignment with International Frameworks

The programme aligns with several international frameworks related to migration governance. All member states of ASEAN voted in favor of the GCM with the exception of Singapore, which abstained. Although agreed after the programme's development, the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme still aligns closely with many of the objectives of the GCM. The programme has been influential in ensuring the continuity of the collection of international migration statistics within the ILO and in strengthening the capacities of member states in ASEAN to collect and publish disaggregated statistics each year, thus supporting objective 1 of the GCM. The grassroots work at the MRC level of the programme also supports the objectives of providing timely and accurate information at all stages of migration (objective 3), addressing and reducing vulnerabilities in migration (objective 7), promoting faster and cheaper transfer of remittances through the work with Saver Asia (objective 20), and cooperating in facilitating safe and dignified return and reintegration (objective 21). The regional component of the programme supports the strengthening of international cooperation (objective 23), and through the discussions held at the regional level and the subsequent transfer to national level dialogue, has supported, or at least began discussion on, several other objectives, including enhancing the availability and flexibility of pathways for regular migration (objective 5), facilitating fair and ethical recruitment (objective 6), enhancing consular protection for migrants (objective 14), providing access to basic services for migrants (objective 15), investing in skills development and mutual recognition of skills (objective 18), and establishing mechanisms for the portability of social security mechanisms. Other objectives such as empowering migrants and societies to realise full inclusion (objective 16) and eliminating discrimination (objective 17), are mainstreamed throughout the activities of the programme.

The programme also aligns with several of the SDGs, particularly SDG 8.8, 'Protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers, in particular women migrants, and those in precarious employment', and SDG 10.7, 'Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies.' There is also relevance to other SDG goals including those focused on women's empowerment, particularly within SDG 5, and the elimination of child labour, forced labour, and trafficking-in-persons within SDGs 5, 8, and 16.

ILO's normative framework through the international labour standards contained in its conventions also provide key references on migration, and TRIANGLE in ASEAN contributes to Members States obligations under several of these. ASEAN member states are signatories to various ILO conventions are relevant migration, including the ten fundamental conventions, as well as governance and technical conventions.

Country	87 ⁵	98	100	111	29	105	138	182	155	187	81	97	143	189
Brunei Darussalam	-	-	-	-	X	-	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cambodia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-
Indonesia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	-	-
Lao PDR	-	-	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X		-	-	-
Malaysia	-	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	-	-
Myanmar	X	-	-	-	X	-	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-
Philippines	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	X
Singapore	-	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-
Thailand	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	-	-	-	-
Viet Nam	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-

Table 3: List of ILO Convention Ratifications per Country

While all countries are signatories to both child labour conventions and C29 on forced labour, ratification to the other fundamental and other relevant conventions is mixed, particularly for the conventions on freedom of association and collective bargaining. However, the 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work⁶ (FPRW), articulated that all Member States of the ILO are called upon to respect the principles of all fundamental conventions, including the conventions they have not ratified. The High-Level Evaluation of the ILO's Strategies and Actions on FPRW in 2023, found that the integrated approach envisaged by the Governing Body in its follow-up to the discussion concerning the second recurrent discussion on FPRW⁷, had not been effectively implemented by the ILO. However, TRIANGLE in ASEAN is an exception to this, providing an example of an effective integrated approach on several of the key fundamental principles. The programme addresses gender equality and non-discrimination for migrant workers, as well as strengthening the capacities of migrant workers and their respective organisations to organise to articulate rights of freedom of association and collective bargaining. The programme also strengthens awareness among migrant workers and key duty bearers on the indicators of forced labour.

The ILO's work on migration is also guided by the Migration for Employment Convention (Revised), 1949 (No. 97), and the Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provisions) Convention, 1975 (No. 143), although among ASEAN Member States, only the Philippines has ratified these two conventions. The Private Employment Agencies Convention, 1997 (No. 181), which although also has not been ratified by any ASEAN Member State, is also an important guiding convention for the ILO's programming involving recruitment agencies. Two non-binding ILO guideline documents are also supported

⁵ C87, Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention 1930, C98, Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention 1948, C100, Equal Remuneration Convention 1951, C111, Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention 1958, C29, Forced Labour Convention 1930, C105, Abolition of Forced Labour Convention 1957, C138, Minimum Age Convention 1973, C182, Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention 1999, C155 Occupational Safety and Health Convention 1981, C187 Promotional Framework for Occupational Safety and Health Convention 2006, C81, Labour Inspection Convention 1947, C97 Migration for Employment Convention (1947), C143 Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provisions) Convention (1975), C189 Domestic Workers Convention 2011.

⁶ ILO, (2022). Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-up.

https://www.ilo.org/declaration/thedeclaration/textdeclaration/WCMS_716594/lang--en/index.htm

⁷ ILO, (2017). Matters arising out of the work of the 106th Session (2017) of the International Labour Conference. Follow-up to the resolution concerning the second recurrent discussion on fundamental principles and rights at work. GB.331/INS/4/3(Rev.). https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_579684.pdf

through the programme. The work the programme does on reducing recruitment costs aligns with the General principles and operational guidelines for fair recruitment and Definition of recruitment fees and related costs (2017). Various elements of the programme also align with the ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration (2006) including the need for a solid legal foundation for the protection of migrant workers, the importance of social dialogue, the critical role a strong knowledge base can provide, the need to consult civil society, the principle of non-discrimination, and the importance of addressing migration governance at all stages of the migration cycle.

The programme has a significant focus on gender equality and non-discrimination which is discussed in more detail later in the report. The programme is thus relevant to UN and ILO conventions. All member states have ratified the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). Additionally, all member states have ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD). The ILO's latest convention, the Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No.190) and the Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No.189), are also very relevant to the attention to the empowerment of women migrant workers and the focus on domestic work included in the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme. Although none of the ASEAN Member States have ratified these conventions, with the exception of the Philippines for C.189, they do provide a framework for advancing discussions on issues related to domestic work and women's empowerment. The DWCP for Thailand, approved by the tripartite partners, has identified C.189 and C.190 as priority conventions, and the Government of Thailand approved Ministerial Regulation 15 Governing the Working Conditions for Domestic Workers in April 2024 (discussed more in the section on Gender Equality). The Government of Viet Nam has also indicated a willingness to ratify C.190, along with several other ILO conventions, by 2030.

- Regional frameworks

The relationship between regional activities at the ASEAN level and the national policy development is a critical element of the design of TRIANGLE in ASEAN. The programme works closely with the ASEAN Secretariat and in particular the ACMW and aligns with, and helps shape, ASEAN normative and operational frameworks on labour migration. The main foundation of ASEAN's normative framework is the ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers, 2007 (Cebu Declaration) and the 2017 ASEAN Consensus on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers. The programme aligns with these through the significant support given to ACMW to implement the Declaration and Consensus and the support given to national governments to align national policies with these instruments.

- Programme and Budget and Decent Work Country Programmes

The biennial Programme and Budget (P&B) agreed by the International Labour Conference (ILC) has included references to migration through the implementation period of the second phase of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme. The mid-term evaluation noted, the programme aligned with the Outcome 9, a specific outcome on migration. Since the 2020-21 biennium, the P&B has had a reduced number of outcomes, and migration has been part of the outcome, 'Adequate and effective protection at work for all' (outcome 7 in 2020-21 and 2022-23, and outcome 6 in 2024-25). Within this outcome, the output 7.5, 'Increased capacity of Member States to develop fair and effective labour migration frameworks, institutions and services to protect migrant workers' in 2020-21 and 2022-23, and output 6.4, 'Increased capacity of Member States to develop fair and effective labour migration frameworks' in 2024-25, have been the main outputs that the programme has contributed to. The programme also aligns with other outcomes in the P&B, most notably those focused on

gender equality and non-discrimination, universal social protection, and increased capacities of tripartite constituents, although the programme does not report against these.

The influence of the work on migration in the region, of which TRIANGLE in ASEAN is a significant element, can be seen in the prominent inclusion of migration governance within the DWCPs that have been developed during the period. The Thailand DWCP, 2023-27 includes migrant workers within its priority 2, 'Ensure social protection for all and inclusive decent work', particularly notably in the outputs on social protection systems and increased opportunities of decent work for vulnerable populations. Cambodia's 2024-28 DWCP includes within priority 1, 'HUMAN CAPITAL -Promoting strengthened technical and vocational skills systems, strengthened and expanded social protection and improved labour market transitions' that migrant workers have increased access to public employment services, and within priority 3, 'INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS- Promoting social dialogue, harmonious industrial relations and rights at work in line with national and international labour standards', the outcome, ' By 2028, increased realisation of rights, better working conditions and sustainable reintegration for migrant workers as a result of enhanced labour migration governance, policies, mechanisms, and support services.' Viet Nam's DWCP, includes references to migrant workers in its outcome focused on reducing trafficking in persons, where it highlights the important role the MRCs will play in achieving this outcome. The DWCP also devotes considerable space to discussion on migration and is clear that it includes migrant workers in its outcomes focused on vulnerable workers. Lao PDR's DWCP 2022-26 includes the outcome, 'Strengthened multi-stakeholder capacity to protect the rights of women and men migrants and create a conducive environment for safe and fair migration for decent work through advocacy and enhanced regulatory and law compliance'. Malaysia's DWCP 2019-2025 Priority 3 is, 'Labour migration – Strengthening labour migration governance', and includes among the outcomes the commitment to strengthen labour migration governance in line with ASEAN instruments. The military coup in 2021 has meant the ILO has not engaged with the Government of Myanmar since then. However, prior to the coup, the DWCP 2018-2021, did include the outcome, 'By 2021, functioning labour market information and safe migration systems are in place'.

The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme predates all the country DWCPs, which are usually renewed every 3-5 years. The programme though has remained relevant for the tripartite constituents given the alignment with the newly developed DWCPs. The DWCPs are agreed through a negotiation process with the tripartite constituents facilitated by the ILO, and thus should reflect the constituents' priorities. The prominence given to labour migration in various priorities and outcomes demonstrates the continued importance of the subject to the constituents in all countries of implementation, and also may be a reflection of the success that the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has had, along with the ILO's other projects on labour migration, in maintaining interest in the subject.

Each biennium, the country and regional offices report contributions to the ILOs P&B outcomes under specific country programme outcomes. For each of the biennia where the report has been produced (i.e. currently excluding 2024-25), the ILO's Decent Work Dashboard shows several results where the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has contributed. The table shows the outcome and in parentheses, the number of indicators reported on:

Biennia	Regional	Cambodia	Lao PDR	Malaysia	Myanmar	Thailand	Viet Nam
2016-17	RAS151 (1)	KHM128 (1)	n/a	MYS827 (2)	n/a	n/a	VNM105 (1)
2018-19	RAS151 (1)	KHM128 (2)	LAO901 (1)	MYS827 (1)	MMR126 (2)	THA176 (1)	VNM105 (1)
2020-21	RAS151 (1)	KHM128 (2)	LAO179 (2)	MYS827 (1)	MMR126 (1)	THA176 (2)	VNM105 (1)
2022-23	RAS151 (1)	KHM128 (2)	LAO179 (2)	MYS827 (2)	MMR126 (1)	THA176 (2)	VNM105 (2)

Table 4: CPOs reported on for each biennium.

This demonstrates that along with the programme being aligned with the DWCPs and the P&B, it is also making significant contributions to the ILO's reported results each biennium.

- Alignment with donor priorities

There are strong alignments of the programme with the priorities of both DFAT and GAC. Representatives of both countries stressed the importance of collaboration with the ASEAN region to their governments which is highlighted by the significance placed on the recognition of both countries' components of TRIANGLE as official ASEAN cooperation projects in 2017 for Canada and 2022 for Australia. Australia's International Development Policy (2023) stresses the importance of building effective and accountable states and enhancing community resilience to vulnerabilities, priorities which promoting regular migration is highly relevant to. DFAT's regional programme indicators for ASEAN include, 'Evidence of policy, legislative and/or technical support on labour migration, reducing remittance costs, protection and gender equality for migrant workers'. TRIANGLE in ASEAN's programme staff also acknowledged that DFAT had been a considerable driver in pushing the programme to develop more explicit programming on disability inclusion, which is discussed in more detail later in the report.

Canada's regional development programme is aligned with its global Feminist International Development Policy and has two main priorities, the development of ASEAN human capital by investing in people, including promoting the protection and rights of vulnerable people, and by strengthening ASEAN's regional stability by advancing peace, gender equality, and disaster management. ASEAN's importance to Canada is reflected by the fact that Canada has an Indo-Pacific strategy. Canada has also prioritised the funding of care related programming since 2021, and has supported the TRIANGLE in ASEAN's continued focus on domestic work and the care economy.

Gaps and Challenges to Relevance

- Undocumented populations

One area that potentially challenges the relevance of the programme for migrant workers is the bureaucratic constraints for partners providing support to undocumented workers. One partner reported that they are required to record migrant workers IDs and obtain signatures every time there is an event that utilises budget for provisions such as bottled water for the participants. Many of the population they work with are undocumented and so either do not have ID or are very reluctant to share the ID for fear of repercussions with government authorities. In some cases, this concern can also extend to not wanting to sign an attendance sheet. This obviously would limit the scope of the individuals the programme can work with, and also does not align with the ILO's objective of providing a path to full and productive employment and decent work for all or the ILC's emphasis on the ILO responding to protecting migrants in irregular situations⁸. It is understood by the evaluation

⁸ ILO, (2017). Matters arising out of the work of the 106th Session (2017) of the International Labour Conference. Follow-up to the resolution concerning fair and effective labour migration governance. GB.331/INS/4/1(Rev.)

team that the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme team is aware of this challenge and has assisted partners in resolving this issue when it has arisen, but a permanent solution has not yet been found with the finance department.

- **Geographical Scope**

The programme supports the ASEAN processes on migration through its regional components. However, only six countries have national level implementation activities. Two of these countries, Malaysia and Viet Nam had their full time NPCs and Admin and Finance Assistants removed during the budget consolidation in 2019. Malaysia's activities are managed directly by Bangkok, with support from other projects in the country office. Viet Nam has benefited from the support of the NPC of the Ship to Shore programme and provided three months salary contribution for the NPC's position. Some stakeholders in Malaysia and Viet Nam believed the lack of a full staff had not particularly affected implementation of the programme, although the scope of work the programme can undertake in Malaysia and Viet Nam is considerably less than the other countries of implementation and lower than it would be if a full staffing structure was available in these countries. It was also acknowledged that in Malaysia in particular, the scope of the work was limited compared to the high level of need for a major country of destination in the region. The Philippines and Indonesia were highlighted in particular as being gaps in the programme due to the lack of national activities. Both are significant countries of origin in the region and have considerable inputs into the ASEAN processes. There are obviously challenges in extending the programme to other countries. It would either require a significant expansion of the budget or reductions in activities elsewhere. The ILO also has other migration programmes in Indonesia and the Philippines which fill the gap to an extent, although none are of the length of TRIANGLE in ASEAN, and the current programmes are sector specific, and thus the consistency and range of support to national stakeholders on migration from the ILO as a whole cannot be guaranteed.

- **Security and Mental Health**

A gap identified by a several officials who work at the grassroots level with migrant workers was the lack of provision of training on security and safety and the provision of psychosocial support for field staff. These were particularly highlighted as an issue in Thailand and Myanmar. Many of the MRC staff and community organisers reported being threatened by employers and stated a need for training on risk management to improve how they, other leaders, and migrant workers manage security and safety threats. Additionally, the staff reported they and migrant leaders both experiencing traumatic incidents themselves and hearing distressing stories from migrant workers. The migrant leaders have often experienced similar incidents themselves in the past and hearing descriptions from migrant workers could be re-traumatising. None of the evaluation team are trained psychologists able to make a professional judgement, but some of the descriptions given sounded like post-traumatic stress. MRC staff expressed the opinion that having provisions for referrals to counselling included in the implementation agreements would be helpful.

3.2 Coherence and Validity of Design

Key Findings

6. The convening power of the ILO is seen as a significant strength of the programme by the tripartite constituents and CSOs.

7. The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has been able to collaborate effectively with other ILO programmes. Not all stakeholders are able to distinguish between TRIANGLE in ASEAN and other ILO's programmes on migration.
8. Some of the partners have built on synergies with other projects and thematic areas they work in.
9. There is room to expand collaboration with other programmes, particularly those working on trafficking.

Evaluation Questions

- In what areas of work, leveraging on ILO's comparative advantages, does TRIANGLE have comparative advantage over other interventions by the ILO or other UN agencies? How is it complimentary to other interventions?
- Has the project maximised synergies with other projects implemented by the ILO and other organisations?

Tripartite Plus Structure

The importance of the convening power of the ILO was one of the recurring themes of the feedback from stakeholders. This applied to all types of partners but particularly CSOs. It was believed that the ILO's expertise in international labour standards, its normative framework, and the relationship it has with governments and employers and workers' representatives, all contributed to its ability to get groups who often do not communicate effectively to participate in the same policy dialogues. The tripartite nature of the ILO was identified as an important value-add that other UN agencies do not have, and as something that has contributed to the success of the programme.

That said, there were some small issues related to the ILO's structure that stakeholders wished to bring to the evaluation team's attention. While the tripartite nature of the ILO was generally seen as positive, there were some tensions identified over how much the ILO should focus on the tripartite constituents and what should be the involvement of CSOs. This was mainly notable between CSOs and workers' organisations. In most cases, the trade unions welcomed the involvement of the CSOs, and ATUC has encouraged its affiliates to work with CSOs that have strong connections to migrant groups, but this acceptance has not been uniform. The other limitation, noted as a slight concern was the engagement of ministries other than the Ministries of Labour, which was noted as important given the cross-cutting nature of migration governance across government departments. It is important to continue efforts to engage other line ministries responsible for elements of migration governance and human trafficking.

International Labour Standards and the ILO's Normative Framework

International labour standards, set through conventions in the ILO's normative framework, and the expertise on these within the ILO, provide a strong comparative advantage, and the programme has managed to leverage this effectively. Key stakeholders shared with evaluation team that the technical expertise in identifying gaps, aligning policies, and supporting implementation of policy frameworks that align with international labour standards is seen as a considerable strength of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN, and the programme team's success in leveraging expertise from the in Decent Work Technical Support Team for East and South-East Asia and the Pacific and specialists in Geneva has contributed to this.

Developed Comparative Advantages

The programme has been able to develop additional comparative advantages as a result of its successes, combined with the length of the programme. The relationship that has developed with the key regional stakeholders, particularly the ACMW is a key advantage not shared by other programmes. The recognition of the programme as an official ASEAN cooperation project is a

testament to this. Additionally, the MRC structure that has been used in other ILO migration programming in ROAP and by other organisations, owes much to the refinement of the approach by TRIANGLE in ASEAN over its two phases. The development of this successful model has encouraged demand from partners interested in implementing the model and helps build long-term ownership and capacities.

Synergies with Other Programmes

TRIANGLE in ASEAN has ensuring synergies with other ILO projects and programmes. During the funding period, two other regional migration programmes have been implemented, the Safe and Fair programme, focused on migrant women empowerment (which ended in 2023 and a new programme, PROTECT, is starting in 2024), and the Ship to Shore programme, that has a thematic focus on fishing and the seafood processing sector. Collaboration with the programmes appears to have been effective. Informal coordination between the three CTAs and teams in Bangkok took place on a regular basis, as well as between the NPCs in the countries of implementation and other programme staff, and by TRIANGLE in ASEAN backstoppers and technical staff from other projects. The programmes have also utilised each other's resources effectively to maximise efficiency, without leading to duplication. Examples of this included the inputs given to the revision of Law 69 in Viet Nam, and the joint funding of the NPC in Viet Nam. The ILO also recently commissioned an assessment of the performances of the MRCs across South-East Asia, covering MRCs implemented by the regional programmes. The programme has effectively interacted with country level projects as well. For example, in Malaysia, the Protecting the Rights of Migrant Workers through Empowerment and Advocacy project has collaborated with TRIANGLE in ASEAN on the implementation of MRCs.

Several stakeholders had some difficulties in distinguishing between the ILO's migration programmes. It was particularly identified that work TRIANGLE in ASEAN had done on topics related to women's empowerment or gender quality were often credited to the Safe and Fair programme. One example of this was a regional stakeholder believing the TRIANGLE in ASEAN "Skilled to care, forced to work? Recognizing the skills profiles of migrant domestic workers in ASEAN amid forced labour and exploitation" publication was produced by Safe and Fair. Overall, this did not seem to have an impact on the programme. TRIANGLE in ASEAN is still acknowledged and appreciated and probably gets credit for actions taken by other programmes at times. Most stakeholders agreed that the key issue was the overall performance of the ILO on migration programming and less the individual programmes. None of the stakeholders complained about not knowing who in the ILO to speak to on a particular issue.

The programme has also been able to leverage support from various technical units in both Bangkok and Geneva. In Bangkok, the employers and workers specialists, skills specialist, regional labour statistician, and gender and inclusion specialist have all supported the programme. The programme has also received support from Geneva on the portability of social security from SOCPRO, forced labour and trafficking from FUNDAMENTALS, domestic work from INWORK, and gender equality and disability inclusion from GEDI.

The evaluation team spoke to officials from UN Women, IOM, and UNFPA. Unlike Ship to Shore and Safe and Fair, the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme is implemented solely by the ILO rather than as a joint UN programme. Despite this, UN Officials reported there has been good collaboration with by the programme team. IOM and UN Women have financially supported elements of the AFML. IOM's PROMISE programme and TRIANGLE in ASEAN have collaborated on supporting ACMW processes to develop the ASEAN Declaration on skills mobility, recognition and development for migrant workers (ongoing) and ASEAN Declaration on protection of migrant workers and their families in crisis situations and its Guidelines (2022-2023), and also jointly conducted the baseline of the programme in 2015 and will conduct an endline in 2024/25. UN Women was a joint implementer of Safe and Fair and in some countries the NPC was employed through UN Women. UN Women officials indicated

that TRIANGLE in ASEAN had been as effective in ensuring collaboration in the countries where the NPC was from UN Women as the countries where ILO provided the NPC.

The other significant ASEAN programme that DFAT supports is the ASEAN-Australian Counter Trafficking programme (ASEAN-ACT). DFAT believes there are strong connections between labour migration and counter-trafficking programming, particularly on the subject of forced labour, and all the countries of implementation for TRIANGLE in ASEAN are also member states of the Bali process and as such, DFAT is keen to see collaboration between the two programmes. Senior officials from the Australian Government are shown activities from both programmes during exposure visits. DFAT, ASEAN-ACT, and ILO Officials reported good collaboration between the two programmes that actively try to find areas of convergence. This has included collaborating on support to a few ACMW activities, specifically on development of the ASEAN Declaration on the Protection of Migrant Workers and Family Members in Crisis Situations and its Guidelines (2023) and investigation and prosecution of trafficking in persons (2017, 2019). There was though a general sense this could be developed further. This could include supporting the MRCs more deeply on responding to forced labour and increasing the technical capacities of stakeholders to respond to the newer phenomenon of scam centres, as well as increasing coordination between the NPCs and ASEAN-ACTs country managers. Both programmes place a priority on the engagement of CSOs, giving a solid platform for engagement on certain activities. ASEAN-ACT main contact ministries are the Ministries of Justice and Interior (or equivalent) and so potentially provides an opportunity for TRIANGLE in ASEAN to strengthen its engagement with more ministries beyond the traditional tripartite partner of the Ministry of Labour. ASEAN-ACT is also engaging the private sector in its work, which could be a possible further area for collaboration. TRIANGLE in ASEAN's activities on trafficking has been a less prominent part of their work recently as the Safe and Fair and Ship to Shore regional programmes have focused on anti-trafficking. As Safe and Fair has ended and Ship to Shore is due to end soon, there is potential for this is feature more prominently once again in TRIANGLE in ASEAN's work.

Programme partners have also demonstrated effectiveness in utilising synergies between the programme's activities and other projects and thematic priorities, as well as between different organisations. As an example, MAP in Thailand has four priority programmes, and the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme is implemented under their Labour Rights For All area, but there are also significant interactions with two out of the other three programmes, namely the Women's Empowerment and Multi-Media programmes. Collaboration between programme partners was also apparent, both in country and cross-border. For example, CSOs in Myanmar collaborate with CSOs in Thailand. In Cambodia, MRC implementers reported the ILO has facilitated collaboration and lesson learning to help share challenges and solutions between the implementers.

3.3 Intervention Progress and Effectiveness

Key Findings

10. The programme is on-track on almost all of its planned outcomes at the current stage of the programme.
11. Although substantially valid, the classification of some indicators should be reviewed, and the enabling factor of improved migrant worker empowerment is missing from both the results framework and theory of change.
12. Key achievements include, the development of women's groups, several changes in national policies, the adoption of ASEAN declarations, guidelines and tools, the development and refinement of the MRC model, contributing to the expansion of the body of evidence on migration, and improvements in social dialogue and tripartite plus relationships. These

achievements have been facilitated by the strengths of the programme, including strong attention to gender and non-discrimination, the convening power of the ILO, the involvement and capacity building of CSOs, the multi-faceted nature of the programme, and the programme's length and flexibility that have contributed to strong and trustful partnerships.

13. Key challenges the programme has faced include the military coup in Myanmar and the subsequent challenges in programming, budgetary limitations, persistent limited awareness among some key duty bearers about gendered differences faced by migrants, coordination between key ministries, and national follow-up of the AFML process.

Evaluation Questions

- To what extent has the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme made progress towards delivering the stated outcomes of the programme?
- What have been the key achievements and what enabled them to happen?
- How did TRIANGLE in ASEAN's partnerships with regional institutions (ACMW, ACE, ATUC, TFAMW and other CSOs) contribute to strengthening regional cooperation in addressing and increasing awareness on labour migration issues in the region?
- To what extent has the programme influenced governments' policies and practices, and the protection and promotion of the rights of migrant workers?
- What key challenges have detracted from the effectiveness of the programme activities?

Current Status

The programme has a results framework that is used to monitor programme performance. The long nature of the programme has required an adaptive approach with changes being made where relevant. The first five years of the merger of the DFAT and GAC projects was covered by the first inception report, encompassing 2017-2021. A second inception report, including a revised results framework, a theory of change, a M&E plan, a risk management strategy, a sustainability and impact strategy, the GEDSI, and a product list, was developed in 2021 and approved in April 2022.

The ILO produces annual progress reports that collate data from all the implementation partners in the different countries and reports progress against key performance indicators. The draft 2023 report was made available to the evaluation team leader. The achievements of the programme against planned indicators can be seen in more detail in annex 3.

The status descriptors of achieved, on track, and off track used in annex 3, are those devised by the programme for their reporting. On track is used to refer to indicators that do not have annual targets but have targets for the end of the programme. Achieved is used to refer to indicators that have a yearly cumulative target, and the target for the year has been reached. Overall, the programme has reported they have achieved 12 indicators, are on track with 3 indicators, and off-track with 4 indicators. The actual performance of the programme is probably higher than reflected by these broad numbers, which is linked to both the descriptions the programme uses for describing progress and the type of indicators included. Two of the three off track indicators in Outcome 1, the number of officials trained, and the number of migrants reached, are at 95% and 94% respectively. The amount of compensation obtained for migrant workers, which is included as a sub-indicator is at 92%. These numbers also do not include up to date numbers from Malaysia, due to delayed reporting because of the internal challenges the MTUC has faced recently. Therefore, the description 'off-track' seems quite harsh for indicators that are marginally under-achieved. While it is positive the programme is holding itself to high standards, an addition descriptor for indicators that are within 10% of the target could be adopted.

One challenge of identifying progress towards outcomes is that the intermediate outcomes for outcomes 2 and 3 in particular, are ones which the programme can only have limited impact on and in some cases are very optimistic. These should have been classified as impact indicators. One of these is one of the indicators reported on in the 2023 report for Outcome 3 Proportion of women migrant workers registered as employed in a regular legal status (by corridor). The others are ones that are the percentage gap in average earnings of women and men migrant workers by occupation (SDG Indicator 8.5.1) in Outcome 1, the two remittance cost outcome indicators in Outcome 2, and the proportion of women registered in formal migration status in Outcome 3. All of these indicators are ones the programme is hoping to contribute to improvements in but achievement of them is dependent on much broader factors. In terms of assessing progress towards achieving the objectives of the programme, the evaluation considered this to be a design flaw of the results framework rather than an indication of the lack of progress. There are indicators in the immediate outcomes that would fit within intermediate outcomes, such as 1.1, the number of policy and legislative instruments adopted or amended with ILO inputs on labour protection and gender equality for migrant workers and these do provide a good proxy of progress towards the programmes objectives, and an overall assessment of achievements against the goals of the programme justifies the finding that strong progress is being made and that the programme is on-track.

Each of the outcomes has indicators for both the intermediate outcomes and the immediate outcomes, most of which are measured and reported on, on a yearly basis. These indicators include both output and outcome indicators. A sign of the achievements of the programme is that outcome targets as well as outputs are being achieved. This has included policy change in several areas, migrants and their family's receiving compensation, and the recognition of skills standards.

Outcome Achievements

TRIANGLE in ASEAN is on-track to achieve most, if not all, of the planned programme outcomes by the end of the programme. This assessment is supported by evidence of achievement in each outcome.

- Outcome 1: All migrant workers are better protected by labour migration governance frameworks.

The programme has built the capacity of government officials of Member States to develop, revise, and implement gender-sensitive migration policies and frameworks. Several examples are listed throughout the report, but include the support given to the Government of Thailand to revise Ministerial Regulation 14, Governing the Working Conditions for Domestic Workers, to the Government of Viet Nam for the revision of law 69, the Law on Contract-Based Overseas Workers and the five sub-laws which support the interpretation and operationalisation of the law within Viet Nam, and to the Government of Cambodia to develop its Labour Migration Policy. At the regional level, the programme has supported the development of the ASEAN Guidelines on the Portability of Social Security Benefits for Migrant Workers in ASEAN and the implementation at national level of many AFML recommendations. At the grassroots level, the programme has ensured the operationalisation of laws and systems for the realisation of rights to compensation for migrant worker complaints. The programme has supported the awarding of US\$11.9 million compensation to migrant workers and their families.

- Outcome 2: Policies and programmes enable all migrant workers to contribute to and benefit from economic and social development.

The programme has also worked to strengthen economic and social development by addressing legislative gaps, the policies of recruitment agencies, and the knowledge of migrant workers and the tools they have at their disposal to maximise the financial power of their salaries. At the policy level, the programme supported the ACMW to develop the ASEAN Guidelines on the Protection of Migrant Workers and Family Members in Crisis Situations that includes direction on issues linked to return and reintegration of migrant workers. During the Covid-19 pandemic, the programme implemented national activities to support returning migrant workers, including through the provision of immediate aid, and advocated with governments in destination countries to ensure migrants could access support schemes. 382 recruitment agencies have signed up to codes of conduct on fair recruitment, although the results framework does not have an indicator for monitoring the actual implementation of the code of conduct. Migrant workers are also able to contribute to economic and social development through improved management of financial resources. The programme has given financial literacy training to almost 22,000 migrant workers and their family members. Testimony from recipients of the training, included in the impact section of this report, demonstrated important changes in household budgeting and in accessing income generating opportunities. The empowerment of migrant workers to demand rights for minimum wage and other benefits has also contributed to economic development, as identified by one migrant worker in Thailand who sends money back to Myanmar:

“Now I realise that my work is decent work and contributes greatly to Thailand and my country as well. For example, where I work, the husband is a (professional-withheld to remove distinguishing features) and wife in a business, they are out of the house between 9 and 5 and I am responsible for them (house and children). They are able to contribute to the Thai economy because I am able to support them to go to work while I look after the home. I send 70% of my salary home to my village. I can see the impacts of this money on my village. I think they are better off than some other places who for example rely on construction work remittances being sent home which is not as much, so I see the impacts of me having decent work on my home village as well.” (Migrant Worker- Thailand)

- Outcome 3: Labour mobility systems are gender-transformative and increase the efficiency of labour markets.

Outcome 3 focuses on mobility, with a focus on skills recognition and removing discriminatory barriers to migration for women and persons with disabilities. The programme has reported the recognition of two prior learning agreements and mutual recognition of skills agreement, including working with the Battambang Institute of Technology in Cambodia to provide assessments of skills of migrant workers in the electrical and construction sectors, and the bilateral agreement between Cambodia and Thailand on a multi-year pilot on bricklaying and plastering. The programme is also supporting the ACMW, through Lao PDR's chair of ASEAN for 2024, to develop a declaration and its checklist on skills mobility, recognition, and development for migrant workers in ASEAN. TRIANGLE in ASEAN has also worked with Cambodia and Lao PDR to remove bans on migration for domestic work, seen as discriminatory to women migrant workers.

The only outcome indicator that the programme has more control over that is off-track by more than 10% as of December 2023 was indicator 1.3, 'Number of social protection agreements and related policy measures developed to increase coverage for migrant workers with support from the ILO.' The target is 2 and the current achievement is zero. The ILO has supported the development of the ASEAN Guidelines on the Portability of Social Security Benefits for Migrant Workers in ASEAN and continues to work with national governments to encourage unilateral policy change and agreements between countries. Whether by the end of the programme, two policy related measures can be

achieved will depend on how quickly the policy making process moves and the willingness of governments to act on the ASEAN Guidelines.

There are also indicators in the results framework that have been classified as outcome but appear to be output indicators. These are the number of knowledge products used, the number of remittance products developed, and the number of migrant workers who are provided with support on return. A further indicator, the number of private recruitment agencies that sign up to codes of conduct on fair recruitment, serves as proxy indicator for an outcome, but itself is an output, (implementing the code of conduct and ensuring behavioural change among agents would be the outcome). A review of the classification of indicators when developing the results framework for a future programme is advisable.

The programme has a theory of change document. This combines the impact, outcomes, and outputs of the results framework with nine enabling factors or assumptions, and seven implementation principles. The document also contains a short narrative explanation of the theory of the programme. As a result of the theory of change using the results framework as its main structure, it is quite linear and the interconnections between the three outcomes are not explicitly described. The programme itself is logically developed and implemented, with the grassroots-national-regional-national-grassroots element of it being a key strength, and the approach appears to be well understood by the programme team and the programme partners. However, as an exercise for the next phase, reviewing the connections between the three outcomes and including areas that are not formally described would help continued understanding of the approach of the programme.

In addition to the observations above, there is one significant gap in the results framework in terms of not measuring an achievement of the programme. The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has done considerable work in empowering migrant workers to access their rights, particularly women, through the MRCs. Although the programme team and their partners appear well aware that this is an outcome of the programme, it is not included in either the results framework or the theory of change. As such, this critical element of the programme is not highlighted as much as it could be, and also the lack of the means of measuring this element, may mean empowerment and the best approaches to achieve it are not discussed among partners as much as it could be.

Strengths of the programme

The evaluation was able to identify certain strengths of the programme that have contributed to the achievement of results listed above. These included:

- Convening power of the ILO

Government officials, officers from trade unions and employers' federations, and staff of CSOs all identified the convening power of the ILO as being a significant strength of the programme. The ability of the ILO to bring different groupings together has strengthened the level of discussion among the key stakeholders and allowed the representation of groups that were not represented before.

Staff of CSOs were particularly complimentary about this aspect of the programme, reflecting that under the traditional tripartite structure, they are often excluded from meetings and activities. The ILO has at times received feedback from workers' and employers' organisations that the inclusion of CSOs should be minimised in order to maximise the role of the ILO's traditional tripartite constituents. Although there were some limited references to this concern, the majority of employers and workers' representatives acknowledged the important role of CSOs in supporting

migrant workers, and believed the ILO's contribution in involving such organisations had been important.

“The AFML is the most significant impact (of TRIANGLE) because it brings together not only the constituents of ILO but also the CSOs. They have expertise to deal with certain labour migration concerns. It also provides the opportunity for the stakeholders to group together and bring their concerns to the whole group and come up with an acceptable recommendation. Even in individual ASEAN states, some governments don't encourage that type of dialogue but at the regional level they accept the mechanism.” (Regional stakeholder)

- Targeting regional, national, and provincial levels of migration governance

The relevance section of the report referred to the multi-faceted nature of the programme ensuring it was relevant for regional, national, and provincial levels of migration governance. This was identified by stakeholders as a key strength of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme. The structures the ILO supports has helped ensure the key needs of migrant workers are brought to the attention of the national and regional governance structures, and also that decisions taken at the regional and national level have an impact at the provincial and grassroots level.

- Knowledge generation

The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has made contributions to the body of evidence around different migrant governance topics in the last ten years. The quality of knowledge products was identified as a strength of the programme by evaluation participants. The products were seen as relevant to discussions in ASEAN, as well as contributing national specific issues. The programme has been able to support its commitments to gender equality and non-discrimination through products on domestic work and disability rights. Knowledge products related to domestic work and the Covid-19 pandemic were most regularly cited by evaluation participants as being usable in their daily work, but other topics were also seen as highly relevant for ASEAN and national level discussions.

“They make the thematic papers relevant to the subjects being discussed during the AFML that year. These fit into the plenary discussions. As example they gathered data on the impact of Covid 19 on Migrant Workers. At the time Member States were finding it difficult to conduct because they were pre-occupied with the responses. The surveys were appreciated to give them a better idea of what was going on in the region. They were able to use this.” (Regional Stakeholder)

While the programme has produced many knowledge products, there does appear to be a sense the programme is strategic about what is produced and tries not to over-produce products, in order to ensure what is published is utilised by key stakeholders. Coordination with Safe and Fair and Ship to Shore programmes has also ensured replication does not occur. For example, as Safe and Fair conducted a survey on migrant workers with diverse sexual identity, there was no need for TRIANGLE in ASEAN to produce similar work.

The main concerns about the knowledge products raised during the evaluation was whether they were easily digestible for senior officials and whether more could be translated into local languages. While the detail and data in the knowledge products is impressive, it was suggested that shorter summary bulletins for senior officials who may not have the time to go into the details of the reports would be helpful.

- Buy in from ASEAN and national governments

As noted in the relevance section of the report, the programme is highly relevant to both the ASEAN secretariat and the national governments. The alignment of the programme with the ASEAN workplan, supporting various ACMW activities, including the preparation of national stakeholders for the AFML, and the responsiveness of the programme to the needs of ASEAN stakeholders has helped build a close working relationship with the ASEAN Secretariat. This is reflected in both the Canadian and Australian contributions being given official development partner status by ASEAN.

- Capacity Building of Partners

Given the programme has a strong presence at the grassroots and provincial level, it requires significant support from partners to implement the activities. The partners who have participated in the programme shared with the evaluation team examples of capacity building on technical knowledge that had strengthened their abilities to implement activities.

“We now have the capacity to support migrant workers not just in Cambodia but on the move overseas. The connections with other CSOs have been important. ILO has helped us to build a cross-border network with Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore etc. The meetings have helped networking. The programme has also helped us improve our collaborative relationships with the trade unions, governments, and employers. We used to see employers and government as confrontational entities. Now they collaborate with them.” (CSO Representative- Cambodia)

“We understand how to advocate with the different partners such as the Ministries, which in most cases were successful.” (CSO Representative- Thailand)

The programme has also conducted capacity building at the national and regional level to strengthen the technical knowledge of key stakeholders to be able to implement policy and frameworks. This has included ASEAN level officials, national governments, employers and worker representatives, and CSOs. The programme’s Sustainability and Impact Strategy, argues that the ‘extensive consultation with government and social partners at all stages for technical comments to draft gender-responsive policy and legislation builds capacity.’⁹ The programme’s extensive policy work has supported capacity building in this way, although this was less acknowledged by evaluation participants than the other forms of capacity building. For this activity, praise for the ILO’s technical support as an input was given more attention than the output of capacity building. It would be likely though that this work has built capacities in the manner set out in the Sustainability and Impact Strategy.

- Programme length

The length of the programme is a key strength of the programme. The programme is unusually long for a development cooperation programme. However, this has had several benefits. There is clearly a high level of trust between ILO, the ASEAN Secretariat, other regional stakeholders, and national level tripartite plus partners that supports the implementation of the programme and achievement of high-quality results at the level of regional and national policy, capacity building and service delivery to migrant workers. The programme also has considerable flexibility, acknowledging that the needs identified at the beginning of a ten-year programme will change during the programme. The Covid-19 pandemic and its impact on migration patterns and priorities could not have been predicted in 2019, let alone 2015. The programme has had the flexibility to adapt to new needs of

⁹ ILO, (2021). TRIANGLE in ASEAN Inception report Second edition, 2021-2024. Annex 4, Sustainability and Impact Strategy, (p.18)

ASEAN Member States as they have emerged, and considerable credit should be given to DFAT and GAC for this.

- CSO involvement

CSOs play a critical role in the grassroots support of migrant workers, often providing services that governments do not and operating in locations where union presence is limited. The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has actively involved CSOs in both implementing activities at the grassroots level and more recently ensuring CSO participation in ASEAN level discussions. Other stakeholders have recognised the importance of the role of CSOs in the migration governance discussions.

Stakeholders acknowledged two particular entry points the programme had been able to leverage. In Cambodia, the role of CSOs in responding to migrants returning as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. CSOs supported by the programme had worked collaboratively with the provincial governments and immigration authorities to provide items of support such as food and PPE and helped the reintegration of the returning migrants. One stakeholder acknowledged that this had helped government authorities recognise the importance of partnership with CSOs, which had continued post-pandemic through strong collaboration.

The other entry point specifically mentioned were the opportunities linked to the AFML, both the preparation and event itself. CSOs believed that with the ILO's support, they have had greater access to having their voice heard compared to usual challenges they faced in a shrinking civil society space.

"It is really helpful and important to have the backing of the ILO. As local NGOs we are out there on our own. Having ILO's backing gives us a little more security. We are able to face the government agencies with more confidence and strength knowing we have the backing of the international community. Participating in the national and regional meetings also gives us strength. This gives us more visibility, so it is important to be a part of the ILO." (CSO Representative- Thailand)

- Attention to gender equality

A focus on gender transformative policies and women's empowerment is a key strength of the programme and is discussed further in the last criterion of the findings section of the report.

- Consultation and flexibility in design of activities

There was a high degree of consensus among different stakeholders that the programme had been collaborative in the design of activities, thus helping to ensure relevance to the key partners, as well as being flexibility and adaptable as contexts and priorities changed. The development partners have contributed considerably to the flexibility by allowing ILO to amend the programme where ILO sees as necessary. The strength of the length of the programme is only a strength because the programme has adapted throughout its period of implementation to respond to emerging needs.

The flexibility also contributes to allowing a consultative approach to the design of implementation agreements and activities. Most of the implementing partners believed the ILO took a collaborative approach to developing implementation agreements and not imposing a strict programme on them. A small number of CSOs, particularly more recent partners, felt the ILO should be more flexible, and this is perhaps a reflection that full trust has not yet been developed in these partnerships.

Regional Partnership Building

The mid-term evaluation identified the relationships that had developed with the ASEAN Secretariat as being a key driver of success in the programme. This relationship appears to have remained strong. The ASEAN Secretariat and the ACMW Chair and Vice Chair are on the RPAC, which helps strengthen their involvement in programme design and implementation.

The influence the programme has had on the relationship between ATUC and ACE was also identified by stakeholders as a key success of the programme.

“Another strength is the ability of Triangle to bring ACE and ATUC together [in the ACE-ATUC bipartite dialogue process]. ASEAN started the collaboration between ACE and ATUC, before there was not collaboration, but now they are talking and now hopefully will strengthen the collaboration mechanisms.” (Regional Stakeholder)

Key Achievements

The programme has had several key achievements during its implementation. There are more than can be listed in this report, but below are some of the significant examples identified during the evaluation.

- Tripartite Collaboration and Social Dialogue

The inclusion of tripartite plus partners within the programme and particularly the success the ILO has had in ensuring the inputs of employers' organisations, trade unions and CSOs into ASEAN processes is a key success of the programme. Stakeholders were of the belief that coordination between the tripartite plus partners had improved significantly from the efforts of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme, and this had contributed to improvements in social dialogue. The coordination mechanism developed between ACE and ATUC is one clear example of this. Regular communication has improved in recent years, as the recent agreement to form a working committee demonstrates. National level collaboration was also raised by stakeholders in various countries, including Cambodia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, and Thailand.

“We have worked more closely with employers. They (employers) have a better understanding of the importance of unions in their companies. Under this project there has been a lot of progress... ILO is a really important organisation that can link the employers and governments.” (National Stakeholder, Lao PDR)

Migrant workers and CSO representatives in Thailand in particular also reported some evidence of improvements in social dialogue at the enterprise level between migrant worker groups and unions, and the employers. This was still very inconsistent and dependent upon the employers but noted as an improvement in the last few years and was linked to the empowerment of migrant workers through their interactions with the MRCs.

- Policy changes at national levels

Many stakeholders, particularly those operating at the national and regional level, identified policy changes as being the significant achievements of the programme. The programme had supported the revision or development of 45 policies and legislative achievements by the end of 2023. This includes support given to the revision of significant national policies, such as, among others, the Cambodian Migration Law, Viet Nam's law 69, the Revision of the Law on Contract-Based Overseas Workers, or the Agreement no.1050 on the Management of Recruitment Agencies in Lao PDR, the revision of Thailand's Ministerial Recommendation 14 Governing the Working Conditions for Domestic Workers,

and the ongoing support on revising Thailand's Ministerial Regulation on Agriculture. This achievement can also be expanded beyond government policies, to include policies, guidelines, and codes of conduct implemented by recruitment agencies and employers.

- Policy changes at ASEAN regional level

The support the programme has given to the ASEAN Secretariat, national governments, and the ACMW, has also contributed to the adoption of ASEAN Declarations and other frameworks and tools, including most recently the development of the ASEAN Guidelines on Portability of Social Security Benefits for Migrant workers in ASEAN (in support of the implementation of the ASEAN Declaration on the Portability of Social Security), and the ASEAN Declaration and its Guidelines on the Protection of Migrant Workers and Family Members in Crisis Situations. While ASEAN declarations are voluntary, and not binding, several stakeholders believed that the declarations had had a positive effect on stimulating conversation and policy dialogue at the national level.

- Level of compensation obtained for migrant workers

The draft 2023 annual report stated that US\$11,912,160 had been awarded to 225,480 migrant workers (W:46%, M: 54%) in the lifetime of the programme. While this is slightly below the targets for year 8 (and this may be revised upwards once the MTUC has finalised its reports), the awarding of such sums is significant. Migrant workers who participated in KIIs and FGDs stated that without the support of the MRCs, they would not have had the opportunity to reclaim these funds, and thus access to justice has been significantly improved as a result.

- The development and refinement of the MRC model

The MRC model has been applied throughout the programme's lifespan in all countries of implementation. The success of the model is demonstrated by the broad utilisation across the region by other ILO programmes and projects, and other organisations. Other regional offices of the ILO have also applied the model or expressed interest in learning more about it. The programme does not use a one-size fits all approach to the MRCs, with activities being tailored differently dependent on the country, particularly whether it is a country of origin or destination, and be implemented by Government, trade unions, and CSOs. TRIANGLE in ASEAN recently collaborated with the Ship to Shore and Safe and Fair programmes to conduct a review of MRC implementation across the region. The final report will be available in the third quarter of 2024 and goes into more detail on the successes and challenges of the MRCs. This evaluation did identify the important good practice of developing strong relationships between the provincial government authorities and trade unions and/or CSOs. A good level of trust was demonstrated in Cambodia between the CSOs and trade unions who ran the MRCs in the locations the evaluator visited, and the provincial government who oversee the grievance cases. Similarly in Mae Sot, the MRC run by HRDF has built good relationships with the newly formed Migrant Workers Assistance Centres (MWACs) that have been set up throughout the country with the support of ILO pushing the provincial authorities to engage with local CSOs. The same attention to the MWACs has not been given in other provinces and the utility of them in other locations was questioned by evaluation stakeholders, which helps demonstrate the importance of this good practice.

A further good practice identified was In Viet Nam, migrant workers indicated they had received follow-up support from the MRC staff in the Government's Employment Centres when they needed it in their countries of destination. This was missing from some other MRCs. For example, in Lao PDR, it was less apparent that migrant workers receive follow-up support from the MRC once they have migrated, and this does limit the empowerment possibilities of the MRC. The MRCs also offer

opportunities for organising of migrant workers and collaboration between trade unions and CSOs that could be more explored in a future phase of the programme. Careful review of the findings of the MRC assessment report once published should be undertaken by the programme team and partners.

- Contribution to global statistics on labour migration

The production of International Labour Migration Statistics (ILMS) was an important initiative of the ILO HQ from 1996 to 2008. The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme led the initiative to revitalise the collection of ILMS in the ASEAN region since 2012 from its initial phase. This continued in the current phase of the programme. Since 2018, the collection of ILMS at the global level has again become a priority of the ILO and the ILO's Guidelines concerning statistics of international labour migration was endorsed by the 20th International Conference of Labour Statisticians in 2018¹⁰. The reviving of the ILMS at the global level owed much to the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme and the work of ROAP to continue collection in South East Asia. The programme has continued to support the collection of migration statistics in ASEAN Member States. The success of this has varied from country to country. Some countries such as Thailand have actively embraced it, and also acknowledged to the evaluation team the importance of the ILO's support. Others, such as Malaysia and Singapore are much more reluctant to share data publicly.

- Women's groups

The focus on women's empowerment and gender equality was identified as one of the strengths of the programme. The development of 23 women's migrant groups in Cambodia, Myanmar, and Thailand is one of the key successes of this strategy. This is addressed further in the findings in the gender equality and disability inclusion criterion.

Challenges

- Coordination among ministries

As detailed in the coherence criterion findings, the coordination between ministries responsible for migration governance is sometimes limited. ILO's does not have the same relationship with other ministries as it does with the Ministries of Labour and coordination can be a challenge. That said, there have been examples of successful coordination, including other ministries in coordination efforts. These include the inclusion of the Ministry of Women's Affairs in the ongoing development of the ethical code of conduct for recruitment agencies in Cambodia, the inclusion of other line ministries to the quarterly national and annual provincial migration network meetings in Lao PDR, and the work the programme has done with the national statistic bureaus and other ministries responsible for statistics.

- National level follow up of AFML

The mid-term evaluation identified the volume of recommendations emerging from the AFML over the years as being a challenge for follow-up and ensuring implementation. The final evaluation identified a similar concern. Several stakeholders noted this continued to be a problem, noting discrepancies between the larger number of recommendations and the actual implementation of them at the country level. It was felt that at times Member States waited for the ILO to propose

¹⁰ ILO, (2018). Guidelines concerning statistics of international labour migration, https://webapps.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---stat/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_648922.pdf

projects to address a recommendation rather than taking the initiative on it themselves. Several non-government actors also questioned the level of follow-up on the recommendations, suggesting that they were only addressed on an annual basis. Given the work the programme has done in supporting the recommendations, as detailed in the latest progress report, this may be more linked to communication about progress.

“The process of the AFML is very good in terms of the worker network. We try to be involved and be actively participate. After this what is the follow up? I haven’t see much.” (CSO Representative, Thailand)

The mid-term evaluation made the recommendation, ‘consider having these recommendations revisited by a consultant to come up with a limited number of main recommendations instead of just tracking all 149’. The programme disagreed with this recommendation, arguing that this was duplicative of an existing process of monitoring the recommendations in thematic clusters. The programme does produce a report every two years (latest in 2023) detailing progress within the different clusters and making recommendations on future priorities. The approach of the programme is probably the correct one. As a Member State driven process, the ILO should not be removing recommendations that Member States have made, and given this, monitoring within clusters is probably the most efficient approach. ASEC has conducted a follow-up study analysing the AFML recommendations that has identified and acknowledged gaps and was used by ACMW to complement the ILO’s progress review of AFML recommendations. However, the report is only internal to ACMW. It is important for the programme to continue to highlight the findings of the summary report from 2023, work with ACMW on the gaps they identified and advocate with Member States to pro-actively address recommendations. Identifying ways to either encourage more involvement of non-state actors in ongoing follow-up, rather than just the annual preparation meeting, or at least communicating more clearly to them how progress is being made, should also be considered.

- Myanmar

Since the 2021 military coup in Myanmar, the ILO has adhered to the United Nations Principles of Engagement in Myanmar. As a result, the programme no longer interacts with representatives of the military government. The situation in Myanmar has created significant challenges for the programme. These include the refusal of the Myanmar military junta to recognise the participation of the Confederation of Trade Unions, Myanmar (CTUM) at the AFML and other ACMW activities supported by TRIANGLE, challenges in transferring funds to programme implementers (although by now, alternative payment channels have largely been established), CTUM senior leaders needing to go into hiding for security reasons, the ongoing civil conflict in many areas the partners work in, and the security challenges faced by CSO partners. The work with the private recruitment agency association (MOEAF) was also terminated, following a request from the military junta to MOEAF. At the same time, the needs of migrant workers have increased. As a result of the civil conflict, and particularly recently in response to the Junta’s conscription law, the introduction of forced remittances of 25% of earning, and an income tax on earning abroad, the volume of migration has increased, while access to information has become harder. MRC representatives from Myanmar noted that the need to be more secretive about their affiliations has damaged their credibility with community members in some cases, who are understandably suspicious in the current climate. It has also made it very challenging to address violations given interaction with the local authorities needs to be very limited.

Despite these challenges, the programme has probably reacted as effectively as possible. Stakeholders in Myanmar were appreciative that of the support the programme has continued to give, with significant achievements such as the launch of the Myanmar Domestic Worker Association, financial literacy training for women migrant workers, and income generating activities for family members of migrant workers, returning migrant workers, and those unable to migrate due to the current situation. The programme's partners have continued to provide traditional MRC services, such as legal support to individuals cheated by recruitment agencies or migrant workers who acquire disabilities, as well as pre-departure information and counselling. The needs in Myanmar of migrant workers remain substantial, and thus the continued support of the programme is important.

There was some feedback from government representatives from other member states that the ILO and the development partners should be more flexible in supporting de facto government officials from Myanmar to attend the AFML and other ASEAN regional activities supported by TRIANGLE. An uneasy balance has been found that allows ASEAN to include representatives from the military junta but without ILO's support and for the voice of Myanmar workers to be heard through the ATUC. This allows the ILO to continue to support vulnerable migrants in Myanmar and the voice of CSOs and trade unions at the ASEAN level without going against the UN principles of engagement, and does appear to be an effective approach at the moment.

- Gender equality awareness

The programme has made significant investments in addressing gender equality and women's empowerment. As detailed in the section on gender equality below, these have led to important achievements. It was identified during the evaluation though that awareness of the gender challenges that migrants face was mixed. While many stakeholders understand potentially differences of the experience of men and women migrants, some, including those in positions of power did not seem to believe that any specific differences existed. This highlights the need for the programme to continue the twin track approach of ensure gender equality and non-discrimination is both mainstreamed throughout its activities as conducting specific activities. The programme had just started a series of gender equality and disability inclusion training at the time of the evaluation's data collection, but it was too early to assess this. However, it was notable that stakeholders who had previously received training on gender equality, gender identity and sexual orientation, and disability inclusion in Cambodia did demonstrate a strong awareness of key issues, thus highlighting the relevance of the work TRIANGLE in ASEAN is doing.

- Budget size

The section on efficiency of resource use details some of challenges linked to the size of the budget and trade-offs needed in programming as a result.

3.4 Efficiency of Resource Use

Key Findings

14. The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has utilised a tight budget effectively, following value for money principles. The distribution of resources appears reasonable.
15. The amalgamation of the two projects has strengthened the programme, allowing more flexibility to respond to programming needs, more resources for project activities, and savings on administrative costs. Aligning the two funding periods would strengthen efficiency by providing greater certainty to the ILO and the programme partners. The budgetary

shortfall that led to the removal of NPCs and Admin and Finance Assistants in Malaysia and Viet Nam, has reduced efficiency.

16. Allowing greater flexibility in the budgets for implementing partners and increasing budget areas in lines might support increased quality of performance and thus improve efficiency.

Evaluation Questions

- Has the allocation of resources been optimal for achieving the programme's outcomes (financial, human, institutional and technical, etc.)? To what extent has the merger of the two separate DFAT and GAC funded projects into the joint TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme been able to leverage the resources under the two separate grant arrangements? What are the lessons learned from this kind of implementation approach?
- Did TRIANGLE deliver Value for Money (following the Value for Money principles: cost consciousness, encouraging competition; evidence-based decision making; proportionality; performance and risk management; results focus; experimentation and innovation; accountability and transparency)?

The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme is an amalgamation of two originally distinct investments by the Governments of Australia and Canada, represented by DFAT and GAC, initially entered into in 2015 and 2016 respectively. In 2018, DFAT and GAC approved the merger of the two projects into one programme. Since 2015, DFAT has committed AUS \$24 million and since 2016, GAC CAD 9.5 million. Both of the development partners have increased their original commitment. Following a cost extension and then no-cost extension, the GAC funding period is due to end in September 2024. The DFAT commitment was originally scheduled to run until 2027, but as a result of the funding shortfall from GAC's funding period ending in 2024, the ILO and GFAT have amended the contract to end in September 2025.

The annual report for 2023 reports that the following percentage expenditures for DFAT and GAC:

Cost item	DFAT, % of total expenditure (2015 - 2023)	GAC, % of total expenditure (2017 - 2023)
Activities under Outcomes 1-3	29%	29%
Other costs associated with Outcomes 1-3 (staff travel, PAC meetings, printing and translation)	4%	2%
Personnel costs	49%	55%
Operational costs	4%	2%
M&E	2%	1%
Programme support costs	12%	12%

Table 5: Programme expenditure as per 2023 annual report

The mid-term evaluation noted the expenditure on personnel costs was relatively high for an ILO programme. However, this is linked to the nature of support of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme, with significant technical support provided for regional and national activities. This remains valid today. A restructuring took place in 2019 that led to the reduction in support at the national level in Malaysia and Viet Nam, that has reduced personnel costs. A further reflection on the personnel costs, is that TRIANGLE in ASEAN is able to produce many of its knowledge products and provide technical support in-house, rather than like many other ILO programmes, relying on consultants. This increases cost-effectiveness as well as quality control for the programme.

The limited activity cost has though had some impact on programme partners. The evaluation did find that at times, the limited nature of budgets for partners may affect quality and this trade off needs to be considered more carefully in implementation agreements. A large proportion of programme partners raised limited budgets as being a challenge. For many partners, this was the

only concern they had when asked about any weaknesses of the programme. Implementing partners believe the requirements and targets of the implementation agreements are often disproportionate to the level of budget granted. This was particularly felt by CSOs and trade unions, who often do not have other funding sources to support programming.

There are two areas that could be considered more with implementation agreements. Reporting and bureaucratic requirements were seen as onerous. While monitoring of activities is important, identifying ways to reduce the burden on partners would help mitigate challenges of a tight budget. The previously mentioned requirement of collecting IDs for every participant in a workshop should be immediately ended, both to ensure more vulnerable and undocumented migrants participate, and to reduce reporting burdens. The other consideration is to build in some flexibility into budgets to allow partners to respond to particular issues. One partner noted the tight nature of the budget did not allow for them to provide transport for persons with disabilities to attend events, so a reasonable accommodation budget could be considered. Another request was for flexibility in activity budgets to allow for when special speakers or influential officials attend events to provide small tokens of appreciation such as bunch of flowers. However, the ability of the partners to continue to provide services even with tight budgets does indicate a positive ownership of the programme and suggest longer term sustainability, which is addressed later in the report.

The merger of the funding streams was seen as positive by development partners, the ILO, and other stakeholders. The awarding of development project status to both the Australian and Canadian elements of the programme is a positive sign of the regard ASEAN has for the programme, and as two countries with closely aligned interests, there is a benefit from both being jointly involved. From the ILO's point of view, the merger has allowed a more flexibility and holistic approach to the programme, with greater financial resources allowing a larger programme response. The relationship between DFAT and GAC appears to be positive, which helps the ILO in its smooth running of the programme.

The major challenge with the joint approach is the differing funding cycles. With the Canadian funding phase ending in September 2024, there would be a significant budget shortfall if the programme is to be implemented at the same volume as it currently is. As a result, DFAT and the ILO have agreed a revised time period, with the programme currently scheduled to end in September 2025. This has created some uncertainty in programming. The ILO also reported the challenge of complex branding protocols that were but in place to reflect ownership of different activities. This concern has been mitigated through the protocol developed as part of the inception package but ensuring joint branding of all activities could be revisited in a future phase of the programme.

The budget shortfall for the programme has existed for several years. Funding from DFAT was front-loaded to allow for more initial activities. In 2019, a budget revision led to the ending of funding for NPCs and Admin and Finance Assistants in Malaysia and Viet Nam. The programme has benefitted from the support of the Ship to Shore NPC in Viet Nam and funded three months of her position. Programming in Malaysia is backstopped by the regional programme team. As described in the relevance section, the limited budget for Malaysia and Vietnam has reduced the volume of activities the programme has been able to undertake. The ILO has utilised other programmes to fill some of these gaps, but limitations remain. The lack of NPCs does limit opportunities for network building with new partners and responding to tripartite constituent requests, and overall, having the NPCs in position would be more effective for the programme. The approach taken in Viet Nam of utilising resources to have a de facto migration programme officer is a good practice where budget shortfalls occur. While TRIANGLE in ASEAN remains smaller in Viet Nam than other countries, coordinating

with (and providing a small amount of funds for) a national expert who oversees ILO's migration programming in Viet Nam is an effective second-best option in this scenario.

Overall, the programme appears to have delivered good value for money, stretching a tight budget to produce significant results. The principles of value for money have been followed by the management team. Programming decisions are evidence based, and the resources dedicated to both knowledge generation and M&E support innovation and experimentation. Examples of innovative work include the programmes focus on the portability of social security, domestic work, and more recently persons with disabilities. The cost consciousness and results-based focus of the programme can be seen in the manner in which budgets are stretched and partners challenged to produce results efficiently, albeit with the caveats noted above.

The programme has also been delivered on a timely basis. As reported in the effectiveness section, the programme is by and large on target to deliver the results on time. This is helped both by the flexibility of the development partners and the length of the programme. The 10-year implementation cycle, that has built on a previous phase, has supported the building of trust among key stakeholders. The ILO does not need to reintroduce itself and convince the constituents of the importance of the programme (beyond the obvious turnover of some personnel), and thus saves time that a series of shorter programmes would require. Other time delaying aspects of a programme's inception and running are also reduced such as recruitment lead times, closing down activities, and losing staff due to job insecurity. The flexibility allows the ILO to pursue emerging topics that become relevant to ASEAN Member States.

3.5 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements

Key Findings

17. The programme is effectively managed with clear roles and responsibilities and a high satisfaction among partners about the level of support given to them by NPCs and the regional team.
18. The monitoring and evaluation system is comprehensive and supports the adaptive management in the programme. It is able to manage the collection of data for a diverse range of sources. Continuing to strengthen the capacities of MRC partners to collect data, particularly focused on the changes the programme is contributed is needed.

Evaluation Questions

- To what extent do the management arrangements put into place for TRIANGLE in ASEAN support the achievement of results? Are the staffing structures and resourcing of activities (noting national/regional and policy/service delivery at minimum) contributing to quality performance and impact?
- How do the national and regional staff and management arrangements support fluidity between the top-down and bottom-up initiatives between national and regional (ASEAN) levels vis-à-vis law and policy frameworks, programmers, structures, priorities etc. What adjustments are suggested for a potential next phase of the programme?

Management Arrangements

Management of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme is bolstered by the development of clear planning documents (primarily the inception report) and the long-term stability of the team that has seen only limited turn-over during the programme. The overall programme is guided by the inception report. An initial inception report for the joint programme was developed following the merger of the DFAT and GAC elements of TRIANGLE in ASEAN. A revised inception report was completed in

2022 to acknowledge programme revisions. The inception report is comprehensive and includes several annexes critical for planning, namely a theory of change, a M&E plan, a risk management strategy, and sustainability and impact strategy, the GEDSI, and the branding strategy.

A further strength of the programme to add to those identified in the effectiveness section is the effectiveness of the teamwork among the programme team and the implementing partners. This was identified by the ILO staff and several external stakeholders as being important for the results that have been delivered. The coordination among the programme team and level of support has supported quality technical support to partners. The programme has also effectively leveraged the support of technical experts in ROAP and Geneva. In addition to internal teamwork, the relationships developed between partners was also identified as a key strength of the programme. MRC implementers shared examples of discussions of challenges and good practices among themselves that had helped individual MRC officers respond to these in their own work.

In general, the staff structuring has been effective in delivering the programme. A common theme in responses from programme partners was the satisfaction in the support they received from the ILO, believing that when they asked for support, this was generally forthcoming. This satisfaction was for both regional and national positions, suggesting a positive structure for the programme, although with the caveats identified in the efficiency section coming from the lack of full-time NPCs in Malaysia and Viet Nam. The main other concerns raised about the level of support from the ILO linked to national level stakeholders wanting more ILO staff in country to expand the programming and it being noted that the programme does not have the resources to respond to all requests from Member States put forward through the ACMW. Given the resources available, it is acknowledged that the ILO cannot support everything.

The management arrangements of the programme also appear to be solid. The relationships developed by the national staff contribute to the trust the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has built up with national and provincial level partners and supports grassroot voices being heard at a policy level, and that regional commitments are translated to action at the national and local levels. The interaction between the national and regional programme team also appears to contribute to this dynamic. The activity of planning for the AFML and other regional activities at the national level is an important contributor to the social dialogue and improvements in tripartite plus relationships that have developed during the programme.

Monitoring and evaluation

The effectiveness of the management arrangements is underpinned by a solid M&E system. As previously reported, the programme effectively measures outcome indicators as well as outputs, that supports the programme to monitor the change it is creating overtime. The feedback mechanisms built into the M&E system have contributed to programme adaptations that have taken place over the course of implementation. The annual reports provide both quantitative and qualitative data, with case studies added qualitative information that provides real examples to accompany the numeric information in the report.

Managing data from so many partners in different countries can be challenging, particularly in ensuring uniformity of understanding of definitions and quality of data. MRC officials shared with the evaluation team that the MRC manual produced by TRIANGLE in ASEAN had been helpful in supporting reporting of achievements to the ILO. It was though acknowledged by ILO officials that the quality of reports varied between MRCs, with identifying change being a particular challenge, especially when there is turn-over of MRC staff. Continued capacity building will be needed to ensure

the quality of monitoring is maintained. Overall though the M&E system has supported the programme to identify progress towards its targets and adapt activities where necessary.

The reporting system in general appears solid. The annual report contains a significant amount of information. Donors are kept updated about programme developments on a regular basis. This was reported to have improved in the second half of the programme. The evaluation did identify a potential risk of over-reporting. The programme team submits a weekly report to the donors, following a recommendation from DFAT's annual investment monitoring report. The cost in terms of human resources to achieve this does seem high. NPCs and international regional staff all contribute to it. Reducing the reporting requirement to two weeks rather than weekly might be a better trade-off on efficiency.

3.6 Impact Orientation and Sustainability

Key Findings

19. Changes in national and regional policies have been supported by the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme and should contribute to durable changes.
20. The MRCs have contributed to the empowerment of many migrant workers, particularly women's groups. Considering empowerment more broadly in all activities could be considered.
21. Ownership of the programme was strong by stakeholders at all levels of the programme.
22. While there is some evidence of stakeholders making financial or other commitments to continuing the work if support from the ILO were ended, responses on this were mixed, and there would be some reduction in the level of activities in many areas.
23. While there has been significant progress, considerable efforts are still needed to address existing and emerging needs for migration governance. A future programme phase would help address these. Priorities identified during the evaluation included continued work on the portability of social security and skill recognition, continued support to Myanmar and Lao PDR, the inclusion of Indonesia and the Philippines, full teams in Viet Nam and Malaysia, addressing emerging issues of forced labour such as scam centres, and climate change.

Evaluation Questions

- Has TRIANGLE made a significant contribution to longer-term, sustainable development changes? What is the likelihood that the results of TRIANGLE are durable and can be maintained beyond the current end date of the programme?
- What actions are required to ensure the sustainability of the programme-supported initiatives? What would be the key priorities and strategic directions for future programming beyond the lifetime of the current phase of TRIANGLE in ASEAN?

Policy Impacts

Possibly the most sustainable changes the programme has contributed to are the development and revision of national and regional policies related to migration governance. These have helped national governments to codify in law policies that are compatible with international labour standards. Barring further changes in the law, these policies should continue to contribute to migration governance for the foreseeable future. The length of TRIANGLE in ASEAN has been a significant contributing factor to these changes. Policy change is generally a slow-moving process. The ILO have been able to build relationships and trust with policy makers during the programme, as well as bringing regional attention to particular issues through the ACMW. The production of high-quality knowledge products and the evidence the ILO can bring from its grassroots activities have

also significantly contributed to these changes. The fact the programme has contributed to policy change in all the target countries, and the benefits are not just limited to one or two, is another key factor demonstrating the impact in this area.

It was evident from responses from key stakeholders that continued work is needed to ensure policy changes in Member States are institutionalised throughout the country. The engagement of provincial level government officials had been effective in the areas the programme operates, but evaluation participants from both government and CSOs noted the awareness of provincial authorities in other locations on new laws and the rights of migrants, as well as the capacity to deal sensitively with individuals who are vulnerable and often traumatised was limited. This was demonstrated most clearly in Thailand through the example of the Migrant Worker Centres. There has been significant engagement in Mae Sot, and it was reported that the relevant local authorities in Mae Sot are considerably more open to working with CSOs and engaging with migrant workers in a positive manner, than in other centres around Thailand that have received less attention. Even in the locations where the programme has been more present, central and provincial government officers stressed the need for continued training of provincial officers to strengthen awareness of existing and new laws that are developed.

Capacity Building

The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has contributed to the capacity building of different stakeholders. While capacity building is not itself an impact, it has ensured the relevant stakeholders have the capacities to implement policies and activities that have had an impact. Representatives from CSOs noted one of the significant changes they had experienced was improvements in their organisational capacity to support migrant workers. This included providing better information on rights and being able to support migrant workers to navigate complex justice systems. This change is demonstrated by the following testimony from a CSO officer in Thailand:

“The officers and activists have expanded their horizons, to see more broadly in this area. Before the programme, they work on a case-by-case basis and if there were things they could not do, they would just let the case go. They might know to some extent, and they would give the recommendation as much as they could, but if they couldn’t do any more, they would send them to the brokers. They wouldn’t think to look for additional information. Now, if there is something they cannot do, they look at what they do to address it. They will find more information on how to resolve the case. They exclude the broker from the case. They will try to get many activists together to try to resolve the case. They would get the activist, the social security officers to discuss the case.” (CSO Officer- Thailand)

CSOs were not the only entities reporting that capacity improvements had led to better services for migrants from the programme funded activities. Government MRC officials in Lao PDR, Cambodia, and Viet Nam, also identified the capacity building the programme has done in being significant in improving services for migrants in their area. The main challenge this change has in terms of sustaining long-term impact is the turn-over of staff. For example, in Lao PDR, it is government policy to rotate staff to different posts. As a result, the MRCs have seen a considerable turn-over of staff and thus new training is often required for new staff.

Capacity building at the national and regional level through strengthening the technical abilities to formulate and implement migration policies and frameworks is also a key strategy of the programme. The actual impact of this work is seen in the policy level impacts discussed above.

Knowledge Generation

As identified in the effectiveness section, knowledge generation is one of the key strengths of the programme, and has provided the ILO, governments, and other stakeholders with evidence-based data to input into policy making and advocacy. The development of knowledge products, like capacity building, is not in itself an impact. However, it appeared clear from the responses the products had been utilised to contribute to the impacts described in this section of the report. The evaluation did not do a comprehensive survey to understand which knowledge products were the most useful. Data produced during Covid and the products on domestic work were highlighted as being important, although positive indications about the knowledge products in general were given.

Impacts on Migrant Workers

The experiences of migrant workers will vary considerably depending on their individual circumstances. However, the evaluation was able to identify some specific themes that migrant workers identified as being impacts of the programme:

- Empowerment to access rights

Migrant workers highlighted a combination of increased awareness of rights, with the gains in confidence to address those in authority (both government officials and employers) gained from support and activities with the MRCs and their peers, had contributed to greater sense of empowerment in accessing their rights. This impact was most noticeable among members of women's migrant forums and among migrants supported by the MRCs in Thailand (the evaluation team did not speak to users of the MRCs in Malaysia, the other major country of destination in the programme). Women migrants shared examples of being more willing to discuss their needs and challenges with authority figures including employers and government officials. They attributed this to the support given to them by the partner CSOs and trade unions, and a snowballing effect of being given the opportunity to participate in meetings so it becomes less and less daunting for them.

“With the knowledge about the law, we can protect ourselves. Before and for many people when they arrived in Thailand, the law seemed to be something which was very far away for us. But (the CSO) has a way of explaining the law which makes it seem closer to us and help us understand it. Now we can negotiate for our rights. As a live in domestic worker, you usually get paid less than the ones who live out. When I negotiate conditions, I am able to ask if meals are provided, if I get holiday, what other benefits etc. That helps me decide whether to take the job. If it is a live-out job then I ask about travel expenses, if holiday is deducted etc. We used to have very long work hours. We didn't know the law was to work 8 hours a day. Now we know how to negotiate from what (the CSO) taught us.” (Woman Migrant Worker- Thailand)

Empowerment could also be identified among users of the MRCs in general in Thailand where a system of migrant leaders in the community had been supported by the MRCs and a focus put on organising in factories where violations were occurring. Empowerment to access rights was less apparent in general MRC users in other countries (separated from members of the women's groups). This is probably for various reasons. MRCs based in countries of origin have less of a focus on organising and collective bargaining. Although some bilateral agreements have been reached between unions in Cambodia and Thailand, these are limited examples. Organising, and the empowerment that comes from it, is a much higher priority in countries of destination. Other activities that can contribute to empowerment, such as soft skill training and financial literacy have been conducted more through women's groups than the general information the MRCs give, thus

more demonstration of empowerment could be seen from speaking to this group. Additionally, in some countries, most notably Lao PDR, the users of the MRC who spoke to the evaluation team had not yet migrated, and thus awareness of how they might utilise the knowledge they had gained to advocate for their rights was only theoretical.

- Financial compensation

The programme has had significant achievements in facilitating compensation for migrant workers who have experienced fraud or abuse. The evaluation team were able to speak to only a small number of migrant workers who had received compensation. Those who interviewed indicated improved financial security as a result. There are quite limited examples in the programme's reports about the case studies, and those that are presented generally focus on the process of receiving compensation, rather than the impact on the migrant worker. Thus, potential impacts, such as improved mental well-being from the sense of having a complaint listened to and/or resolved and the effects of the financial compensation itself are under-investigated. This could be investigated more in future reports.

There is another element of financial gain that is not counted in this indicator, that of migrants accessing social protection systems as a result of the interventions of the MRC through direct support or awareness raising. Although access remains varied for migrant workers across ASEAN, some users of the MRCs referenced the support they received in understanding what systems they can access as being significant to them. This currently is an un-quantified impact of the programme.

- Financial literacy

The impact of the financial literacy training given through the programme was included in the testimony of several migrant workers. This included improvements in household budgeting and the setting up of small income generating activities and enterprises. Migrant workers in both Cambodia and Myanmar shared experiences of setting up small enterprises in their community as part of the programme's reintegration services. In addition to providing financial security, the evaluation also identified other impacts including increased financial independence for women and improvements in family relationships:

"Before I joined the group, I was financially dependent on my husband. I migrated to Thailand and when I returned, I did not have any savings. I did not get a job in Cambodia and so did not have any income. I only knew my role was to stay at home and care for my family. Now I know I can get my own job, run a business and do everything my husband can do. I have a small shop selling goods at home. My husband supports this, because before he was our only source of income. Now we have two sources of income." (Migrant Women's Group Member, Cambodia)

Stakeholders in Cambodia also highlighted the importance of the Saver Asia element of the programme including the financial literacy training and the available app, indicating they believed the app was useful for saving migrant workers money in remittances. On the other hand, in Thailand, the utility of the app appears to have been damaged by the military coup in Myanmar. 100% of the Myanmar migrant workers asked about the app, indicated they were either unaware of it or that they could not use it because their relatives in Myanmar are unable to access the official banking system, and as such they need to send money through the broker system instead.

Sustainability Strategy

The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has developed a sustainability strategy. This is based on five pillars: alignment with regional and international development frameworks, ILO principles and priorities, partnership, ownership, participation and social dialogue, capacity and institution building, knowledge management, and meritocracy and reward, institutionalizing tools and approaches through policy and legislative change and accountability, financial viability and incremental shifting of the funding burden.

As previously identified, the programme is aligned with regional and development frameworks and has developed a strong partnership with the ASEAN Secretariat and other key regional stakeholders. There have been significant achievements at the ASEAN level, including the improvement in discourse between Member States, the inclusion of the voice of employers, CSOs, and trade unions in dialogue processes, and the progress on awareness and discussion of key topics. The flexibility of the programme has supported this by allowing topics such as the portability of social security to be pushed when the political consensus allowed. Discussion on this would have been difficult at the start of the programme. Covid-19 in particular, raised the awareness of the priority of this, meaning discussion could move forward. The main challenge for sustainability is to ensure the progress on various issues at the ASEAN level is completed and supports the development of national level policies. Positive work on the portability of social security and the recognition of skills is ongoing but needs to be completed.

The programme has built strong partnerships with tripartite plus constituents. This is a key element of the sustainability strategy. Ownership of the programme is strong among these partners. Some stakeholders did though believe the ILO should encourage proactiveness among members states and the ASEAN Secretariat in continuing dialogue and moving forward on declarations and recommendations, rather than waiting for the ILO to take the lead on them. There was a belief among some stakeholders the lack of initiative leads to limited progress following the AFML at the national level. More regular tripartite plus discussion at the national level about the AFML and its recommendations was suggested to ensure progress, rather than just an annual preparation meeting prior to the AFML.

Social dialogue was reported to have improved during the programme because of actions taken by the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme. There were examples of social dialogue at the individual business level being undertaken by migrant workers. At the regional level, the platform for coordination set by ACE and ATUC is promising for sustainability, and the involvement of trade unions and employer federations in the national preparation meetings and the AFML, along with representatives of diverse migrant, women and persons with disabilities groups also supports sustainable social dialogue. A continuing challenge is ensuring the right groups are in the discussion. Migration governance requires the broader involvement of government ministries than just the ILO's traditional tripartite partner of the Ministry of Labour. The programme needs to continue to work to ensure other relevant ministries are included in dialogue sessions.

The knowledge products the programme has produced were regarded as high quality and of considerable use for evidenced based advocacy and policy development. The main recommendations to improve sustainability in this area were to develop shorter summaries for high-level officials who may not have the time or the technical knowledge to go into the more detailed elements of the studies, and also, where budget allows to ensure the products are translated into the national language of the Member States.

This sustainability factor also includes adapting to the local context. The programme has taken a twin track approach of both developing knowledge products relevant to ASEAN and also products that are specific for member states. This has helped local interest in different products. The capacity building of the programme is critical for ensuring strong local capacities. DFAT's new development policy includes a focus on the localisation of development support. The programme has worked to build capacities at the national and provincial levels in Member States with the inclusion of the different tripartite constituents and CSOs. ILO itself has added to national capacities through the recruitment and career development of NPCs in the targeted countries of intervention. Currently none of the regional programme team are from ASEAN countries. If any of the current programme team decide to move on from the programme in the future, consideration should be given to identifying technical expertise from within the ASEAN region to strengthen the localisation process.

Partner Financial Contribution

One of the programme's outcome indicators is ' % of migrant worker resource centres are co-funded by the implementing agency'. Starting with a baseline of 57%, the programme target for year 8 was 85%, and the achievement rate 87%. This demonstrates a strong ownership of the MRCs by the implementing partners. However, there are still concerns regarding sustainability of the MRCs, particularly related to community outreach activities in government-run MRCs and those implemented by CSOs and trade unions. Government-run MRCs are usually run within existing government buildings by staff including on the budgeted payroll. For these MRCs, the ILO supports with costs for workshops, information materials, office supplies, and transport costs. When asked about the implications if the ILO's support to the MRC's cease, government stakeholders indicated that the services given in the office would continue, but outreach activities could be affected, thus reducing the opportunities for people living in more remote communities to benefit from the MRC services. The MRCs run by CSOs and trade unions often require more funding to support office rent and staff salaries. CSOs and trade unions suggested to the evaluation team that they would try to continue the programming if funding ceased, but it would be very challenging in many cases. Locations where the CSO or trade union had existing office space and other programmes appeared to offer strong opportunities for sustainability, as the capacity gains by organisation staff would support the absorption of MRC-like activities into other programming.

The trust that the MRCs have built among the community and the relationships that have been developed do offer opportunities for sustainability. Community members have become aware of the services of the MRCs and the successes the MRCs have had in increasing awareness of migrant rights and supporting access to justice has ensured the MRCs have a strong reputation among migrant workers, their families, and their communities. There are also examples of good relationships being developed between different stakeholders. In Cambodia, grievance cases are handled by the Provincial Department of Labour and Vocational Training, and through TRIANGLE in ASEAN offices from the department have come to rely on CSOs and trade unions to identify cases, support the migrants in collecting the necessary documentation, and spread awareness of staff migration messages. In Thailand, the programme has supported the development of the Government's one-stop Migrant Workers Assistance Centres (MWAC). There has been particular focus on the MWAC in Mae Sot, which stakeholders noted showed much stronger results than other MWACs in the country. The ILO has facilitated stronger coordination between the MWAC, the programme's CSO implementing partners, and other government agencies. Continuing the relationship building between government agencies and CSOs and trade unions, will help strengthen ongoing sustainability of the MRCs.

Future Programming

There was a universal belief from programme stakeholders that the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme should continue. While the programme has achieved several successes, including the key achievements listed in the effectiveness section and the impacts described above, there is still considerable work to be done to strengthen migration governance within the region, particularly as the volume migration is likely to continue to increase in the coming years. The suggested list below is based on findings from the evaluation, but with the recognition that funds will not be unlimited, and it may not be possible to address all these areas.

Areas for particular attention in the next phase of the programme include:

- Portability of Social Security

The development of the ASEAN Guidelines on Portability of Social Security Benefits for Migrant Workers in ASEAN was cited by stakeholders in several countries as important progress. TRIANGLE in ASEAN has managed to mobilise momentum from the more recent recognition among Member States of the importance of this topic for migration governance. The guidelines address principles that support gender equality such as maternity leave, sickness benefits and pensions. Ensuring the guidelines can be implemented should be a priority for Member States in the coming years. Multi-lateral agreements will take time to develop and reach consensus, and as such TRIANGLE in ASEAN should also support unilateral efforts in individual Member States that improve access to social security for migrant workers and bilateral agreements that can provide best practices for other Member States.

- Skill Recognition

The mutual recognition of skills for middle to lower skills professions within ASEAN was raised by stakeholders as a continued challenge. TRIANGLE in ASEAN has worked with the ILO's SKILLS team on raising awareness on skill recognition related to labour migration, including the participation of the Regional Migration Specialist in the ASEAN Regional Skills Technical Working Group and the Government of Lao PDR in its role as ASEAN chair for 2024 hopes to facilitate an ASEAN declaration on skill recognition. Support will be needed to ensure continued progress. Focusing on bilateral pathways for middle skilled workers in particular professions could provide models for other countries. Working on the Thailand-Lao PDR corridor on bricklaying and plastering presents one such opportunity.

- Continued support to Myanmar and Lao PDR

Both Myanmar and Lao PDR have lower results in certain areas than other countries, for differing reasons. The continued presence of the de facto government in Myanmar means the programme is not going to have achieved policy change there. The programme has though continued, through CSOs and CTUM, to provide important support to migrant workers, their families, and individuals who are unable to migrate as a result of the current crisis. In Lao PDR, the often lower capacities of key stakeholders compared to other Member States and turnover of government staff, means progress is often slower. However, again, there have been important achievements of the programme. It is important to continue support to both countries despite some of the challenges in achieving the same level of results as other countries, and this should be prioritised in the future phase.

- Climate change

Climate induced migration is very likely to increase in the coming years and pose more challenges to governance and stability throughout the world including the ASEAN region. Some stakeholders shared with the evaluation that climate change is already one of push factors for migration as agricultural crops fail as a result of variable weather patterns. Interestingly, OPDs linked discussions on migration and climate change as they identified them both as areas where persons with disabilities are excluded from decision-making. Climate change is also an increasingly priority for development partners, and forms a cross-cutting priority in Australia's new development policy.

- Engagement of labour attaches

Stakeholders from countries of origin informed the evaluation team of the key role their labour attaches can play in ensuring the protection of their nationals overseas. For example, Cambodia government officials shared the belief that it was important for Cambodian migrant workers to be informed of the contact numbers of the attaches so they could contact them if they faced problems. Providing training on different elements of decent work and migrant worker protections through the programme was recommended as an activity for a future phase.

- Scam centres and other emerging issues on forced labour

Concerns over newly emerging issues linked to trafficking and forced labour were raised to the evaluation team and provide areas the TRIANGLE in ASEAN could work in during the next phase of the programme, potentially in collaboration with ASEAN ACT. Scam centres, where migrants are deceived into migrating for supposedly legitimate jobs, but then forced into working in online scamming operations have increased in recent years and are reported to exist in several ASEAN Member States.

- Inclusion of Indonesia and the Philippines

While recognising the pressures on funding, not including Indonesia and the Philippines has been a gap in the programme. Should funding be available, identifying ways to programme directly in these countries is important.

- Full funding of Malaysia and Viet Nam

The decision to reduce the presence of the programme in Malaysia and Viet Nam was justifiable given the budgetary shortfall. However, the trade-off has left a gap in the programme as activities have been reduced. While noting the pressure on budgets again, should sufficient funding be identified, ensuring a full team in both countries should be considered.

- Identifying additional development partners

As the last two suggestions in particular will require additional funding, it would be ideal for the programme to identify additional development partners to support the programme. This could include either bilateral government donors, or private foundations who ILO work with (for example the H&M Foundation funds some of the ILO's work in the garment sector).

- Ensure alignment with the ACMW's next action plan

The current ACMW's Action Plan of the ASEAN Consensus work plan runs under 2025. The ACMW will develop its post-2025 Action Plan shortly and it is expected to be adopted next year by Member

States. The next phase of the programme should ensure the close alignment that has existed with previous ACMW Action Plans continues with the post-2025 Action Plan.

- Continue to strengthen collaboration between trade unions and CSOs to support the organising of workers utilising the MRC structures

Organising of migrant workers is challenging due to prevailing laws and practices, attitudes towards migrant workers, pressure from companies, and very relevant fears many migrant workers have about the consequences of challenging their working conditions. Trade unions may also not have significant presence in the locations where migrant workers are concentrated. CSOs play a significant role in informally organising workers. The MRCs give the potential to support joint efforts from trade unions and CSOs. Efforts that have been made already could be expanded further in the next phase of the programme.

3.7 Gender Equality and Disability Inclusion

Key Findings

23. Attention to women migrants is a significant strength of the programme.
24. There is some evidence of changes in attitudes towards gender identity and sexual orientation.
25. The disability inclusion work is new to the programme. However, there is already evidence in some locations of awareness of the need to strengthen capacities and improve programming on disability inclusion. This provides a solid platform for innovative approaches from the programme in the future.
26. In addition to ensuring programming is disability inclusive, TRIANGLE in ASEAN has the opportunity to be a model for the ILO internally on how a programme can holistically address different indicators in the ILO's Disability Inclusion Policy and Strategy and the United Nations Disability Inclusion Strategy
27. Gender budgeting has been a useful tool for the programme to monitor its work on gender equality. Highlighting the different percentages of the budgeting is for gender equality, SOGIECS issues, and disability inclusion would strengthen this further. The programme should share experiences of gender budgeting to other offices in the ILO.

Evaluation Questions

- To what extent did the initial and ongoing (iterative) project design consider specific gender equality and non-discrimination concerns relevant to the project context? To what extent has TRIANGLE been able to realize its GEDSI outcomes?
- How has the programme been able to make a difference for women migrant workers, in terms of gender equality and empowerment?
- How has the programme made a difference for persons with disabilities?
- How effective has TRIANGLE's gender budgeting been at achieving the programmes gender equality goals?

The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme utilises a twin-track approach to gender equality and non-discrimination. Gender equality, SOGIESC considerations, and disability inclusion are mainstreamed into activities for track 1, and specific activities and a target for dedicated budgeting that specifically address gender equality and non-discrimination are implemented in track 2.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

The programme has achieved significant results in gender equality and women's empowerment through three main approaches; ensuring policy revisions and developments have gender transformative provisions in them to address identified gender gaps in migration governance, targeting sectors in which there are higher proportions of women migrants and specific vulnerabilities such as domestic work and the care economy, and by developing women specific support groups at the local level in Cambodia, Myanmar, and Thailand.

At a policy level, the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has supported the policy initiatives that address the needs of women migrant workers and worked to ensure labour law revisions have transformative provisions in them. An example of this is Viet Nam's Law 69 that gives workers the right to terminate their contracts if they experience threats, sexual harassment or forced labour, and includes a provision for legal aid for the workers who experience harassment or discrimination. The programme has dovetailed with other ILO programmes on this work, most notably the Safe and Fair programme, which was explicitly designed to focus on women migrants. Specific attribution to a particular programme can be difficult but it appears clear the ILO programmes have worked well together, without duplication and covering gaps where necessary. The revision of Law 69 is an example of this, where the regional programmes of Safe and Fair, TRIANGLE in ASEAN, and Ship to Shore, and the national project Law 72 all contributed technical inputs to, with the end result being positive amendments to the law that were gender responsive and addressed protection needs of migrant workers. The programme has also supported the revision of Thailand's Ministerial Regulation 14 Governing the Working Conditions for Domestic Workers. The revised rule (Regulation 15) was adopted by the Cabinet in April 2024. The programme has worked on the revision of this regulation since 2018. The regulation extends a number of important protections to domestic workers that they were previously excluded from, and the programme and its partners have advocated for including eight-hour workdays and one hour rest, a minimum wage, leave for necessary business, prohibiting terminating employment because of pregnancy, and maternity leave.

TRIANGLE in ASEAN's focus on the domestic work sector is significant for its work on gender equality and women's empowerment. The approach has included MRC services to domestic workers, the support of grassroots organisations working with domestic workers, including Three Good Spoons in Myanmar and Home Net in Thailand, working with policy makers on extension of labour and social protection to domestic workers, and producing knowledge products. The knowledge product, *Skilled to Care, Forced to Work?*, was highlighted by stakeholders as a output of the programme that had solid data to conduct evidence-based advocacy. Decent work for domestic workers was the theme of the 10th AFML in 2017 and has since featured regularly in discussions and outcome documents of various ACMW activities, and the theme for the 17th AFML in November 2024, that will be hosted by Lao PDR, is "Care work and labour migration in ASEAN". The focus more recently on the portability of social security benefits, was also identified as something with the potential to have a significant impact on women migrants if bilateral agreements can be reached.

Since 2022, TRIANGLE in ASEAN has included an initiative to form migrant women's groups in Cambodia, Myanmar, and Thailand. This includes women migrants from various sectors. The main approach of the groups is to provide peer-to-peer support for women in the community, with a focus on safe migration messages and financial empowerment. During the evaluation, women migrants shared some of the successes of the groups. This included a belief that there was greater awareness in the community about safe migration that was leading to more informed decisions. Women in Cambodia for example believed that less of their peers were using unauthorised brokers for migration. There has also been a significant empowerment element to the groups. Financial literacy

has been part of the activities and has contributed to improved budgeting and income generation activities.

“We are members of (name redacted) women group established with the guide of the local organisation (name redacted). With trainer from the organisation, we get together and can make products like (Fried banana chip snacks) and sell them at local market or event. We are happy to see this kind of group activity and feel proud of ourselves especially when we see money after selling those products. We have lots of banana plants in our backyard and didn’t know before we can make this kind of nutritious, tasty and crunchy banana snacks and can make money out of it. We can also feed own kids replacing high price imported snacks from China and Thailand. It is also safe and nutritious. We want to learn more and want more opportunity to sell this kind of new products to be more profitable for ourselves as well as for villages.” (Migrant Women’s Group Members, Myanmar)

The evaluation participants also believed the women’s groups had improved their confidence, given them more opportunities to interact with community leaders and local government officials, and improved the respect they are given by the family members. This story of change from a member of one of the women’s groups in Cambodia demonstrates the increased empowerment.

“After becoming part of the women’s group, we feel more empowered and to speak up for ourselves. Before I was very shy to stand up for myself and speak out. Now I feel I am able to stand up for myself because of this group and training I have received. Before having the women’s group, we weren’t aware of safe migration. Women would be scammed by brokers and we wouldn’t know about the documentation or where to reach out for support overseas. We now know the importance of safe documentation and are able to reach out to the Cambodian embassy if we have problems in the country. The women are braver before and can stand up for themselves. We also have some leadership quality. Before it was only men who travelled far from home. Now women do this too.” (Migrant Women’s Group Member, Cambodia)

An area that could be given more attention in future activities are campaigns to ratify the ILO Domestic Worker Convention (C.189) and the Violence and Harassment Convention (C.190). Among ASEAN Member States, only the Philippines have ratified C.189 and none have ratified C.190. While the programme has included information and awareness raising on C.189 and C.190 at various events, there has not been a dedicated campaign for ratification, although on the 10-year anniversary of C.189, the programme published the Skilled to Care report and increased calls for ratification. Safe and Fair took more of a lead on advocacy for the ratification of C.190, which could be undertaken more by TRIANGLE in ASEAN now that Safe and Fair has ended. Some Member States, such as Viet Nam have indicated an interest in moving towards ratification of these conventions, and this may provide entry points for a more dedicated campaign by the ILO in future.

Gender Identity

Approaches to SOGIESC issues have been included in the GEDSI. Gender and sexual identity was a focus of the Safe and Fair programme, and thus less explicit programming has been conducted by TRIANGLE in ASEAN. However, training for partners does include ethics and safeguards related to programming for people with diverse SOGIESC and awareness raising among MRCs and migrant workers has been conducted. Members of women’s migrant forums in Cambodia shared their behaviour towards people with diverse SOGIESC has changed as a result of the programme:

“Before I used to use the word gay as mocking or joking to people. Now I am aware of the term of LGBTQI and intersectionality and I am much more understanding of LGBTQI people and respectful to them” (Migrant Women’s Group Member, Cambodia)

Disability Inclusion

Disability inclusion is a relatively new focus to the programme. The programme initially scored poorly on the Annual Investment Monitoring Reports (AIMRs) produced by DFAT every year. Following prompting by DFAT, the programme’s then Senior Technical Officer, who has responsibility for gender equality, diversity, and inclusion, led a review of the programme’s Women’s Empowerment and Gender Equality (WEGES) strategy, which was updated to the Gender Equality, Disability, and Social Inclusion Strategy (GEDSI). TRIANGLE in ASEAN has since made significant progress in considering disability inclusion in its programming, and in the last AIMR scored 5/6 and 4/6 on the two disability inclusion questions, as compared to 2 and 2 in 2022.

The ILO has a Disability Inclusion Policy and Strategy endorsed by the Governing Body. This was developed to help the ILO align with the United Nations Disability Inclusion Strategy (UNDIS). The Disability Inclusion Policy and Strategy has 13 thematic areas that respond to the 15 indicators of the Entity Accountability Framework of the UNDIS. The 15 indicators are within four thematic areas, strategic planning and management, inclusiveness, programming, and organisational culture.

Since the programme has refined its approach to focus more on disability inclusion, the Technical Officer has become an active member of the ILO’s Disability Champions Network, a grouping set up by the Disability Inclusion team in Geneva to provide networking and capacity building opportunities, and peer support for ILO staff in programming and operational departments at both HQ and the country and regional offices. A positive indication of the work the programme has put into disability inclusion, is the featuring of the programme and its best practices at one of the regularly scheduled Disability Champions online meetings.

Awareness about disability inclusion was mixed among stakeholders. Many indicated the importance of ensuring their services were inclusive and that barriers to migration for persons with disabilities needed to be addressed. However, other stakeholders stated that they did not discriminate against persons with disabilities but that they had not seen persons with disabilities in the MRCs, demonstrating a lack of awareness of the need for pro-activity to address the lack of persons with disabilities accessing their services. A small number of stakeholders believed that TRIANGLE in ASEAN should not focus on disability inclusion, stating there were other issues that should received more priority. Given the programme has to date had limited focus on disability, the fact several stakeholders were either not pro-active or believed there were other priorities is not surprising. The more significant finding is that several stakeholders did recognise the importance of disability inclusion, which a topic that is much under-addressed in migration governance and programming.

In March, the programme invited the ILO’s Disability Specialist to conduct Disability Equality Training for regional and Thai stakeholders. This is participatory training that the ILO’s disability inclusion team conducts for staff, constituents, and other stakeholders, and is designed to challenge pre-conceived notions and change attitudes and practices towards persons with disabilities. During this workshop representatives of migrant workers CSOs and OPDs were able to identify that many of the challenges migrants and persons with disabilities face are similar, and government officials indicated a willingness to work with CSOs and OPDs on improving the disability inclusion responsiveness of migration governance. When asked about disability inclusion, several representatives of CSOs and MRC officials in various countries indicated they were expecting, and looking forward to, training on disability inclusion in the next couple of months, demonstrating that while there has been limited

impact to date so far for persons with disabilities, there is a willingness to work on disability inclusion among many programme stakeholders.

Some project partners have received training on disability inclusion, and it was notable that these stakeholders were more aware of issues related to disability inclusion and had taken some steps to address it. In Cambodia, MRC coordinators, provincial government stakeholders, and members of migrant women's groups shared how they had taken steps to include persons with disabilities in activities and in some cases, changed their attitudes towards persons with disabilities. One MRC representative even linked the limited budget allowed per person at events to the challenge of ensuring reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities in being able to attend.

The inclusion of OPDs is important for the programme. The ILO developed guidance on the consultation of OPDs in 2022. Involving OPDs is a crucial indicator in the UNDIS, and the ILO has underperformed globally on this category¹¹ (along with much of the UN family¹²). The programme has developed an implementation agreement with Life Haven to address disability at the regional level, as well as working with OPDs in Cambodia and Myanmar. The ILO's guidance on the consultation of OPDs and the UNDIS indicator stress the importance on mainstreaming consultation of OPDs across programming and not just on disability specific issues. The inclusion of OPDs in regional and national consultations on migration sets a strong platform for this, that the ILO will need to continue to develop as the programme continues. Other areas of the strategy require more attention. The publications of the programme are not fully accessible for persons with screen readers and the recent ILO guidelines on inclusive procurement including during the organising of meetings and workshops need to be implemented.

Gender Budgeting

The results framework includes a target of 20% of the project activity budget to be spent on activities focused on redressing gender balance and disability inclusion. The programme has significantly overachieved on this target. Since the start of the programme, 25.7% of the overall budget has been spent. In 2022 and 2023, this total was 32% and 29.6% respectively. It has to be questioned as to whether the target is actually necessary for the programme anymore. As reported above, TRIANGLE in ASEAN has shown a strong focus on gender equality and women's empowerment, expanding this more recently to SOCGIESC issues and disability inclusion. The percentage in the results framework would probably have been achieved without the target actually being there. However, as a general good practice, the gender budgeting approach has had some benefits. It does provide a monitoring tool for the programme to track its expenditure and react if any concerns on budget utilisation appear. It also acts as an aide memoire for NPCs to ensure they continue to consider this in their programming. Additionally, it provides an example of an approach can be used as a good practice by other ILO projects and programmes. The approach was replicated by the Ship to Shore programme, which has less explicit focus on migrant women specific issues, and should be highlighted to other programmes and country offices. TRIANGLE in ASEAN's implementing partners should also be orientated on how to use this tool as it could be used to support their efforts to prioritise gender activities in their work.

¹¹ ILO, 2023. Report on the implementation of the ILO Disability Inclusion Policy and Strategy (2020–23). GB.346/INS/INF/5. https://webapps.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_857591.pdf

¹² UN. 2023. Disability inclusion in the United Nations system. Report of the Secretary-General. https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/undis_sg_report_2022_english.pdf

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

4.1 Conclusions

Overall, the programme has registered considerable achievements in strengthening migration governance in the ASEAN region and empowering migrant workers to identify and demand their rights and access to decent work. The strong partnerships and development of trust over the lengthy implementation period have been significant drivers of this. The needs related to migration governance in ASEAN are large and continuation of the programme beyond the current phase is important. This will ensure the ILO can continue to successfully partner with the ASEAN Secretariat, national governments, social partners, and CSOs to continue to build on these successes and ensure migrant workers have opportunities to access decent work and seek redress for violations, as well as support the development goals of Australia and Canada in the region. The continuation of the programme offers the potential for sustained achievements in the future, tackling existing and emerging challenges in the region.

4.1.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit

The relevance of the programme towards the needs of migrant workers, governments, employers, trade unions, and CSOs in the ASEAN region was found to be high. The multi-faceted nature of the programme allows it to ensure relevance to all these groups. In particular, the programme works at the provincial level and directly engages migrant workers, ensuring data and experiences from this level are available to impact policy discussions and revisions at the national and regional level. The programme supports ASEAN priorities through aligning with the ACMW's Action Plan of the ASEAN Consensus work plan and has also been successful in supporting development of ASEAN instruments such as declarations and guidelines and supports efforts to implement them at the national level through country level programming.

The programme addresses needs of migrant workers through its MRC system, providing support to migrant workers both in countries of origin and destination. The need for information and to be able to access grievance mechanisms is acutely felt by migrant workers, and the systems the programme has supported are often the only means to do this. Including CSOs in the programme and introducing them into the national and regional policy debates has strongly increased the relevance of the activities for migrant workers.

The programme also responded effectively to the Covid-19, nimbly adjusting strategies to provide immediate support. This response appears to have contributed to increased collaboration between government agencies and trade unions and CSOs as the importance of coordination was highlighted during this period.

The main challenges to relevance are the geographical scope of the programme. The resources available mean that national staff are not available in Malaysia and not full time in Viet Nam, and only six of the ten ASEAN members have national level activities, with both Indonesia and the Philippines being excluded. The other main challenge is the bureaucratic problems concerning the involvement of migrant workers without documentation in programme activities and requires urgent attention from the ILO to resolve.

4.1.2 Coherence and Validity of Design

Coherence was generally rated high. The convening power of the ILO was seen as a particular comparative advantage of the programme, especially by CSOs who have traditionally been excluded from the policy debate on migration at the regional level, along with the ILO's normative framework and expertise on international labour rights. The programme's strengths of building a relationship and reputation with the ACMW and setting the standards for MRCs, have also been developed into comparative advantages. Collaboration with other ILO programmes has also been effective, including both the regional migration programmes and national projects. The programme has also successfully leveraged the technical support of ILO departments in both Bangkok and Geneva. Partners also demonstrated synergies with other areas of work, which helps compliment both the efficiency and sustainability of the programme. TRIANGLE in ASEAN has coordinated with the DFAT funded ASEAN-ACT programme but there is probably potential for increased collaboration in future.

4.1.3 Intervention Progress and Effectiveness

The programme is currently on-track to achieve almost all of its outcome and output targets. Most of the targets that are reported to be behind the benchmark for year 8 are at least 95% of the way to achieving them. The programme does need to review the classification of some outcome targets to and revise some to impact targets and some to outputs.

The successes of the programme are driven by strong teamwork, flexibility of design and a long programme length, strong attention to gender equality and women's empowerment, and more recently disability inclusion, the involvement of CSOs in addition to the traditional social partners, the capacity building of partners, the convening power of the ILO, the strengthening of the knowledge base, targeting multiple levels of governance, and the trust that has been built up between the ILO and key stakeholders during the programme. These have contributed to the key achievements that include the improvements in social dialogue and tripartite plus relationships development of migrant women's groups, the adoption of ASEAN declarations, the revision of several national and regional policies, the contribution to global statistics on labour migration, and a significant level of compensation obtained for migrant workers. Although the programme is mainly on track, it has faced some challenges. The military coup in Myanmar and the Covid-19 pandemic are the main external challenges, along with some persistent limited awareness of gendered differences in migration, although significant improvements are noted among many stakeholders. Internally, the main challenge has been the budgetary limitations creating uncertainty for programming. Several non-government stakeholders also mentioned a belief there needed to be more regular and concrete follow-up and participation of the AFML at the national level.

4.1.4 Efficiency of Resource Use

The programme was assessed to be generally efficiently implemented. It has followed the key principles of value for money; risks are monitored and reported on regularly, innovative approaches are attempted, there is good transparency and communication with programme partners, and evidence-based decisions supported by quality knowledge products and a strong monitoring and evaluation system are made.

The amalgamation of the two projects has strengthen the programme, allowing more flexibility to respond to emerging challenges and having the unified support of two development partners rather than one. The administrative and reporting costs are also reduced. The main challenge from the merging has been the uncertainty the differing funding periods has created. Budgetary shortfall has been a challenge throughout the programme, and a unified programme completion date may have avoided some of the uncertainty.

4.1.5 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements

The programme is effectively managed, with there being clarity over roles and responsibilities among regional and national staff and programme partners. The evidence-based and adaptive approach to the programme is supported by an effective monitoring and evaluation system that brings together evidence from the different implementers and countries and supports feedback into the programme. The quality of the knowledge products also contributes to this finding.

4.1.6 Impact Orientation and Sustainability

The programme has supported policy changes in all of the countries of implementation (albeit with implementation of those in Myanmar now having been suspended). This has contributed to significant change in migration governance and often positive outcomes for Migrant Workers. The programme has also supported the dissemination of these policies to provincial areas. While much work remains to be done in this area, these achievements should be long lasting.

The programme has also important impacts for Migrant Workers. A substantial amount of compensation has been awarded as a result of the support of the MRCs. Women's empowerment through the forming of women's group, improved awareness of rights, and financial literacy training has also been significant. Sustainability of the MRCs does remain a concern. Ownership of the programme by different duty bearers is in general strong, however more initiative in addressing AFML recommendations without waiting for ILO would strengthen sustainability. Additionally, it is not clear to what extent the programme's partners would continue the activities if funding were to cease.

Key areas identified for future programming include continuing to support work on the portability of social security and skills recognition, climate induced migration, and working on emerging issues of forced labour and trafficking, such as scam centres. The programme should continue to support activities in Myanmar and Lao PDR, despite some of the challenges of programming there, and if funds permit, have full teams in Malaysia and Viet Nam, and include national level activities in Indonesia and the Philippines.

4.1.7 Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination

Gender equality and women's empowerment was identified as a particular strength of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme. The programme has focused on sectors where there are large numbers of women migrants, as well as ensuring draft policies are gender responsive. There has also been some attention to diverse sexual and gender identities and evidence in at least Cambodia of this impacting the attitudes of government officials and community members. The programme has more recently begun to address disability inclusion. It has developed a strong springboard to work on this issue and has the potential to be a model programme for ILO on how to ensure the participation of persons with disabilities, OPDs and tripartite constituents, while at the same time support the ILO's achievement of other indicators in the UNDIS.

4.2 Recommendations

Recommendations	Addressed To	Priority and Time frame	Resource Implications
<p>1. Fund a further phase of the programme.</p> <p>While TRIANGLE in ASEAN has had considerable successes, the large needs related to migration governance in the region remain, and continued work is needed to support these.</p> <p>Funding an additional phase would help the ILO address these needs.</p> <p>The ILO and the development partners should also consider if additional funders can be brought into the partnership.</p> <p>Some specific recommendations are included below, but as a summary of topics identified, considerations for a future phase included continued work on the portability of social security and mutual skill recognition, addressing climate induced migration, working more deeply with labour attaches, and addressing emerging forms of forced labour and trafficking, such as scam centres.</p>	DFAT, GAC, the ILO	ASAP High	At least a similar, but preferably higher level of funding is needed.
<p>2. Align funding periods if possible.</p> <p>Uncertainty over programme funding has created challenges in programming for the ILO and its partners. The alignment of funding periods between donors would help reduce this concern by providing more clarity over what funds are available for a specific period and allow the ILO to attempt to address shortfalls through other funding sources.</p>	DFAT and GAC	Ongoing Medium	Dependent on how easily this could be done with different government policies.
<p>3. Review the classification of results framework indicators and adjust during the design of any future phase.</p> <p>A few of the indicators in the results framework appear classified, particularly outcome indicators that the ILO has very limited control over, and some outcome indicators that are outputs.</p>	Regional Programme Team	During design of next phase. Medium	Staff time
<p>4. Revisit the theory of change when developing the next phase of the programme and build in descriptions of how the outcomes interact and include areas that are currently missing from the programme.</p> <p>In particular, consider how to include the empowerment of migrant workers in the theory of change and results framework for a future phase.</p> <p>The programme has achieved impacts through the empowerment of migrant workers, but this element is missing from the theory of change and the results framework. The design of the next phase should consider how empowerment impacts the other elements of the theory of change and if there are ways to measure it</p>	Regional Programme Team	During design of next phase. High	Staff time

Recommendations	Addressed To	Priority and Time frame	Resource Implications
<p>5. Support campaigns focused on the ratification of C189 and C190.</p> <p>Some of the member states have expressed an interest in ratifying C189 and/or C190. Activities that could be supported include legal gap analysis to support governments to move towards ratification, public awareness campaigns, and capacity building of Employers, Trade Unions, and CSOs to increase knowledge of the details of the conventions among key stakeholders.</p>	Regional Programme Team Partners	Ongoing Medium	Activity cost, consultants fees or staff time.
<p>6. Identify if there are funding opportunities that would allow the joint funding of NPC positions in Malaysia and Viet Nam.</p> <p>Funding limitations led to the removal of NPC positions in Malaysia and Viet Nam. The programme has benefited from utilising the Ship to Shore NPC and funded her position for three months. While full funding for the position within the programme on its own is ideal, if this cannot be obtained, looking at a more sustained shared funding model for the position could help close the human resources gap and is one the programme could consider if funding opportunities exist.</p>	Regional Programme Team	Ongoing High	Would require programmes to be relatively closely aligned in funding periods.
<p>7. If funding can be identified, expand the programme to include national activities in Indonesia and the Philippines.</p> <p>Both countries are key countries of origin for migrant workers in ASEAN and play an important role in ACMW activities. It is acknowledged that funding is limited, and the ILO sat times has other migration programmes operating in these countries. The inclusion of Indonesia and the Philippines should not come at the expense of other countries in the programme. However, if funds are available, the inclusion of Indonesia and the Philippines should be considered in any future phase of the programme. Barring this, undertaken a scoping exercise with the country offices to understand how the programme might partner with existing or upcoming interventions is recommended.</p>	Regional Programme Team	During the design of a future phase. High	Would require significant additional funds
<p>8. Continue to ensure a strong focus on sectors and topics that support gender transformative policies.</p> <p>The work of the programme on domestic work has been an example of this. The programme should ensure topics that have emerged more recently such as the portability of social security and considering broader aspects of the care economy continue to be supported in the next phase of the programme.</p>	Regional Programme Team	Ongoing High	Ongoing programming costs
<p>9. Continue to roll out disability equality training and build the capacity of partners on disability inclusion as well as identifying other areas in the operational side of the</p>	Regional Programme Team	Ongoing High	Workshop costs

Recommendations	Addressed To	Priority and Time frame	Resource Implications
<p>programme where disability inclusion can be improved such as procurement, recruitment, and the accessibility of publications.</p> <p>Continued participation in the ILO Disability Champions network and close coordination with the GEDI Disability Team should be undertaken.</p> <p>The programme should also consider identifying additional OPDs to participate in the programme.</p> <p>A reasonable accommodation budget could be set up to support project partners who request it to support persons with disabilities attending events. A centrally managed fund would reduce the challenge a partner might face in balancing budget management against inclusion needs.</p>	Programme partners		
<p>10. Develop short key message briefings to accompany select knowledge products.</p> <p>This would help support the dissemination of the findings to senior officials while maintaining the key technical information for relevant users. A targeted approach should be taken with this recommendation as this probably would not be needed for all products.</p> <p>Where relevant, the products should be translated into local languages.</p>	Regional Programme Team	Ongoing Medium	Drafting costs
<p>11. Clarify with partners that migrants without IDs are still eligible to attend programme events. Ensure that this is understood by the finance team.</p> <p>If necessary, this issue needs to be raised with the senior levels of management within the ILO (DG's office, the Governing Body).</p>	ILO including senior management	Immediately High	None
<p>12. Continue to identify ways to partner with ASEAN ACT.</p> <p>The two programmes have made attempts to identify joint areas of collaboration but there is probably room to do more. Collaborating could help broaden the engagement of TRIANGLE in ASEAN with different ministries responsible for migration governance and the prevention and response to trafficking including the police and the ministries of justice and interior. The ILO's relationship with Ministries of Labour could help expand the focus on labour inspectorates and support ASEAN ACT to engage more on forced labour with the inspectorates. Emerging topics such as scam centres could provide potential entry points for collaboration as well.</p>	Regional Programme Team and ASEAN-ACT DFAT	Ongoing High	Coordination costs and potentially implementation budget
<p>13. Continue to share the successes of the programme with other regional and country offices, and globally through HQ, and among partners.</p>	Regional Programme Team MIGRANT	Ongoing Medium	Staff time

Recommendations	Addressed To	Priority and Time frame	Resource Implications
<p>The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has several initiatives that are innovative and successful and could provide models for other ILO programmes. The programme has recently share best practices on the MRC model with the Regional Office for Latin America and is a good practice to continue. Additionally, the exposure of partners to other ILO implementing partners, both within and externally to TRIANGLE in ASEAN should be undertaken where costs allow. Sharing of good practices was highlighted as useful by partners in the programme. However, clear expected outcomes of such exchanges and follow-up action plans should be developed to ensure value for money is applied to these activities.</p>	Regional Offices		
<p>14. Provide security training and PSS support for front-line CSO and trade union workers.</p> <p>Safety and security were raised as concerns in Myanmar and Thailand, and examples were given of re-traumatisation of front-line staff through their experiences and the situations of migrant workers they support. Providing both security training and PSS support would help the implementation of the MRC activities in future.</p>	Regional Programme Team Partners	ASAP High	Workshop and training costs
<p>15. Where feasible provide funds for implementing partners to train their partners.</p> <p>Several implementing partners have networks of grassroots organisations that work with the populations the MRCs are trying to reach. Additional small amounts of funding to help pass on key training messages the partners receive from ILO would strengthen the collaboration the partners have with the grassroot organisations and the reach of the MRCs.</p>	Regional Programme Team NPCs Partners	Ongoing Medium	Workshop and training costs
<p>16. Work with national governments to provide more opportunities for non-government partners to participate in AFML related activities throughout the year.</p> <p>Several non-government stakeholders were not clear about the follow up of AFML outcomes, indicating they felt there should be more focus on implementing outcomes and recommendations at the national level in collaboration with them on more than just an annual basis.</p> <p>The recommendations of the summary of progress of specific clusters of AFML recommendations, last produced in 2023, offers a sound basis for strengthening the involvement of non-state actors in supporting national governments to implement the recommendations.</p>	ILO ASEAN Member States	Ongoing High	Programme costs and government budget costs

Table 6 : Recommendations

4.3 Lessons Learned

More detailed descriptions of the lessons learned and good practices are contained in annex 6.

- While ensuring there is not wastage in implementation agreements is positive, if the budget is too tight it can harm quality and end up reducing efficiency as a result.
- Where budgetary restrictions in a regional programme limits national staffing, identifying programmes to share staffing positions with, at least mitigates some of the gaps caused by the shortfall.

4.4 Emerging Good Practices

- The development of women's migrant groups is an important support function for women's empowerment.
- Ensuring a regional programme has strong connections to grassroots implementation strengthens the credibility of the intervention as it supports the collection of evidence at the grass-root level that supports evidence-based programming and advocacy at the national and regional level.
- A long programme with flexibility from its donors strengthens trust and helps build relationships, and ultimately improves the quality of the end product.
- The exposure of CSO officers and government officials to OPD representatives at an early stage in disability inclusion programming strengthens awareness of common challenges and solutions and helps ensure programmes follow the 'nothing about us, without us' principles.

Annex 1: Evaluation TOR



Call for Expressions of Interest

Final Independent Evaluation of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme

The ILO Evaluation Office is seeking an expression of interest from an international evaluation consultant (team leader) and 3 qualified national consultants (national of Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Vietnam) to support the lead evaluator in conducting a final independent evaluation of the ILO programme titled TRIANGLE in ASEAN: Safe and Fair Labour Migration. You may submit the EOI as an individual consultant or a team of lead and national evaluator(s).

For further details about the evaluation, please refer to the Terms of Reference (TOR) below.

Required Information for Submission of an Expression of Interest (EOI)

- (i) A description of how the candidate's skills, qualifications and experience are relevant to the required qualifications for this assignment;
- (ii) A brief description of the approach/methodology that the candidate will likely use for this evaluation;
- (iii) A list of previous evaluations that are relevant to the context and subject matter of this assignment;
- (iv) A statement confirming availability to conduct this assignment and the daily professional fee expressed in US dollars;
- (v) A copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae (which must include information about the qualifications held by the candidate);
- (vi) A statement confirming that the candidate has no previous involvement in the delivery of the programme and/or a personal relationship with any ILO officials who are engaged in the programme;
- (vii) Names of two referees who can be contacted for reference.

The deadline for EOI submission is 6 PM (Bangkok time) on 10 January 2024. Please send an e-mail with the subject title "Final evaluation of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme" to the Evaluation Manager, Mr Phumphet Chetianonth (chetianonth@ilo.org), with a copy to Ms Pamornrat Pringsulaka (pamornrat@ilo.org).

Terms of Reference

Final Independent Evaluation of TRIANGLE in ASEAN: Safe and Fair Labour Migration

Key facts

Title of project being evaluated	TRIANGLE in ASEAN: Safe and Fair Labour Migration
Project DC Code	RAS/15/05/AUS & RAS/22/54/AUS (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)) RAS/16/01/CAN (Global Affairs Canada (GAC))
Type of evaluation (e.g., independent, internal)	Independent, external
Timing of evaluation (e.g., midterm, final)	Final Evaluation (mid January-June 2024)
Donor	Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and Global Affairs Canada (GAC)
Administrative Unit in the ILO responsible for administering the project	ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP)
Technical Unit(s) in the ILO responsible for backstopping the project	MIGRANT
P&B outcome (s) under evaluation	Outcome 7: Adequate and effective protection at work for all Output 7.5. Increased capacity of Member States to develop fair and effective labour migration frameworks, institutions and services to protect migrant workers
SDG(s) under evaluation	5, 8, 10
Budget	AUD24 million 2015-2027 and CAD9.5 million 2016-2024

Background Information: Programme Introduction and Rationale

1. Introduction

Labour migration has long been a critical factor behind the economic and social dynamism of the ASEAN region and its people. Disparities in development between Member States, alongside demographic and other structural changes in destination countries, means that migration makes a substantial contribution to improved livelihoods and increased labour market efficiency. Due to the high costs, long duration, and considerable complexity of navigating the regular channels for migration, many ASEAN migrants are employed precariously in destination countries without legal status.

Regardless of the documents they hold, migrants within the region often experience exploitation and abuse because of inadequate protection of their labour rights during recruitment and employment. Women face additional challenges in accessing safe and legal migration opportunities, with the type of work available to them often paying less and affording fewer legal protections due to lack of formalization. Protectionist policies in some countries restrict the movement of women by sector, destination or other circumstances perceived as dangerous or contrary to traditional social values. Persons with disabilities and LGBTI persons also frequently face discriminatory barriers to migration and to decent work.

In addressing these challenges, in 2015 and 2016, and building upon the successes of two earlier projects¹³, the ILO entered into two separate Grant Arrangements aimed to advance labour migration governance in the ASEAN region with the Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and Global Affairs Canada (GAC). Noting that several objectives and priorities under the two Grant Arrangements were complementary, it was agreed to merge these two projects into one joint programme called *TRIANGLE in ASEAN: Safe and Fair Labour Migration (or TRIANGLE in short)*¹⁴.

Australia's support to the current phase of TRIANGLE equals AUD 24 million over the November 2015 – November 2027 period. **Canada's support** CAD 9.5 million over the December 2016 – September 2024 period.

TRIANGLE is active in six countries (Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam) and engages with all ASEAN member states through its regional activities, working in close cooperation with governments, employers' organizations, workers' organizations and civil society.

2. TRIANGLE Scope, Objectives and Outputs

TRIANGLE delivers technical assistance and support with the **overall goal** to maximise the contribution of labour migration to stable and inclusive growth and development in the ASEAN region through more

¹³ The DFAT funded "Tripartite Action to Protect Migrant Workers within and from the Greater Mekong Subregion from Labour Exploitation" (GMS TRIANGLE project) implemented from 2010-2015; and the GAC funded "Tripartite Action for the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers in the ASEAN Region" (ASEAN TRIANGLE Project) implemented from 2012-2016.

¹⁴ The detailed implementation parameters for the joint TRIANGLE programme are governed by an inception report. The inception report outlines the various components of the joint implementation approach and consists of six annexes that details the joint Theory of change, the Monitoring and evaluation plan, the Risk management strategy, a Sustainability and impact strategy, a Gender equality, disability and social inclusion strategy, and the Product list and branding protocol. The inception report has been updated over time, with a first edition being approved in 2018, followed by a second edition that was approved in 2022. In April 2022, the (then) Gender Equality and Inclusion Strategy (GIES) was changed to incorporate diverse SOGIESC and disability inclusion (GEDSI). In September 2023, the Product list was revised, together with the GEDSI.

equitable distribution of benefits (Impact).

The programme is based on the **theory of change** that strengthened **protection** of all migrant workers (**Intermediate Outcome 1**), harnessing their potential to contribute to **development** (**Intermediate Outcome 2**) and ensuring that the systems facilitating their **mobility** (**Intermediate Outcome 3**) are gender transformative and efficient will create a virtuous circle that maximizes the contribution of labour migration to stable and inclusive growth and development in the ASEAN region.

In the TRIANGLE theory of change hierarchy, a number of activities have been identified as critical in order to realize the outcomes and to ultimately contribute to the realization of the overall programme goal. The three intermediate outcomes are as follows:

Intermediate Outcome 1 (Protection): All migrant workers are better protected by labour migration governance frameworks.

Migrant workers will have better protection through evidence-based, gender-inclusive and rights- based labour migration policies, legislation and mechanisms that increase their access to social protection benefits, increase regional and national capacity of stakeholders to implement inclusive policy and provide assistance, and sustainable, effective, gender-inclusive and responsive service delivery by migrant worker resource centres.

Intermediate Outcome 2 (Development): Policies and programmes enable all migrant workers to contribute to and benefit from economic and social development.

The potential of all migrant workers to contribute to and benefit from economic and social development will be enabled through evidence-based, gender-responsive policies on return and reintegration and migration and development, monitoring and reducing the costs and fees associated with recruitment and remittance services, and establishing services that enable migrant workers to better manage their resources, successfully reintegrate and obtain peer support.

Intermediate Outcome 3 (Mobility): Labour mobility systems are gender-transformative and increase the efficiency of labour markets.

The efficiency of labour markets in ASEAN will be increased through establishing gender- transformative labour mobility systems that recognize the skills of women and men migrant workers, matching of the supply and demand for migrant labour via improved statistical data, and adopting more efficient, inclusive and gender-responsive labour mobility policies.

Further, recognizing that gender, disability and other inequalities and discrimination are perpetuating policies and practices that are both unjust and limit the extent to which migration benefits individuals and positively impacts development, all aspects of TRIANGLE's work are guided by a Gender **Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion Strategy (GEDSI)**. GEDSI is a crucial values statement and implementation guide for TRIANGLE that draws from the strong feminist principles that underlie the development goals of the Government of Canada, the priority placed on gender equality and disability inclusion by the Government of Australia and the rights-based approach of the International Labour Organization (ILO). The strategy is centred around a "twin track" that mainstreams gender and disability considerations across all programme interventions (Track 1) and requires that specific activities (equalling at a minimum 20 per cent of the activity budget) are aimed at increasing inclusivity and redressing gender related imbalance where marginalized migrant workers do not receive the same access or services as others

Track 2)¹⁵.

3. Previous evaluations and key recommendations

An evaluability assessment was completed in 2017 to grade the quality of the M&E strategy and make recommendations for further enhancement. It concluded that the inception documentation demonstrated a high level of evaluability for TRIANGLE. Two independent evaluations have been conducted to date. The first, a [mid-term evaluation](#), was conducted from September 2018 to March 2019¹⁶. The second, the [Forward-looking evaluation](#) (FLE), was conducted from September 2019 to February 2020.

The **mid-term evaluation concluded** that the project had made many important and good quality achievements and thus very good progress, that it provided value for money at the general project level, and that it certainly remained a highly relevant project for the countries involved as well as for the donors. Concerning the gender dimension, it underlined that the project had made very substantial achievements and, in particular, that most of the gender targets were reached or even surpassed. It **recommended** to prioritize the ambitious research agenda, and to streamline the Theory of Change and the M&E plan, which were considered too ambitious. It also recommended to involve more actively the employers' and workers' organizations at national level.

The **Forward-looking evaluation concluded** that most recommendations made by the mid-term evaluation in May 2019 had been followed up by TRIANGLE and that the programme had progressed well over the course of 2019. The evaluation identified the following key factors behind TRIANGLE's successful development results as being characteristic of the TRIANGLE brand: The bringing together of stakeholders; Linking up regional and national level implementation; Outreach to grassroots level and migrant workers; Ability to provide evidence-based policy advice; Gender-responsive; Rights- based and normative; Engagement with the private sector; Sectoral elements; Model of donor cooperation. It **recommended** to continue the streamlining of the Theory of Change and the M&E plan. Further, the cross-cutting Private Sector Engagement Strategy and the Communications-, Visibility, and Advocacy Strategy should be phased out¹⁷.

4. Purpose, Objectives, Scope, and Clients of the Evaluation

4.1 Purpose and objectives

In accordance with the [ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation](#) (4th edition), the [Guidance Note 2.1: Independent midterm & final evaluations](#), in line with [DFAT standards- Design and monitoring, evaluation and learning standards](#), and the Grant Agreements signed with DFAT and GAC, a final evaluation needs to be undertaken before the end of the respective projects. In line with ILO policy for evaluations, this evaluation will be managed as an independent evaluation.

The final evaluation will support accountability, learning and knowledge sharing for the ILO and key stakeholders of the TRIANGLE programme. The specific objectives of the evaluation are the following:

¹⁵ TRIANGLE's strategy was amended for disability inclusion in April 2022 and September 2023.

¹⁶ Management response on the Independent Mid-Term Evaluation of TRIANGLE In ASEAN from DFAT.

¹⁷ The first edition of the inception report (approved in 2018) consisted of three cross cutting strategies; (1) the Women's empowerment and gender equality strategy; (2) the Private Sector Engagement Strategy and (3) the Communications-, Visibility, and Advocacy Strategy. The latter two were phased out as dedicated strategies following the 2019 evaluation but recognising that both private sector engagement and communication and advocacy remains important parts of TRIANGLE interventions, strategic activities under both strategies were retained in national and regional workplans.

following the 2019 evaluation but recognising that both private sector engagement and communication and advocacy remains important parts of TRIANGLE interventions, strategic activities under both strategies were retained in national and regional workplans.

1. To determine the progress in achieving the end of programme outcomes and to what extent gender equality and empowerment of women were mainstreamed throughout the programme
2. To assess the implications of the merger of the two separate DFAT and GAC funded projects into the joint TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme.
3. To identify challenges which should be addressed or avoided during the remainder of the TRIANGLE programme, or in future investments in migrant labour programmes.
4. To document lessons learned, and good practices that should be prioritized going forward, as well as to provide recommendations for areas that can be strengthened and to inform the DFAT and GAC decision in considering future migrant labour investments.

The ILO Policy guidelines for results-based evaluation, 2020¹⁸ provide the framework for carrying out the evaluation. These guidelines adhere to the norms and standards of evaluation adopted by the United Nations Evaluation Group and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

4.2 Scope

The evaluation will cover all activities under the jointly (DFAT and GAC) funded TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme, from the start in November 2015 to present. Geographically, the evaluation will cover all interventions including those at the regional level within ASEAN as well as country-specific work in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam. Targeted or case study country visits will be conducted in Cambodia, Thailand and Indonesia (ASEAN Secretariat).

4.3 Timing

The evaluation will be carried out from January to June 2024. The detailed timeframe is included in Section 7.

4.4 Clients

The primary clients of the evaluation's findings include the development partners DFAT and GAC, and the ILO (including in particular TRIANGLE management, and ILO technical (MIGRANT) and administrative (Regional and Country Offices) units).

Secondary clients of the findings include all TRIANGLE stakeholders and partners at regional and national levels. At **regional** level, key clients include the ASEAN Secretariat and the ASEAN Committee on the ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers (ACMW); the ASEAN Trade Union Council (ATUC), the ASEAN Confederation of Employers (ACE), and the Task Force on ASEAN Migrant Workers (TFAMW). At the **national** level, key clients include the Ministries of Labour and other line ministries with a mandate related to labour migration, workers' and employers' organizations, civil society organizations, academia and other parties that have who have partnered with the programme. Other actors working on labour migration on regional and national levels, including UN agencies and international NGOs are also considered secondary clients of the evaluation.

5. Evaluation Criteria and Questions (including cross-cutting issues/ issues of special interest to the ILO)

The ILO [Policy guidelines for results-based evaluation](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_571339.pdf), DFAT *Monitoring and Evaluation Standards* and GAC *Results-Based Management for International Assistance Programming: A How-to Guide* will provide the framework for carrying out the evaluation. These guidelines adhere to the evaluation norms and

¹⁸ https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_571339.pdf

standards of the United Nations system, the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards and [DFAT's Aid Investment Criteria](#) and [GACs Gender equality and empowerment measurement tool](#).

As set forth in the TRIANGLE Inception Report, Annex 3: Monitoring and Evaluation plan, the evaluation criteria are presented in the table below. The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions. Any fundamental changes should be agreed between the evaluation manager and the evaluator and reflected in the inception report.

5. Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Explanation
Relevance and strategic fit of the intervention	<p>To what extent are the objectives of TRIANGLE consistent with beneficiary requirements, country needs, regional and global priorities, and development partners' strategies and priorities?</p> <p>In what areas of work, leveraging on ILO's comparative advantages, does TRIANGLE have comparative advantage over other interventions by the ILO or other UN agencies? How is it complimentary to other interventions?</p> <p>Did the programme successfully respond to, and adjust its activities following the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic?</p>
Validity of intervention design/ Coherence	<p>To what extent is the design of TRIANGLE logical and coherent? Has the scope of the interventions been realistic given the time and resources available?</p> <p>To what extent has the merger of the two separate DFAT and GAC funded projects into the joint TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme been able to leverage the resources under the two separate grant arrangements? What are the lessons learned from this kind of implementation approach?</p> <p>What areas of work are core in ensuring high quality development results in a potential next phase of the programme? Which design elements could be replicated/up scaled, and which could be discontinued?</p>
Intervention progress and effectiveness	<p>How did TRIANGLE's partnerships with regional institutions (ACMW, ACE, ATUC, TFAMW and other CSOs) contribute to strengthening regional cooperation in addressing and increasing awareness on labour migration issues in the region?</p> <p>To what extent has the programme influenced governments' policies and practices, and the protection and promotion of the rights of migrant workers?</p> <p>What key challenges have detracted from the effectiveness of the programme activities?</p>
Efficiency of resource use	<p>Did TRIANGLE deliver Value for Money (following the Value for Money principles: cost consciousness, encouraging competition; evidence-based decision making; proportionality; performance and risk management; results focus; experimentation and innovation; accountability and transparency)?¹⁹</p> <p>Has the allocation of resources been optimal for achieving the programme's outcomes (financial, human, institutional and technical, etc.)?</p>

¹⁹ See [this website](#) DFAT's value for money principles

Criteria	Explanation
Effectiveness of management arrangements	<p>To what extent do the management arrangements put into place for TRIANGLE support the achievement of results?</p> <p>How do the national and regional staff and management arrangements support fluidity between the top-down and bottom-up initiatives between national and regional (ASEAN) levels vis-à-vis law and policy frameworks, programmers, structures, priorities etc.</p> <p>Are the staffing structures and resourcing of activities (noting national/regional and policy/service delivery at minimum) contributing to quality performance and impact?</p> <p>What adjustments are suggested for a potential next phase of the programme?</p>
Impact orientation and sustainability of the intervention	<p>Has TRIANGLE made a significant contribution to longer-term, sustainable development changes?</p> <p>What is the likelihood that the results of TRIANGLE are durable and can be maintained beyond the current end date of the programme?</p> <p>What actions are required to ensure the sustainability of the programme-supported initiatives?</p> <p>What would be the key priorities and strategic directions for future programming beyond the lifetime of the current phase of TRIANGLE in ASEAN?</p>
Gender equality and disability inclusion²⁰	<p>To what extent did the initial and ongoing (iterative) project design consider specific gender equality and non-discrimination concerns relevant to the project context?</p> <p>To what extent has TRIANGLE been able to realize its GEDSI outcomes?</p> <p>How has the programme been able to make a difference for women migrant workers, in terms of gender equality and empowerment? How has the programme made a difference for persons with disabilities?</p> <p>How effective has TRIANGLE's gender budgeting been at achieving the programmes gender equality goals?</p>

6. Methodology

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

- **Desk review** of project design and strategy documents, activity documents, communications and research and publications
- Review of the TRIANGLE **Theory of Change**, with particular attention to the identification of

²⁰ TRIANGLE's Strategy was amended for disability inclusion in April 2022 and revised in September 2023. UNEG's 2022 Guidance on Integrating Disability Inclusion in Evaluations and Reporting on the UNDIS Entity Accountability Framework Evaluation Indicator will be incorporated into evaluations, along with already planned and mainstreamed inclusion of gender in ILO evaluations.

assumptions, risk and mitigation strategies, and the logical connect between levels of results and their alignment with ILO's strategic objectives and outcomes at the global and national levels, as well as with the relevant SDGs and related targets.

- **Key informant interviews** with DFAT and GAC staff (ASEAN Missions and posts in Jakarta, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand, Vietnam), TRIANGLE staff and relevant ILO specialists. Regional stakeholders and partners including the ASEAN Secretariat, ACMW focal points of all ASEAN member states, regional workers' and employers' organizations and CSO bodies. National level partners and stakeholders in all six targeted countries, including Ministries of Labour and other line ministries, workers' and employers' organizations, civil society organizations, migrant women's groups, academic and other stakeholders and partners. Interviews will be done both in person and virtually depending on accessibility and scheduling (to be further defined as part of the inception report).
- **Focus group discussions** with beneficiaries (women and men potential migrants, migrant workers, return migrant workers and members of their families, including migrants with disabilities). Efforts will be made to ensure that focus group discussions can be made largely in person, but when not possible, they can also be made virtually.
- **Observation of programme activities** at regional, national, and provincial level (such as capacity building activities and activities carried out by Migrant Worker Resource Centres; to be determined based upon scheduling of activities)

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

Sampling

As part of the development of the detailed evaluation methodology, the evaluator will propose the sampling methodology. One strategy could be to employ a purposive sampling approach engaging with key stakeholders. To ensure a diverse set of voices are heard, data collection must obtain a balanced perspective from women and men beneficiaries, including those with disabilities, from tripartite plus stakeholders, as well as irregular migrants. The final list of respondents to be interviewed will be determined during inception. Limitations of the chosen evaluation methods, including those related to representation of specific group of stakeholders, should be clearly articulated.

7. Main Deliverables

Output 1. Inception report (no more than 20 pages): (8 days)

Based upon the desk review and initial discussions with programme staff and stakeholders, the evaluator will develop an inception report for the evaluation. At a minimum, the inception report should include key evaluation questions, evaluation sample and data collection methods, data collection instruments, field mission schedule, analytical techniques to be applied and an outline of the evaluation report. The inception report should also respond to the requirements outlined in ILO Checklist 4.8: [Writing the inception report](#). The ILO will share the inception report with DFAT and GAC and other stakeholders for review and allow time for feedback. Within one week of receiving comments, the evaluator must submit a final inception report to be approved by ILO, DFAT and GAC.

Output 2. Field visits, data analysis and presentation of preliminary findings: (20 days)

Upon approval of the inception report, the evaluator will visit national programme stakeholders and implementing partners in two countries; **Cambodia** (as an example of programming in a country of origin) and **Thailand** (as an example of programming in a country of destination). In addition, online meetings will be arranged with programme stakeholders and partners at the regional and nation levels in other countries as required. A visit to **Jakarta** will also be arranged for the evaluator to meet with the ASEAN Secretariat, and the DFAT and GAC ASEAN missions.

In Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Viet Nam, national consultants will be hired to assist the evaluator by collecting background information, contribute to the desk review of relevant programme and non-programme documents, undertake FGDs and stakeholder interviews and/or assist the lead evaluator during such interviews etc (see section 9).

At the end of the mission, the evaluator will present preliminary findings to DFAT and GAC, and thereafter to other stakeholders at an online stakeholder workshop. The workshop will validate the preliminary findings of the evaluation after data collection and analysis is completed. The evaluator will develop a PowerPoint presentation and work with the evaluation manager to set the agenda for the workshop. The presentation should provide a brief review of key results for each evaluation criteria.

Output 3. First draft of evaluation report (no more than 40 pages, excluding annexes): (9 days)

The first draft of the evaluation report, including the lessons learned and good practices to be carried forward, will be submitted to the evaluation manager for review by programme staff, DFAT and GAC and other key stakeholders as relevant. The evaluation manager will consolidate comments and send these to the evaluator. The evaluation report should be practical and include specific recommendations designating the parties responsible. The draft evaluation report and the lessons learned and good practices should be prepared as per the ILO Checklist 4.2: [Preparing the Evaluation Report](#).

Output 4. Final evaluation report: (5 days)

The final output of the evaluation will be a report systematically assessing the results of the programme to date based upon the evaluation criteria, including the lessons learned and good

practices to be carried forward, and areas requiring further strengthening in future programming. Lessons learned will be generic and can be tailored to the needs to specific stakeholders if necessary. The report should be accessible to and inclusive of a diverse audience. It should be no longer than 40 pages (excluding appendices) and will include an evaluation summary as per the ILO Checklist 4.4: [Preparing the Evaluation Report Summary](#) following the ILO [template](#). The summary should have no more than five pages and be appropriate for publication on the ILO website (including recommendations and a summary of [lessons learned](#) and [good practices](#)). The evaluator will incorporate comments received from the ILO and other key stakeholders into the final report and comply with the requirements outlined in ILO Checklist 4.9: [Rating the quality of evaluation report](#). The evaluator will also provide a brief note explaining why any comments might not have been incorporated.

The report and other outputs of the evaluation must be produced in English. All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with Word for windows.

Any data files associated with the assignment will also be provided to the ILO at its conclusion. Ownership of the data from the evaluation rests jointly with the ILO and the evaluator. The copyright for the evaluation report is held exclusively by the ILO. However, key stakeholders may freely make use of the evaluation report, if appropriate acknowledgement of the source is made. The report will not be made available to the public without obtaining permission from the ILO.

8. Management Arrangements and Work Plan (including timeframe)

Evaluation Manager: A designated ILO staff, Mr. Phumphet Chetiyononth, M&E and Knowledge Management Officer of ILO Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia: Regional programme on labour migration in the fishing sector, who has no prior involvement with the TRIANGLE programme will manage this independent evaluation, with technical support and quality assurance provided by the Regional Evaluation Officer. ILO Evaluation Office will provide oversight and approval of the final evaluation report. The evaluation manager is responsible for completing the following specific tasks:

- Draft and finalize the evaluation TOR with inputs from key stakeholders;
- Develop the expression of interest and select the independent evaluator;
- Brief the evaluator on ILO evaluation policies and procedures;
- Coordinate with the programme team on the development of the field mission schedule;
- Circulate the inception report for comments by key stakeholders;
- Coordinate with the programme team on organizing the validation workshop
- Circulate the first draft of the evaluation report for comments by key stakeholders;
- Ensure the final version of the evaluation report meets ILO requirements and the information needs of key stakeholders.

Programme Staff: The TRIANGLE programme team will manage the administrative and contractual arrangements for the assignment and provide logistical support for the field missions. The staff of the TRIANGLE programme are responsible for the following specific tasks:

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

Evaluator: The external evaluator will be responsible for delivering the above-mentioned evaluation outputs using the methodology as mentioned in Section 5. The evaluator will submit all deliverables to the Evaluation Manager and will be required to ensure the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases. It is expected that the report shall be written in an evidence-based manner such that all observations, conclusions, recommendations are supported by evidence and analysis.

Key Stakeholders: Stakeholders will be engaged throughout the project evaluation process, including providing inputs to the terms of reference, participating in interviews during the field work, contributing to the validation of the preliminary findings and commenting on the draft evaluation report. This includes but is not limited to DFAT and GAC staff in Bangkok and Jakarta and at posts in TRIANGLE implementation countries, the ILO Evaluation Office, tripartite constituents and CSOs at national and regional levels and other programme partners. A detailed stakeholder list should be provided with the inception report. In addition, DFAT and GAC will be provided with an opportunity to review the evaluator's CV before final selection and participate in the field visits during the evaluation as appropriate.

Suggested timeline

Task	Start date	Completion date	Responsible
Preparation and sharing of the TOR	1 November 2023	5 December 2023	Evaluation Manager and Programme Manager
Approval of the TOR	5 December 2023	12 December 2023	Regional Evaluation Officer, GAC and DFAT
Issuance of EOI and selection of consultant	12 December 2023	19 January 2024	Evaluation Manager/Regional Evaluation Officer
Issuance of contract	22 January 2024	26 January 2024	TRIANGLE Team
Draft mission schedule and list of key stakeholders to be interviewed	29 January 2024	2 February 2024	Evaluation Manager and TRIANGLE Team
Brief evaluator on ILO evaluation policy and the programme	5 February 2024	9 February 2024	Evaluation Manager and TRIANGLE Team

Task	Start date	Completion date	Responsible
Document review and development of the inception report	12 February 2024	23 February 2024	Evaluator
Review and approval of the inception report	26 February	8 March 2024	Evaluation Manager/GAC and DFAT
Field mission Thailand	11 March 2024	22 March 2024	Evaluator, TRIANGLE Team in ROAP and National Project Coordinator
Field mission Jakarta (and Bangkok for additional meetings if required)	25 March 2024	29 March 2024	Evaluator and National Project Coordinator
Field mission Cambodia	1 April 2024	5 April 2024	Evaluator and National Project Coordinator
Debriefing meetings with DFAT and GAC and separate meetings with all stakeholders (online)	8 April 2024	10 April 2024	Evaluator
Draft of evaluation report	11 April 2024	26 April 2024	Evaluator
Sharing draft report with the key stakeholders for comments and suggestions. Consolidating stakeholder comments on the draft report	29 April 2024	10 May 2024	Evaluation Manager
Final draft of the evaluation report	13 May 2024	24 May 2024	Evaluator
Review and approval of the evaluation report	24 May 2024	31 May 2024	Evaluation Manager/ Evaluation Office/GAC and DFAT
Presentation of the evaluation results to stakeholders	31 May 2024	7 June 2024	Evaluator
Management response to the evaluation recommendations	7 June 2024	21 June 2024	TRIANGLE Team

9. Profile of the lead evaluator

Selection of the lead evaluator (consultant) will be based on the strength of their expressions of interest in the assignment and interviews with a shortlist of candidates. The selected evaluator will possess the following experience and qualifications:

- Post graduate degree with a minimum of 10 years of relevant professional experience, including completion of independent evaluations for development projects of a similar size, scope and complexity.
- Extensive knowledge of evaluation methodologies, including qualitative and participatory data collection techniques;
- Strong thematic expertise in labour migration governance and gender equality particularly with regional policies in perspective. Knowledge related to private sector engagement and skills development will be considered assets.
- Substantial prior work experience in one or more ASEAN countries.
- Knowledge of the ILO's organizational mandate, tripartite structure, normative frameworks

- and core values.
- Excellent verbal and written communication skills in English;
- Ability to listen to and value the opinion of a diverse range of respondents;
- Awareness of the critical importance of ethics in evaluation practice.

It is estimated that the scope of effort required by the evaluation will be 42 days (see section 6). The successful evaluation consultants will be remunerated on an output based total fee.

10. Profile and Level of Efforts of the National Consultants

The national consultants (nationals of Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Viet Nam) will support the team leader in conducting the evaluation process. The level of efforts for the national consultants are:

- Lao PDR consultant approximately 7 working days
- Myanmar consultant approximately 7 working days
- VietNam consultant approximately 5 working days

Responsibilities:

- collect background information and prepare summaries in English (as required).
- contribute to the desk review of relevant programme and non-programme documents.
- pro-actively provide relevant local knowledge and insights to the international lead consultant.
- undertake interviews with key partners and stakeholders, and focus group discussions and provide notes to the lead consultant as required; and or assist the lead consultant in setting up and undertake such interviews and FGDs (details to be elaborated in the inception report).
- contribute to the main report to be prepared by the team leader.
- provide interpretation during the evaluation data collection as required.

Profile:

- No previous involvement in the delivery or evaluation of TRIANGLE in ASEAN
- University Degree with a minimum of seven years of strong and substantial professional experience in project evaluations and/ or experience in the labour migration context
- Knowledgeable in programme evaluation methodologies
- Excellent analytical skills and interview skills
- Excellent command of oral and written English
- Understanding of Lao/ Myanmar/ Vietnamese (as relevant)
- Sound knowledge on gender equality, and disability inclusion and non-discrimination.
- Knowledge of ILO's roles and mandate and its tripartite structure as well as UN systems evaluation norms and its programming will be an advantage.

11. Legal and ethical matters

The evaluator should not have any links to project management, or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of the evaluation. The evaluator should adhere to the

highest level of technical and ethical standards. They should fulfil the criteria of professionalism, impartiality and credibility, and should abide by the UN Norms and Standards for evaluations, the UNEG ethical guidelines and the [ILO's Code of Conduct for Evaluators](#), which is in line with the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System (UNEG 2020).

Consultants should undergo an [orientation on the ILO guidelines and quality standards for evaluation](#). ILO's Evaluation Office has developed a self-induction programme to support evaluation consultants become more familiar with the unique aspects of the ILO and its evaluation policy and practice. Consultants need to include confirmed completion of the programme in any expression of interest for ILO evaluation assignments.

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

12. Relevant policies and guidelines

- [ILO Policy Guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 4th ed](#)
- [Template: Code of Conduct Agreement with ILO Evaluation Consultants](#)
- [Checklist 4.8: Writing the inception report](#)
- [Checklist 4.2: Preparing the evaluation report](#)
- [Checklist 4.9: Rating the quality of evaluation report](#)
- [Guidance note 4.5: Stakeholder engagement](#)
- [Guidance note 3.1: Integrating gender equality in the monitoring and evaluation of projects](#)
- [Guidance Note 3.2: Adapting evaluation methods to the ILO's normative and tripartite mandate](#)
- [Template: Emerging good practices \(to be annexed to evaluation report and filled in by the Evaluator\)](#)
- [Template: Lessons learned \(to be annexed to evaluation report and filled in by the Evaluator\)](#)
- [Template for evaluation title page](#)
- [Template for evaluation summary](#)
- [ILO Code of Conduct for Evaluators](#)
- [ILO Disability Inclusion Policy and Strategy 2020-23](#)
- [Guidance on Integrating Disability Inclusion in Evaluations and Reporting on the UNDIS Entity Accountability Framework Evaluation Indicator](#)
- [Orientation on ILO guidelines and quality standards for evaluation](#)
- [DFAT New International Development Policy](#)
- [DFAT Value for Money Principles](#)
- [DFAT Design and Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Standards](#)
- [DFAT Aid Investment Criteria](#)
- [GAC Gender equality and empowerment measurement tool](#)

Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix

Topic	Question	Secondary Lines of Enquiry (if applicable)	Indicators	Data Sources	Method	Analysis and assessment
Relevance and Strategic Fit	To what extent are the objectives of TRIANGLE consistent with beneficiary requirements, country needs, regional and global priorities, and development partners' strategies and priorities?	Has TRIANGLE been able to support needs of individual countries? Is it relevant to both sending and receiving countries?	Alignment with key ILS, international frameworks, donor policies, and member state policies	Project documents External documents Project partners (tripartite plus constituents and other stakeholders), MRC users	Desk review KIIs FGDs	Thematic analysis and triangulation of interview data showing relevance to various stakeholder needs. Qualitative Content Analysis of relevant national and donor policy documents.
Relevance and Strategic Fit	What has changed in the context (including ASEAN priorities) since TRIANGLE in ASEAN started in 2015 and how did TRIANGLE in ASEAN respond and adapt?	Did the programme successfully respond to, and adjust its activities following the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic?	Evidence of programme adaptation	Programme documents ILO staff Tripartite plus constituents	Desk review KIIs	Thematic analysis of interview data
Relevance and Strategic Fit	What areas of work are core in ensuring high quality development results in a potential next phase of the programme?	Which design elements could be replicated/up scaled, and which could be discontinued?	Examples of good practices contributing to high performance	Evidence from other questions	Data analysis	Thematic analysis of interview data
Coherence	In what areas of work, leveraging on ILO's comparative advantages, does TRIANGLE	How is it complimentary to other interventions?	Examples of collaboration with	Project documents ILO staff	Desk review KIIs	Thematic analysis and triangulation of interview data

Topic	Question	Secondary Lines of Enquiry (if applicable)	Indicators	Data Sources	Method	Analysis and assessment
	have comparative advantage over other interventions by the ILO or other UN agencies?		UN agencies and INGOs	UN staff DFAT and GAC staff		showing ILO's comparative advantage and coherence and synergies between UN agencies
Coherence	Has the project maximised synergies with other projects implemented by the ILO and other organisations?	Has the programme leveraged the expertise and resources within the ILO? Are there examples of joint programming?	Examples of collaboration with other projects	Project documents ILO staff UN staff DFAT and GAC staff	Desk review KIIs	Thematic analysis and triangulation of interview data showing synergies with other projects
Intervention Progress and Effectiveness	To what extent has the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme made progress towards delivered delivering against the stated outcomes of the programme?	For any lagging areas, is there a plan to address these in the remainder of the programme	Monitoring data shows actual vs planned achievements	Project documents ILO staff	Document reviews KIIs	Analysis of monitoring system data
Intervention Progress and Effectiveness	What have been the key achievements and what enabled them to happen?	Has the programme capitalised on learning concerning the achievements.	Examples of evidencing demonstrating why key achievement could happen	Project documents Government documents ILO staff Government Officials Other partner staff	Document review KIIs FGDs	Thematic analysis of interview data Review of programme monitoring data
Intervention Progress and Effectiveness	How did TRIANGLE's partnerships with regional institutions (ACMW, ACE, ATUC,	Has dialogue among regional institutions increased?	Examples of increased cooperation	Regional partners	KIIs	Thematic analysis of interview data

Topic	Question	Secondary Lines of Enquiry (if applicable)	Indicators	Data Sources	Method	Analysis and assessment
	TFAMW and other CSOs) contribute to strengthening regional cooperation in addressing and increasing awareness on labour migration issues in the region?		Statements demonstrating increased awareness of labour migration			
Intervention Progress and Effectiveness	To what extent has the programme influenced governments' policies and practices, and the protection and promotion of the rights of migrant workers?	What concrete changes can be identified? Have policy changes been operationalised?	Evidence in individual countries of changes being implemented?	Project documents Government documents ILO staff Government Officials Other partner staff	Document review KIs	Thematic analysis of interview data and qualitative content analysis of key policy documents
Intervention Progress and Effectiveness	What key challenges have detracted from the effectiveness of the programme activities?	How did the programme respond to these challenges?	Evidence of documenting of challenges and programme adjustments	Project documents ILO staff Other interview data	Document review KIs	Thematic analysis of interview data
Efficiency of Resource Use	Did TRIANGLE deliver Value for Money?	Did the project follow the following the Value for Money principles? cost consciousness, encouraging competition; evidence-based decision making; proportionality; performance and risk management; results focus; experimentation and	Updated risk register Feedback mechanisms for project decisions exist Innovative approaches are documented and	Project documents ILO staff Project partners	Desk review KIs	Analysis of programme's performance against the key principles

Topic	Question	Secondary Lines of Enquiry (if applicable)	Indicators	Data Sources	Method	Analysis and assessment
		innovation; accountability and transparency	monitored for replication Partners have clear feedback on the direction of the project Options for expenditure are considered.			
Efficiency of Resource Use	Has the allocation of resources been optimal for achieving the programme's outcomes (financial, human, institutional and technical, etc.)?	Were effective decisions taken when the project was redesigned linked the budget shortfall? Has the ILO leveraged existing resources	Evidence of leveraging existing resources and sharing costs with other projects	Project documents ILO staff	Desk review KIIs	Analysis of resource use of the project
Efficiency of Resource Use	To what extent has the merger of the two separate DFAT and GAC funded projects into the joint TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme been able to leverage the resources under the two separate grant arrangements?	What are the lessons learned from this kind of implementation approach?	Examples of synergies between national and regional activities	Project documents ILO staff	Desk review KIIs	Thematic analysis of interview data Qualitative Content Analysis of relevant programme documents
Effectiveness of Management Arrangements	To what extent do the management arrangements put into place for TRIANGLE support the achievement of results?	Are the staffing structures and resourcing of activities (noting national/regional and policy/service delivery at minimum) contributing to quality performance and impact?	Existence of work-plans, communication plans, minute meetings, M&E plans and evidence they are utilised	Programme documents ILO staff Project partners Regional partners	Document Review KIIs	Thematic analysis of interview data

Topic	Question	Secondary Lines of Enquiry (if applicable)	Indicators	Data Sources	Method	Analysis and assessment
Effectiveness of Management Arrangements	How do the national and regional staff and management arrangements support fluidity between the top-down and bottom-up initiatives between national and regional (ASEAN) levels vis-à-vis law and policy frameworks, programmers, structures, priorities etc.	Is the data collected at the country level (MRCs, govt etc) utilised for evidence-based advocacy at the regional level? Has the ILO effectively utilised commitments made by MS at the regional level to push policy change and implementation at the national level?	Examples of grassroots data influencing advocacy approaches Examples of regional decisions being utilised at the national level	ILO staff Regional partners Government officials	KIIs	Thematic analysis of interview data and qualitative content analysis of key policy initiatives and programme monitoring data
Effectiveness of Management Arrangements	What adjustments are suggested for a potential next phase of the programme?	Based on answers to previous questions	Based on answers to previous questions	Based on answers to previous questions	Based on answers to previous questions	Based on answers to previous questions
Impact Orientation and Sustainability	Has TRIANGLE made a significant contribution to longer-term, sustainable development changes? What is the likelihood that the results of TRIANGLE are durable and can be maintained beyond the current end date of the programme?	What actions are required to ensure the sustainability of the programme-supported initiatives? Were the programme's 5 sustainability factors appropriate and how has the programme performed in each area.	Examples of ownership among national and regional stakeholders? Evidence the programme has contributed to policy changes that support the long-term sustainability of the programme	Partner staff Regional partners Project partners	KIIs FGDs Stories of change	Thematic analysis of interview data and qualitative content analysis of key policy documents, comparing to the 5 sustainability factors. Triangulation of stakeholders' opinions on the programme in the stories of change compared to ILO's expectations.

Topic	Question	Secondary Lines of Enquiry (if applicable)	Indicators	Data Sources	Method	Analysis and assessment
Impact Orientation and Sustainability	What would be the key priorities and strategic directions for future programming beyond the lifetime of the current phase of TRIANGLE in ASEAN?	Based on data and answers to other questions	Based on data and answers to other questions	Based on data and answers to other questions	Based on data and answers to other questions	Based on data and answers to other questions
Gender Equality and Disability Inclusion	To what extent did the initial and ongoing (iterative) project design consider specific gender equality and non-discrimination concerns relevant to the project context? To what extent has TRIANGLE been able to realize its GEDSI outcomes?	Did the programme manage to effectively transition from the different diversity and inclusion plans?	Evidence the GEDSI plan is being implemented and achieved	ILO staff Project partners Women's migrant groups OPDs	Document review KIIs FGDs	Qualitative Content Analysis of GEDSI strategy Thematic analysis of interview data
Gender Equality and Disability Inclusion	How has the programme been able to make a difference for women migrant workers, in terms of gender equality and empowerment?	How effective have the women's migrant groups been? Are service providers inclusive to women and persons with diverse SOGIESC identities?.	Evidence of effectiveness and sustainability of women's migrant groups	Partner staff Women's migrant groups	KIIs FGDs Stories of change	Thematic analysis of interview data Triangulation of stakeholders' opinions on the programme in the stories of change compared to ILO's expectations.
Gender Equality and Disability Inclusion	How has the programme made a difference for persons with disabilities?	Are service providers inclusive to persons with disabilities Are persons with disabilities using the MRCs? Were OPDs consulted and actively engaged in the programme?	Evidence of understanding of disability inclusion among programme partners	Partner staff OPDs	KIIs FGDs Stories of change	Thematic analysis of interview data Triangulation of stakeholders' opinions on the programme in the stories of change

Topic	Question	Secondary Lines of Enquiry (if applicable)	Indicators	Data Sources	Method	Analysis and assessment
						compared to ILO's expectations.
Gender Equality and Disability Inclusion	How effective has TRIANGLE's gender budgeting been at achieving the programmes gender equality goals?	Are the guidelines for measuring the gender budget understood and utilised by the programme team? Are they ensuring adequate resources for gender equality?	Sufficient resources allocated in budget Evidence of use of gender budgeting guidelines	Programme Budget Management Data ILO Staff	Document review KIs	Assess budget against gender budgeting guidelines

Annex 3: Current Status of the Programme's Outcomes and Outputs

Intermediate Outcome 1 (Protection): All migrant workers are better protected by labour migration governance frameworks.

Indicator	Target (year 8 unless stated)	Actual (year 8)	Status
The amount of money awarded to migrant workers for redress of grievances.	US\$13,003,000 awarded	US\$11,912,160 awarded	Off-track
% gap in average earnings of women and men migrant workers by occupation (SDG Indicator 8.5.1)	(Year 12 target) Domestic Work: 49 Fisheries: 8 Agriculture:12 Manufacturing: 1 Construction: 16 Hospitality: 0 Total: 9	Not measured until Year 12	n/a
Extent to which policies and practices on labour migration governance are in-line with international principles and guidelines on protection of migrant workers.	Total: Full: 26% Partial: 66% Non: 6% Missing: 2%	Not measured until Year 12	n/a

Immediate Outcome 1.1 Evidence-based, gender equitable and rights-based policies and legislation for all migrant workers are adopted.

Indicator	Target (year 8 unless stated)	Actual (year 8)	Status
Number of policy and legislative instruments adopted or amended with TRIANGLE inputs on labour protection and gender equality for migrant workers.	41 policies	45 policies	Achieved
Extent to which national governments and ASEAN bodies implement AFML recommendations (to be measured 2024).	Year 12 target: Full: 26%, Partial: 66%, Non: 6%, Missing: 2%	Year 8 result: Full: 28%, Partial: 56%, Non: 12%, Missing: 4%	On-track

Immediate Outcome 1.2 Gender-inclusive and responsive mechanisms are established to increase all migrant workers' access to social protection.

Indicator	Target (year 8 unless stated)	Actual (year 8)	Status
Number of social protection agreements and related policy measures developed to increase coverage for migrant workers with support from the ILO.	2 agreements or related policy measures	0 agreements of policy measures	Off-track

Immediate Outcome 1.3 Regional and national capacity to implement inclusive labour migration policy and aid all migrant workers is increased.

Indicator	Target (year 8 unless stated)	Actual (year 8)	Status
Number of policy positions, practical tools, and joint statements issued and implemented by ACE and ATUC with support from the ILO.	14	16	Achieved
Number of government, employer, worker, and civil society representatives trained on labour migration issues.	50,000, (W:46%; M:54%)	47,656, (W:58%; M:42%)	Off-track

Immediate Outcome 1.4 Service delivery by migrant worker resource Centres is sustainable, effective, gender-inclusive, and responsive.

Indicator	Target (year 8 unless stated)	Actual (year 8)	Status
Percentage of migrant worker resource centres are co-funded by the implementing agency (governments, civil society and trade unions) and/ or other development partners.	85% of MRCs are co-funded	87% of MRCs are co-funded	Achieved
Number of potential migrants, migrant workers and members or their families provided with MRC support services	240,000 (M:55%; W:45%) migrant workers reached	225,480 (M:54%; W:46%) migrant workers reached and	Off-track

Intermediate Outcome 2 (Development): Policies and programmes enable all migrant workers to contribute to and benefit from economic and social development.

Indicator	Target (year 8 unless stated)	Actual (year 8)	Status
Remittance costs as a % of the amount remitted (SDG 10.c.1)	Year 12 target THA-KHM: 2.4 THA-LAO: 1.9 THA-MMR: 3.0 THA-VNM: 2.2 MYS-KHM: 3.0 MYS-MMR: 1.5 MYS-VNM: 3.0	Not measured until year 12 endline	n/a
Recruitment cost borne by migrant workers as a % of yearly income earned in countries of destination (SDG Indicator 10.7.1)	Year 12 target KHM-THA: 4 KHM-MYS: 8 LAO-THA: 4 MMR-THA: 4 MMR-MYS: 8 VNM-THA: 4 VNM-MYS: 8	Not measured until year 12 endline	n/a
Number of knowledge products published.	65 knowledge products	72 knowledge products	Achieved
Number of persons reached with online and traditional communication materials.	3,143,000	12,368,408	Achieved

Immediate Outcome: 2.1 Evidence based and gender-responsive policies on return and reintegration, and migration and development, are developed.

Indicator	Target (year 8 unless stated)	Actual (year 8)	Status
Number of policy and legislative instruments adopted or amended with TRIANGLE inputs on return and reintegration, and migration and development.	5 policies adopted or amended	6 policies adopted or amended	Achieved

Immediate Outcome: 2.2 The costs and fees associated with labour migration and remittance services are monitored and reduced.

Indicator	Target (year 8 unless stated)	Actual (year 8)	Status
-----------	-------------------------------	-----------------	--------

Number of private recruitment agencies who signed up to codes of conduct on fair recruitment.	Year 8 target: Total: 372	Year 8 result: Total 382	Achieved
Number of remittance products developed.	1 remittance product developed	1 remittance product developed	Achieved

Immediate Outcome: 2.3. Service systems that enable migrant workers to better manage their resources, successfully reintegrate and obtain support are established.

Indicator	Target (year 8 unless stated)	Actual (year 8)	Status
Number of migrant workers and their family members who are provided support services, including financial literacy.	14,000 migrant workers, W:50%; M:50%	21,951 migrant workers, W:53.6%; M:46.4%	Achieved

Intermediate Outcome 3 (Mobility): Labour mobility systems are gender-transformative and increase the efficiency of labour markets.

Indicator	Target (year 8 unless stated)	Actual (year 8)	Status
% of migrant workers who are matched with jobs for which they have relevant skills.	Year 12 target 22% of migrant workers had relevant skills for their jobs	Not measured until year 12 endline	N/A
Proportion of women migrant workers registered as employed in a regular legal status (by corridor) (M/W).	50%/50% at each corridor	Year 8 result: KHM-THA: 55%/45% LAO-THA: 43%/57% MMR-THA: 56%/44% VNM/THA: 49%/51% KHM-MYS: 76%/24% LAO-MYS: 97%/ 3% MMR-MYS: 78%/ 22% VNM-MYS: 38%/ 62%; Total: 44%	Off-track

Immediate Outcome: 3.1 Regional standards and systems for recognition of the skills of all migrant workers are developed and implemented.

Indicator	Target (year 8 unless stated)	Actual (year 8)	Status
-----------	-------------------------------	-----------------	--------

Number of skills standards or certification and recognition arrangements adopted for women and men migrant workers with ILO inputs.	2 Recognition of prior learning (RPL); 1 Mutual recognition of skills (MRS)	2 Recognition of prior learning (RPL); 1 Mutual recognition of skills (MRS)	Achieved
---	---	---	----------

Immediate Outcome: 3.2 Regional and national capacity to produce and analyze statistical data and match supply and demand for migrant labour is improved.

Indicator	Target (year 8 unless stated)	Actual (year 8)	Status
Percentage of a complete sex-disaggregated dataset (at least one table completed) produced by governments on labour migration statistics.	52% of sex-disaggregated datasets	58.1% of datasets were complete and sex-disaggregated datasets	Achieved

Immediate Outcome: 3.4 Regional, bilateral and national policies on labour mobility are more efficient, inclusive and gender-responsive

Indicator	Target (year 8 unless stated)	Actual (year 8)	Status
Number of policies restricting women or men's migration for employment.	Year 12 target: Reduction to 3 policies (one each in Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Malaysia)	Year 8 result: 5 policies restricting women or men's migration for employment still in place	On Track
Number of MOUs and bilateral agreements reached on mobility of low and semi-skilled workers with support from the ILO social partners.	Year 12 target: 5 bilateral agreements	Year 8 result: 4 bilateral agreements	On Track

Gender Inclusivity and Equality Strategy

Indicator	Target (year 8 unless stated)	Actual (year 8)	Status
% of the annual project activity budget that is spent on redressing gender balance	20%	32%	On Track

Annex 4: List of Interviews and Focus Group Discussions Conducted

KIIs

1. ILO

#	Date	Name	Position	M/W	Type
1	26/01	Anna Engblom	CTA, TRIANGLE	W	Online
2	06/02	Rebecca Napier-Moore	Technical Officer, TRIANGLE	W	Online
3	07/02	Andreas Schmidt	Technical Officer, M&E and Knowledge Manager	M	Online
4	08/02	Marja Paavilainen	Senior Programme Officer	W	Online
5	21/02	Chonticha Tangworamongkon	National Project Coordinator	W	Online
6	28/02	Maria Gallotti	Specialist on Labour Migration Policy	W	Online
7	28/02	Paul Tacon	Labour Migration Specialist (focal point for Asia)	M	Online
8	29/02	Clara van Panhuys	Social Protection Officer	W	Online
9	29/02	Vongtavanh Sayavong	National Project Officer	M	Online
10	29/02	Veth Vorn	National Project Coordinator	M	Online
11	30/02	Catherine Laws	Project Manager, MWEA	W	Online
12	30/02	Wai Hnin Po	National Project Officer	W	Online
13	05/03	Nguyen Thi Mai Thuy	National Project Officer	W	Online
14	07/03	Nilim Baruah	Senior Migration Specialist	M	In-person
15	07/03	Panudda Boonpala	Deputy Regional Director	W	In-person
16	07/03	Dong Eung Lee	Senior Specialist, Employers' Activities	M	In-person
17	07/03	Deepa Bharathi	CTA, Safe and Fair and PROTECT	W	In-person
18	07/03	Akiko Sakamoto	Specialist, Skills and Employability	W	In-person
19	08/03	Eric Carlson	Disability Specialist	M	In-person
20	08/03	Tite Habiakare	Regional Labour Statistician	M	In-person
21	08/03	Simon Brimblecombe	CTA	M	In-person
22	08/03	Piyamal Pichaiwongse	Deputy Liaison Officer for Myanmar	W	In-person
23	12/03	Tun Sophorn	National Coordinator	M	In-person
24	12/03	Sok Sambo	NPC, Ship to Shore	M	In-person
25	20/03	Yuki Otsuji	Specialist, Workers' Activities	W	In-person

#	Date	Name	Position	M/W	Type
26	20/03	Claire Hobden	Technical Specialist on Domestic and Other Vulnerable Workers	W	Online
27	21/03	Jittima Srisuknam	Programme Officer, Country Office for Cambodia, Lao PDR and Thailand	W	In-person
28	29/04	Ingrid Christensen	Country Director, Viet Nam	W	Online

2. Regional

No	Date	Name	Position	Organisation	M/W	Type
1	05/02	Max Pottler	Head of Labour Migration and Human Development	IOM	M	Online
2	08/03	Pattama Vongratanavichit	Senior Development Officer (Development)	GAC	W	In-person
3	08/03	Lucia Pietropaoli	Team Leader	ASEAN ACT	W	In-person
4	08/03	Paul Buckley	Policy Dialogue and Partnerships Director	ASEAN ACT	M	online
5	18/03	Emily Alexander	Counsellor (Development) and Head of Cooperation,	Mission of Canada to ASEAN, GAC	W	In-person
6	18/03	Karla Juranek	First Secretary (Development)	Australian Mission to ASEAN (Jakarta) (until Jan 2024), DFAT	W	Online
7	18/03	Mariam Diakite	First Secretary (Development – Human Security)	Australian Mission to ASEAN (Jakarta), DFAT	W	In-person
8	18/03	Katty Danni,	Senior Program Manager (Human Security) / TRIANGLE	Australian Mission to ASEAN (Jakarta), DFAT	W	In-person
9	18/03	Bia Puspita,	Unit Manager (Human Security) / ASEAN-ACT	Australian Mission to ASEAN (Jakarta), DFAT	W	In-person
10	18/03	Nurul Tarmizi,	Assistant Program Manager (Human Security)	Australian Mission to ASEAN (Jakarta), DFAT	W	In-person
11	19/03	Ben Thatcher	Chief of Global Programmes	Life Haven	M	Online
12	19/03	Karla Henson	Vice President	Life Haven	W	Online
13	19/03	Dr Benjamin Bernardino	Secretary General	Life Haven	M	Online
14	19/03	Jon Capal	Chief of Global Programmes	Saver Asia	M	Online

No	Date	Name	Position	Organisation	M/W	Type
15	19/03	Soe Min Than	Head of Secretariat	Task Force on ASEAN Migrant Workers	M	Online
16	19/03	Japar Malik	Representative of ACMW Chair / Employment Officer	Ministry of Manpower of the Republic of Indonesia	M	In-Person
17	26/03	Mega Irena	Assistant Director / Head of Labour and Civil Service Division	ASEAN Secretariat	W	Online
18	26/03	Carl Rookie Daquio	Senior Officer	ASEAN Secretariat	M	Online
19	26/03	Alvin Pahlevi	Officer	ASEAN Secretariat	M	Online
20	08/04	Vilayphong Sisomvang	Representative of ASEAN Chair 2024 / Vice chair of ACMW / Director General, Planning and International Cooperation Department	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, Lao PDR	M	Online
21	11/04	Dom Tuvera	Coordinator	ATUC	M	Online
22	12/04	Peter Adams	Director, ASEAN and Regional Architecture Branch	DFAT	M	Online
23	23/04	Sophie Wolfer	Assistant Director, People Smuggling and Human Trafficking Task Force	DFAT	W	Online
24	23/04	Celia Hevesi	a/g Director, People Smuggling and Human Trafficking Task Force	DFAT	W	Online

3. Cambodia

No	Date	Name	Position	Organisation	M/W	Type
1	10/03	Nop Savath	Director	Prey Veng Provincial Department of Labour and Vocational Training (PDOLVT)	M	In- person
2	10/03	Nop Vey	Deputy Director	Prey Veng Provincial Department of Labour and Vocational Training (PDOLVT)	M	In- person
3	10/03	Yi Longdi	Deputy Director	Prey Veng Provincial Department of Labour and Vocational Training (PDOLVT)	W	In- person
4	10/03	Nop Langdi		Prey Veng Provincial Department of Labour and Vocational Training (PDOLVT)	M	In- person
5	10/03	Tep Sophea	MRC Manager	Cambodian Labour Confederation (CLC)	M	In- person
6	10/03	Sin Veasna	MRC Assistant	Cambodian Labour Confederation (CLC)	W	In- person

No	Date	Name	Position	Organisation	M/W	Type
7	10/03	Chhorn Pallay	Community Facilitator	Gender and Development for Cambodia (GADC)	W	In- person
8	10/03	Oun Samon	Community Facilitator	Gender and Development for Cambodia (GADC)	W	In- person
9	11/03	Hem Sothea	MRC Leader	Phnom Srey Organization for Development	M	In- person
10	11/03	Teom Phary	MRC Officer	Phnom Srey Organization for Development	W	In- person
11	11/03	Cheng Heang	Director	Kampong Cham PDOLVT	M	In- person
12	11/03	Khiev Socheath	Head of Employment and Manpower	Kampong Cham PDOLVT	W	In- person
13	12/03	Kao Sokunpharady	National Project Officer, PROMIS Regional Project	IOM	W	In- person
14	12/03	Khun Sophea	National Programme Coordinator	UN Women	W	In- person
15	12/03	Chhay Chhunly	Programme Analyst, Safe and Fair Programme	UN Women	W	In- person
16	12/03	Phon Vutha	Programme Specialist-Youth	UNFPA	M	In- person
17	12/03	Mom Sokchar	Director	Legal Support for Children and Women	M	In- person
18	12/03	Chhay Tola	Legal Project Officer	Legal Support for Children and Women	W	In- person
19	12/03	Hor Chanvanthou	Project Officer	Legal Support for Children and Women	M	In- person
20	12/03	Ath Thorn	President	CLC	M	In- person
21	12/03	Chea Sopheak	Project Coordinator for MRC	CLC	M	In- person
22	13/03	Ouk Ravut	Deputy Director for Employment and Manpower	Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training	M	In- person
23	13/03	Vanna Raty	Chief of Office	Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training	M	In- person
24	13/03	Nara Monilak	Deputy Chief of Office	Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training	W	In- person
25	13/03	Mong Virak	Officer of Department of Employment and Manpower	Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training	M	In- person
26	13/03	Pok Sovanna	Department Advisor	Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training	M	In- person
27	13/03	Siv Kheang	Deputy Director of Planning and Cooperation	National Employment Agency (NEA)	M	In- person
28	13/03	Lo Sophearith	Deputy Head of NEA	National Employment Agency (NEA)	M	In- person

No	Date	Name	Position	Organisation	M/W	Type
29	13/03	Mom Bu	Director of Unit	National Employment Agency (NEA)	M	In- person
30	13/03	Norm Sina	Programme Manager	GADC	W	In- person
31	13/03	Uy Chanthon	Head of Programmes	GADC	M	In- person
32	13/03	Soung Hout	President	National Union Alliance Chamber of Cambodia	M	In- person
33	13/03	Neak Heng	Head of Planning Department	National Union Alliance Chamber of Cambodia	M	In- person
34	13/03	Sok Somoun	Admin and Finance	National Union Alliance Chamber of Cambodia	M	In- person
35	14/03	Pin Vireak	Executive Director	Association of Cambodian Private Recruitment Agencies	M	In- person
36	14/03	You Chidara	HR and Admin of Top Manpower	Association of Cambodian Private Recruitment Agencies	M	In- person
37	14/03	Heng Narong	Deputy Director	Kampot PDoLVT	M	Online
38	14/03	Da Ram	Official, Employment and Manpower	Kampot PDoLVT	M	Online
39	14/03	Oum Ty	Head of Inspection	Kampot PDoLVT	M	Online
40	14/03	Meas Dara	Director	Battambang PDoLVT	M	Online
41	14/03	Chan Chariya	Head of Employment and Manpower	Battambang PDoLVT	W	Online
42	14/03	Leouk Phalla	Head of Inspection	Battambang PDoLVT	M	Online
43	14/03	An Saray	Technical Official – Labour and Employment	Battambang PDoLVT	M	Online
44	14/03	Svay Chamrith	Deputy Director	Battambang Institute of Technology	M	Online
45	14/03	Mak Molika	Executive Director	Cambodian Disability Persons Organisation	W	In -person

4. Lao PDR

No	Date	Name	Position	Organisation	M/W	Type
1	26/03	Bouaphet Sibounhueng	Deputy Director of Champasak Provincial Labour and Social Welfare	Champasak Provincial Labour and Social Welfare	M	In-person
2	26/03	Khamone Piengvoravong	Deputy Director of Division, Head of Champasak MRC	Champasak Provincial Labour and Social Welfare	W	In-person
3	27/03	Vanny Keoxayyavong	Deputy Director General, Department of Employment	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare	W	In-person
4	27/03	Soysavanh Outhaphone	Deputy Director of Employment Promotion Division	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare	W	In-person
5	27/03	Kongseng Piengpanya	Programme Coordinator	Village Focus International	W	In-person
6	28/03	Khamchanh Sivanthong	Deputy Director General, Department of Labour Protection	Lao Federation Trade Union	M	In-person
7	26/04	Bounthieng Lattanavong	President	Lao Employment Business Association	M	In-person

5. Malaysia

No	Date	Name	Position	Organisation	M/W	Type
1	08/04	Sumitha Kishna	Director	Our Journey	W	Online
2	16/04	Faiz Mazlan	MRC Officer	MTUC	M	Online

6. Thailand

No	Date	Name	Position	Organisation	M/W	Type
1	20/03	Hataichanok Chinupawat	Director of Statistical Forecasting Division	National Office of Statistics	W	In-person
2	20/03	Bindsara Sung-Aroon	Director of Social Information Analysis and Development Group	National Office of Statistics	W	In-person
3	20/03	Panu Chuohuang	Statistician	National Office of Statistics	M	In-person

No	Date	Name	Position	Organisation	M/W	Type
4	20/03	Piniida Sanpakarn	Statistician	National Office of Statistics	W	In-person
5	21/03	Siriwan Romchatthong	Secretary General & Focal Point for Migration	ECOT	W	Online
6	21/03	Ukrish Kanjanaketu	Advisor	ECOT	M	Online
7	21/03	Poonsap Suanmuang Tulaphan	Director	HomeNet Thailand	W	In-person
8	21/03	Kotchaporn Klakthongkham	MRC Coordinator	HomeNet Thailand	W	In-person
9	21/03	Puttinee Kophatta	Coordinator	HomeNet Thailand	W	In-person
10	21/03	Wanida Kotchasarn	Coordinator	HomeNet Thailand	W	In-person
11	21/03	Manop Kaewphaka	MRC Coordinator	HomeNet Thailand	M	In-person
12	22/03	Polwish Subsrinunjai	Programme Director	HRDF	M	In-person
13	22/03	Puttinee Kophatta	Project Coordinator	HRDF	W	In-person
14	22/03	Sunida Piyakulpanich	Lawyer	HRDF	W	In-person
15	25/03	Mr Brahm Press	Executive Director	MAP Foundation	M	In-person
16	25/03	Suchart Trakoonhooitip	Program Coordinator	MAP Foundation	W	In-person
17	25/03	Nang Shwe Muu	Officer for Human Rights	MAP Foundation	M	In-person
18	25/03	Jackie Pollock	ILO Consultant and Former MAP Foundation ED	Independent Consultant	W	In-person
19	25/03	Name withheld for confidentiality	Individual grievance case	MAP, Chiang Mai	M	In-person
20	26/03	Manop Kuerat	President	State Enterprises Workers' Relations Confederation	M	Online
21	27/03	Mr Adisorn Kerdmongkol	Lead	Migrant Working Group	M	Online
22	27/03	Koreeyor Manuchae	Coordinator	Migrant Working Group	W	Online
23	22/04	Thanadej Panyawiwattanakorn	Labour Specialist, Professional Level, Foreign Workers Administration Office	Ministry of Labour	M	Online

No	Date	Name	Position	Organisation	M/W	Type
24	22/04	Vorralak Dheeranantakul,	Labour Specialist, Practitioner Level, Foreign Workers Administration Office	Ministry of Labour	W	Online
25	22/04	Wasuthorn Phuriekswan	Labour Specialist, Practitioner Level, Labour Market Information Administration Division	Ministry of Labour	M	Online
26	22/04	Krit Pinsuk	Labour Specialist, Professional Level, Central Employment Registration and Job Seekers Protection Division	Ministry of Labour	M	Online
27	24/04	Kasemsan Kruacharoen	Director of Informal Labour Protection Division	Ministry of Labour	M	Online
28	24/04	Puangthong Chokebooncharoen	Director for the Sub-Division for Prevention and Tackling Protection Issues of Informal Workers	Ministry of Labour	W	Online
29	24/04	Jaranya Kaewklom	Labour Specialist, Professional Level	Ministry of Labour	W	Online

7. Vietnam

No	Date	Name	Position	Organisation	M/W	Type
1	22/03	Nguyễn Trí Lạc	Director	DOLISA Hà Tĩnh	M	In-person
2	22/03	Nguyễn thị Thanh Hương	Director	Employment Service Center	W	In-person
3	22/03	Phạm Thị Thanh Huyền	MRC Counselor	Employment Service Center	W	In-person
4	22/03	Phùng Thị Thanh	MRC Counselor	Employment Service Center	W	In-person
5	23/03	Nguyễn Xuân Thái	Head of Employment Unit	DOLISA Hà Tĩnh	M	In-person
6	26/03	Hà Thị Minh Đức	Deputy Director General	General International Cooperation Department (ICD – MOLISA)	W	In-person
7	26/03	Phan Nhật Minh	Official	General International Cooperation Department (ICD – MOLISA)	M	In-person
8	27/03	Phạm Viết Hương	Deputy Director General	Department of Oversea Labor (DOLAB)	M	In-person
9	27/03	Nguyễn Thanh Tùng	Head of Unit	Department of Oversea Labor (DOLAB)	M	In-person

No	Date	Name	Position	Organisation	M/W	Type
10	28/03	Doãn Mậu Diệp	President	Viet Nam Association of Manpower Supply (VAMAS)	M	In-person
12	30/03	Trần Minh Tuấn	Director	DOLISA Phú Thọ	M	In-person
13	30/03	Nguyễn Hiền Ngọc	Head of Employment Unit	DOLISA Phú Thọ	W	In-person
14	30/03	Nguyễn Thế Hùng	Director	Employment Service Center	M	In-person
15	30/03	Lê Quang Hiệp	MRC Counselor	Employment Service Center	M	In-person
16	30/03	Nguyễn Thị Thanh Phương	MRC Counselor	Employment Service Center	W	In-person
17	16/04	Vũ Tuấn Anh	Department of Policy and Law	Vietnam General Confederation of Labor (VGCL)	M	In-person
18	16/04	Hoàng Thu Hằng	ICD officer	Vietnam General Confederation of Labor (VGCL)	W	In-person

8. Myanmar (Names withheld for security reasons)

No	Date	Description	Location	Type	W	M
1	19/03	MRC – CTUM (Confederation of Trade Union Myanmar)	Yangon, Bago, Kayin and Mon state	KII (online)	1	2
2	19/03	MRC – CTUM, community volunteer also migrant worker family member	Bago	KII (online)		1
3	24/03	CTUM – MRC –Migrant worker	Bago	KII (online)		1
4	21/03	CSO and LO network, IREX, FLC, MWRN	Yangon, Bago and Thailand	KII (online)	1	2
5	23/03	MRC - Three Good Spoon	Yangon	KII (In person)	3	
6	25/03	MRC - National local consultant (Mandalay and Sothern Shan State)	Mandalay region Sothern Shan state	KII (online)	2	
7	25/03	Mandalay – Volunteers	Mandalay	KII (online)	2	
8	26/03	Kayah – Ex- MRC consultant	Kayah	KII (online)	1	
9	28/03	MRC - NSSBC – Northern Shan State Baptist Convention	Northern Shan State	KII (online)	3	
10	28/03	NSSBC – Beneficiary	Loikaw	KII (online)	2	
11	29/03	MRC – TKPSI (Tanintharyi Karen Peace Support Initiative) under Carelink	Tanintharyi region	KII (online)	2	1
12	30/03	MRC – Mawk Kon Local development organization	Eastern Shan State	KII (In Person)		6

No	Date	Description	Location	Type	W	M
13	31/03	MRC User (Person with disabilities)	Eastern Shan State	KII (In Person)	1	1
14	1/04	MRC – care support user (GBV)	Eastern Shan State	KII (In Person)	1	
15	5/04	Member of safe migration CSO network – (TFP- The Fifth Pillar)	Yangon and Eastern Shan State	KII (online)		1

Focus Group Discussions

Cambodia (W: 26, M: 3)

No	Date	Description	Location	W	M
1	11/03	Migrant Workers	Prey Veng	10	3
2	11/03	Women's Migrant Forum	Prey Veng	10	0
3	12/03	Migrant Workers	Kampong Chang	6	0

Thailand (W: 17, M: 3)

No	Date	Description	Location	W	M
1	23/03	Women Migrant Workers	HRDF Mae Sot	3	0
2	23/03	Men Migrant Workers	HRDF Mae Sot	0	2
3	23/03	Women Migrant Workers	Migrants' Home, Mae Sot	2	0
4	24/03	Women Domestic Worker Leaders	Bangkok	3	0
5	25/03	Women Migrant Workers	MAP, Chiang Mai	6	0

Lao PDR (W: 7, M: 7)

No	Date	Description	Location	W	M
1	26/03	Men Migrant Workers	Champasack district, Champasack province	0	2
2	26/03	Women Migrant Workers	Champasack district, Champasack province	2	0
3	26/03	Men Migrant Workers	Pakse district, Champasack province	0	1
4	26/03	Women Migrant Workers	Pakse district, Champasack province	1	0
5	29/03	Men Migrant Workers	Luangprabang province	0	4
6	29/03	Women Migrant Workers	Luangprabang province	4	0

Myanmar (W: 31, M: 10)

No	Date	Description	Location	W	M
1	20/03	MRC Users	CTUM, Yangon	3	0
2	23/03	Volunteer	Three Good Spoons, Yangon	3	0
3	25/03	Mandalay –Migrant Worker’s Family Members	Mandalay (Myinchan)	3	0
4	25/03	Southern Shan State – Volunteers and Migrant Workers	Pinlaung and Taunggyi	3	0
5	29/03	TKPSI – Migrant Workers	Tanintharyi Region	9	5
6	30/03	Safe migration volunteers	Eastern Shan State (in person)	1	2
7	31/03	Village Women group	Eastern Shan State (in person)	3	0
8	01/04	MRC – emergency support recipients (IDP)	Eastern Shan State (in person)	3	3
9	02/04	MRC – volunteer as well as Migrant worker family members	Eastern Shan state (in person)	3	0

Viet Nam (W: 11, M: 7)

No	Date	Description	Location	W	M
1	22/03	Women Return & Reintegration Migrant Workers	Hà Tĩnh province	4	0
2	22/03	Women Return & Reintegration Migrant Workers	Hà Tĩnh province	2	0
3	22/03	Men Return & Reintegration Migrant Workers	Hà Tĩnh province	0	3
4	30/03	Women Return & Reintegration Migrant Workers	Phú Thọ province	5	0
5	30/03	Men Return & Reintegration Migrant Workers	Phú Thọ province	0	4

Annex 5: List of documents

Programme Documents

- Programme Inception Report- revised 2022. This includes annexes of the M&E plan, the theory of change, the risk management strategy, the GEDSI, the sustainability and impact strategy, and the product list.
- Annual Reports, 2019-2023
- Quarterly Briefings, 2016-2023
- MRC Map
- Programme Brief
- Key Results 2011-2022
- 2019 Mid-Term Evaluation, including management response
- 2020 Forward Looking Evaluation, including management response

ILO Documents (Programme Knowledge Products and Other ILO Documents)

- TRIANGLE in ASEAN, (2023). Skilled to care, forced to work? Recognizing the skills profiles of migrant domestic workers in ASEAN amid forced labour and exploitation.
- TRIANGLE in ASEAN, (2023). The ASEAN Forum on Migrant Labour A review of the implementation of Recommendations (3rd to 14th Forums).
- Experiences of ASEAN migrant workers during COVID-19: Rights at work, migration and quarantine during the pandemic, and re-migration plans. June 2020
- Governing Body, GB.331/INS/4/1(Rev.), (2017). Matters arising out of the work of the 106th Session (2017) of the International Labour Conference. Follow-up to the resolution concerning fair and effective labour migration governance.
- TRIANGLE in ASEAN, (2023). Disability rights and domestic work in ASEAN
- ILO, (2023). High Level Evaluation on the ILO's Strategy and Action on the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.
- ILO, (2021). ILO Disability Inclusion Policy and Strategy 2020-23.

Other Documents

- ASEAN, (2020). The 2018-2025 Plan of Action to Implement the ASEAN Consensus on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers.
- DFAT, (2023). Australia's International Development Policy. For a Peaceful, Stable and Prosperous Indo-Pacific
- ASEAN, (2007). The ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers.
- ASEAN, (2018). The ASEAN Consensus on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers.
- The Government of Canada. Canada's international assistance priorities, https://www.international.gc.ca/world-monde/issues_developpement-enjeux_developpement/priorities-priorites/index.aspx?lang=eng
- ASEAN, (2023). ASEAN Declaration on the Protection of Migrant Workers and Family Members in Crisis Situations and Its Guidelines.
- ASEAN, (2022). ASEAN Declaration on Portability of Social Security Benefits for Migrant Workers in ASEAN

Annex 6: Lessons Learnt and Good Practices

TRIANGLE in ASEAN: Safe and Fair Labour Migration Independent Evaluation

Project DC/SYMBOL: RAS/15/05/AUS & RAS/22/54/AUS (Australian Government
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)
RAS/16/01/CAN (Global Affairs Canada (GAC)
Name of Evaluator: Chris Morris

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

Topic	Description
Brief description of lessons learned (link to specific action or task)	While ensuring there is not wastage in implementation and that agreement is positive, if the budget is too tight it can harm quality and end up reducing efficiency as a result.
Context and any related preconditions	TRIANGLE in ASEAN has several implementing agreements with partners to run Migrant Worker Resource Centres and conduct other activities.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	ILO programme staff negotiating implementing agreements with partners.
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	<p>Several partners in the programme shared challenges they had faced as a result of the tight budgets given to them for conducting activities. These included not having enough budget for reasonable accommodation cost for persons with disabilities to attend an event or being unable to provide a dignitary who attends a small token of appreciation such as a bunch of flowers. The increase in the cost of basic items, also meant the per person budget for a workshop was even tighter.</p> <p>Several partners believed the limited budget did at times harm the quality of the service they provided.</p> <p>The effects are more clearly felt by smaller partners who smaller staff and lacked other projects to share costs with.</p>
Success / Positive Issues -Causal factors	The programme is run efficiently and ensuring good use of resources is important. The results the partners get on the tight budgets do demonstrate a strong ownership of the programme by the partners.
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Would need to be considered when negotiating implementation agreements.

TRIANGLE in ASEAN: Safe and Fair Labour Migration

Independent Evaluation

Project DC/SYMBOL: RAS/15/05/AUS & RAS/22/54/AUS (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)

RAS/16/01/CAN (Global Affairs Canada (GAC)

Name of Evaluator: Chris Morris

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

Topic	Description
Brief description of lessons learned (link to specific action or task)	Where budgetary restrictions in a regional programme limits national staffing, identifying programmes to share staffing positions with, at least mitigates some of the gaps caused by the shortfall.
Context and any related preconditions	Budgetary constraints led to the removal of full-time staffing in Malaysia and Viet Nam and the management of national activities by the regional team of TRIANGLE in ASEAN based in Bangkok.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	ILO programme/project developers, country offices.
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	The staffing reduction has led to a smaller volume of activities in Malaysia and Viet Nam than in other countries the programme implements in.
Success / Positive Issues -Causal factors	<p>In Viet Nam, TRIANGLE in ASEAN has been able to coordinate with the Ship to Shore regional programme and have activities supported by their NPC. TRIANGLE in ASEAN supported 3 months of salary to cover a budgetary shortfall. The Country Office in Viet Nam has utilised the NPC in a de facto programme officer role to act as a focal point for all migration related activities.</p> <p>While full funding for an NPC (and Admin and Finance Assistant) would be ideal for a programme on this size, where funding is limited, identifying ways to share NPCs with different projects helps address human resource gaps.</p>
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Aligning the programmes/projects and negotiating with development partners to agree to this modality is a potential challenge to implementing this approach.

TRIANGLE in ASEAN: Safe and Fair Labour Migration

Independent Evaluation

Project DC/SYMBOL: RAS/15/05/AUS & RAS/22/54/AUS (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT))

RAS/16/01/CAN (Global Affairs Canada (GAC))

Name of Evaluator: Chris Morris

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

Topic	Description
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	The development of women's migrant groups is an important support function for women's empowerment.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	The programme has supported implementing partners to set up women's groups for returning migrant workers. The groups act as a support group for other women in the community either considering migration or returning. Activities have also included financial literacy and income generating training.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	Members described several changes as a result of being part of the groups linked to both improved knowledge and increase confidence to access rights and advocate for change.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	Improvements in financial awareness and household finances, improvements in household relations, confidence to speak at meetings, and improved awareness of rights were all identified as key changes by group members.
Potential for replication and by whom	Migration programmes, particularly those with a grassroots component.
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	Links to P&B outcomes 5 and 7
Other documents or relevant comments	N/A

TRIANGLE in ASEAN: Safe and Fair Labour Migration

Independent Evaluation

Project DC/SYMBOL: RAS/15/05/AUS & RAS/22/54/AUS (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT))

RAS/16/01/CAN (Global Affairs Canada (GAC))

Name of Evaluator: Chris Morris

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

Topic	Description
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	Ensuring a regional programme has strong connections to grassroots implementation strengthens the credibility of the intervention as it supports the collection of evidence at the grass-root level that supports evidence-based programming and advocacy at the national and regional level.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	The programme is designed to bring evidence from grassroots levels to influence policy discussions at the national and regional level, and then to bring outcomes of those discussions back down to the grassroots level. This good practice can be replicated in programmes with a regional governance component to them.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	Stakeholders who have participated in regional level fora indicated that a key strength of the programme was the level of discussion was considerably improved by having evidence-based information and the voice of migrant workers heard in the discussions. The Migrant Worker Resource Centre approach and the inclusion of trade unions and CSOs in the programme (and regional fora) has strengthened the availability of this evidence considerably.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	The approach benefits both policy makers as well as grassroots stakeholders including migrant workers themselves and the organisations and activists that support them.
Potential for replication and by whom	Other programmes that support regional governance systems.
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	Links to P&B outcome 7.
Other documents or relevant comments	N/A

TRIANGLE in ASEAN: Safe and Fair Labour Migration

Independent Evaluation

Project DC/SYMBOL: RAS/15/05/AUS & RAS/22/54/AUS (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT))

RAS/16/01/CAN (Global Affairs Canada (GAC))

Name of Evaluator: Chris Morris

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

Topic	Description
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	A long programme with flexibility from its donors strengthens trust and helps build relationships, and ultimately improves the quality of the end product.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	TRIANGLE in ASEAN's second phase is 10 years long. This has supported certainty in the programming and strengthened the trust between the ILO and key partners, including the Committee on the Implementation of the ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers, regional and national tripartite partners, and CSOs, which has contributed to the successful results of the programme.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	Partners raised the length of programme and strength of relationships as being key contributor to programme success.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	The programme has achieved significant impacts, many of which take time to achieve (particularly policy change). The length of the programme allowing the ILO to continue to work on these lengthy processes has contributed to this.
Potential for replication and by whom	Programme staff and PARTNERSHIPS conducting advocacy with development partners about funding.
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	TRIANGLE in ASEAN has influenced the DWCPs of the implementation countries, ensuring that migration is a key part of DWCP priorities, outcomes, and CPOs.
Other documents or relevant comments	N/A

TRIANGLE in ASEAN: Safe and Fair Labour Migration

Independent Evaluation

Project DC/SYMBOL: RAS/15/05/AUS & RAS/22/54/AUS (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)

RAS/16/01/CAN (Global Affairs Canada (GAC)

Name of Evaluator: Chris Morris

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

Topic	Description
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	The exposure of CSO officers, government officials, and other tripartite partners to OPD representatives at an early stage in disability inclusion programming strengthens awareness of common challenges and solutions and helps ensure programmes follow the ‘nothing about us, without us’ principles.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	The ILO’s Disability team developed guidance on the inclusion of OPDs in programme design and implementation in 2022. The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme is one of the first programmes to utilise this and has recently held disability equality training designed to improve awareness of disability inclusion.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	Reports from the training were that migration focused CSO representatives identified similarities between challenges faced by migrant workers and persons with disabilities that supported consideration of how to work on disability inclusion, and that government officials, once exposed to testimony from persons with disabilities expressed willingness to work to find solutions to gaps in policy and support services.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	Too early to identify measurable impact
Potential for replication and by whom	Programme developers and implementers.
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO’s Strategic Programme Framework)	Links to P&B outcome 5 Supports the goals of the ILO’s Disability Inclusion Strategy.
Other documents or relevant comments	N/A

Annex 7: Country Summaries

Cambodia

Cambodia is a country of origin, with most migrants going to Thailand. About three quarters of migrants use irregular channels for migration²¹. The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme retains a full programme staff in Cambodia, with an NPC and Finance and Administrative Assistant. The programme currently supports 8 migrant resource centres (MRCs). A further MRC will be added in 2024 with a focus on disability inclusion. There has been substantial work with recruitment agencies on developing and implementing a code of conduct. The ILO also supports the tripartite constituents in preparing for and responding to ASEAN Forum on Migrant Labour meetings, implement the National Action Plan to implement the 2017 ASEAN Consensus, and conduct reviews of the National Action Plan to implement the GCM.

The programme's main partners in Cambodia from the Government are the Ministry of Vocational Training and Labour, the National Employment Agency, and the Provincial Departments of Vocational Training and Labour in Kampong Cham, Prey Veng, Battambang, and Kampot. Workers' Organisation partners are the Cambodian Labour Confederation and National Union Alliance Chamber of Cambodia. The plan Employers' Organisation partner is the Association of Cambodia Recruitment Agencies (that recently incorporated the Manpower Association of Cambodia in a merger of the two organisations). Civil society partners include Legal Support for Children and Women, Phnom Srey Organisation for Development, and the Cambodian Disabled People's Organisation. The programme also works with Battambang Institute of Technology.

Lao PDR

Lao PDR is a country of origin and has one of the lower GDPs in the region. The main destination country is Thailand, where the minimum wage is three times that of Lao PDR. More women migrate than men (57% to 43%). This has increased for the last year there is information on hand (2022). Prior to the Covid-19 pandemic the ratio of men to women migrants was more even, with slightly more women than men migrating²². In addition to currently supporting 3 MRCs, the programme has worked with the Government on supporting the draft and dissemination of operational agreements for employment service agencies (Ministerial Agreement 1050), the formation of the Lao Employment Service Agency Association and the draft and dissemination of Decree 245, as well as providing feedback on the pre-departure training curriculum manual.

Key partners in Lao PDR include the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, the Provincial Departments of Labour and Social Welfare in Champsack and Xayabury, the Lao Federation of Trade Unions and its provincial chapter in Luang Prabang, and the Lao Employment Service Agencies.. The programme also regularly engages with the Lao National Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and Village Focus International, although has not funded them during the programme.

²¹ Integral Human Development. Country Profile- Cambodia. Retrieved from <https://migrants-refugees.va/country-profile/cambodia/#:~:text=The%20vast%20majority%20of%20Cambodians,on%20brokers%20and%20recruitment%20agencies>.

²² IOM, (2023). Migration in the Lao People's Democratic Republic

Malaysia

Malaysia is a country of destination, with a significant number of migrants from Indonesia and Myanmar with the ASEAN region as well as from Bangladesh from outside the region. Malaysia was one of the countries where activities were scaled back following the reorganisation in 2019. The country does not have an NPC and activities are directed from ROAP. The ILO supports the preparation from the AFML on an annual basis. Additionally, the ILO has an implementation agreement with the Malaysian Trades Union Congress (MTUC) to implement two MRCs. Internal governance issues have hampered the ability of the MTUC to fulfil reporting requirements for the implementation agreement. However, MRCs have been some of the most successful in the region in supporting compensation claims for migrant workers.

Myanmar

Since the coup d'état in Myanmar in 2021, the ILO has followed the United Nations Principles of Engagement in Myanmar. This has meant ending interaction with the representatives of the military government. Further, collaboration with the private recruitment agency association (MOEAF) also ended following a request from the military junta to MOEAF. The programme still provides comprehensive support to trade unions, particularly the Confederation of Trade Unions Myanmar (CTUM), and civil society organisations who are operating in a severely reduced and often dangerous civil society space. There is significant migration from Myanmar to the neighbouring states of Malaysia and Thailand. The programme supports information dissemination and pre-departure orientation through its partners who use various modalities, including MRCs to distribute this.

The programme has an NPC and Admin and Finance Assistant in Myanmar. The partners the programme work with include Mawk Kon Local Development Organisation, the Northern Shan State Baptist Convention, the Confederation of Trade Unions Myanmar, Tanintharyi Karen Peace Support Initiative, and the Three Good Spoons Training Centre.

Thailand

Thailand is a country of destination for migrants in the region, particularly migrants from Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Myanmar. The Government of Thailand has signed MOUs of bilateral agreements with these three countries, as well as Viet Nam, to establish regular migration channels for migrants in certain industries from these countries. Many migrants are undocumented though. In July 2022, the government offered opportunities for migrants to regularise their status. The process continued in 2023 with additional deadlines and announcements. Many migrants found it difficult to obtain the necessary documentation for regularisation.

The programme supports three MRCs in Thailand, in Mae Sot, Chiang Mai, and Bangkok. The programme has also advocated for reduction of recruitment related costs and fees, the revision of the Ministerial Regulation on Domestic Workers and supported the Committee considering revisions to the Ministerial Regulation governing the working conditions for agricultural workers, and works with ECOT to advocate for reform of immigration laws governing seasonal agriculture workers. Its key partners are the Ministry of Labour, the Employers' Confederation of Thailand, the State Enterprise Workers' Relations Confederations, Human Rights and Development Foundation, HomeNet, MAP Foundation, and the Migrant Working Group.

Viet Nam

Viet Nam is a country of origin, with the largest number of migrants migrating northwards in East Asia to Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. Viet Nam was one of the countries where activities were scaled back following the reorganisation in 2019. The country does not have an NPC, however activities in Viet Nam have been supported by the NPC of Ship to Shore in the last 2-3 years. Viet Nam is one of the largest country offices for the ILO, with considerable experience in working on issues related to migration and the fundamental principles and rights at work (FPRW), as well as supporting review and revision of labour laws.

In Viet Nam, the programme, in coordination with other migration programmes, supported the revision of law 69, the Law on Contract-Based Overseas Workers and the five sub-laws which support the interpretation and operationalisation of the law within Viet Nam. Subsequent training on the law has been provided by the ILO to recruitment agencies and government officials. The project also supports five MRCs. The key partners in Viet Nam are the Ministry of Labour, Invalids, and Social Affairs, regional Departments of Labour, Invalids, and Social Affairs, the Viet Nam General Confederation of Labour, and the Viet Nam Association of Manpower Supply.

Regional

The regional component of the programme compliments the work at the national level by supporting a regional consensus on key migration governance issues. The ASEAN Secretariat is a key partner and the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has been approved as an ASEAN cooperation project. ASEAN has integrated labour migration into its institutional framework and its significance is reflected in its position in the three ASEAN blueprints, which guide the establishment of the ASEAN Community. In 2007, ASEAN leaders signed the ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers (Cebu Declaration). To ensure the effective implementation of the declaration, the ASEAN Committee on the Implementation of the ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers (ACMW) was established in 2007. One of the key annual activities of the ACMW is organising the ASEAN Forum on Migrant Labour (AFML).

The TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme provides annual support AFML, as well as supporting a number of the activities in the Action Plan (2018-2025) of the ASEAN Consensus. Additionally, the programme also supports the regional International Labour Migration Statistics (ILMS) workshop and the collection and dissemination of ILMS data. Support is also provided to regional employers and workers organisations, namely the ASEAN Trade Union Council (ATUC), the ASEAN Confederation of Employers (ACE), as well as regional CSOs, such as the Task Force on ASEAN Migrant Workers (TFAMW).

TRIANGLE in ASEAN support to the ACMW action plan 2016-2020

No.	Activity	Year	Country	Status
2	9th ASEAN Forum on Migrant Labour (AMFL): Better Quality of Life for ASEAN Migrant Workers through Strengthened Social Protection	2016	Lao PDR	Completed
2	10th AFML: Towards Achieving Decent Work for Domestic Workers in ASEAN	2017	The Philippines	Completed
2	11th AFML: Digitalisation to Promote Decent Work for Migrant Workers in ASEAN	2018	Singapore	Completed
2	12th AFML: Future of work and migration	2019	Thailand	Completed
2	13th AFML: Supporting Migrant Workers during the Pandemic	2020	Viet Nam	Completed

No.	Activity	Year	Country	Status
5	ASEAN Guidelines on Return and Reintegration	2019-2020	Indonesia	Completed
7	Study on portability of social protection	2018-2019	Thailand	Completed
11	Safe migration campaign video	2018	Indonesia	Completed
13	TIP investigation and prosecution	2017	The Philippines	Completed
15	TIP capacity of labour officials	2019	Lao PDR	Completed

TRIANGLE in ASEAN support to ACMW activities under the ASEAN Consensus Action Plan 2018-2025

No.	Activity	Year	Country	Status
6	Sharing good practices on employers' education	2024	Brunei Darussalam	Ongoing
9	Documentation of G-to-G and B-to-B skills recognition	2024	Philippines	Ongoing
20	14th ASEAN Forum on Migrant Labour (AFML): Recovery and labour migration in the post-pandemic future	2021	Brunei Darussalam	Completed
20	15th AFML: Resumption of Labour Migration and Regional Cooperation	2022	Cambodia	Completed
20	16th AFML: Enhancing the effectiveness of legal pathways for labour migration in ASEAN	2023	Indonesia	Completed
20	17th AFML: Care work and labour migration in ASEAN	2024	Lao PDR	Ongoing
20	18th AFML (theme tbc)	2025	Malaysia	Committed
**)	ASEAN Declaration on protection of migrants in crisis	2023	Indonesia	Completed
22b	ASEAN Guidelines on protection of migrants in crisis	2022-2023	Indonesia	Completed
26	ASEAN Guidelines on portability of social security benefits	2023-2024	Cambodia	Ongoing
**)	ASEAN Declaration on skills mobility, recognition and development for migrant workers	2024	Lao PDR	Ongoing
27	Recruitment fees	tbc	Philippines	Interested
28	Policies on employment of MW	tbc	Philippines	Interested
43	Capacity building for labour attachés	2024	Philippines	Ongoing
47	Reintegration employment support	2021-2023	Viet Nam	Interested
48	Regional dialogue to develop a master plan on return and reintegration	2024	Philippines	Ongoing
**)	ACMW open consultation on the Consensus Action Plan	2020	Viet Nam	Completed

**) Indicates new ACMW activities not appearing in the ASEAN Consensus Action Plan 2018-2025

Annex 8: Stories of Change

Examples of Change

No1: ILO is very impressive. Before we didn't know that the stood for us. We would ask 'are we part of ILO'? We didn't feel we ourselves as being part of labour, everything we had experienced since they started work was moulded to them not thinking they are part of labour. When you described the idea of labour it did not fit with domestic work. Now every time we have a training or event, we have ILO behind us. We have become to understand that domestic work was labour, and that we had rights to decent work. We began to realise the connections we had to ILO as a result. ILO was standing for us and recognised domestic workers as also needing decent work. We knew had the convention for us, and that on every point we were fighting for, the ILO was behind us. When we reach out to their friends to expand our network, we focus on the idea that ILO is behind us and they are part of a bigger, prestigious movement. It helps us to invite more members. It also helps us to be empowered to engage with government agencies and to conduct our campaigns. (MW Thailand)

No 2: Before we thought that since we lived in another country, we didn't know about the policy and laws in the area. Back then we thought there was no organisation who could help us. When we got fired, we couldn't sleep and eat well. We thought they couldn't do anything about it. Once we met at the (local organisation) office, they always told us that they we did not need to be afraid and could raise our voice. We were told it wasn't our fault and we had to ask for our rights. After we got support from the organisation, we are now not afraid to talk any more. Even before for this type of interview, I would have been afraid to talk back then. We are prepared to raise our voice. If I get a chance to get a new job in a new area, then I won't be afraid to talk about my experience to my colleagues and friends. (MW Thailand)

No 3: After becoming part of the women's group, we feel more empowered and to speak up for ourselves. Before I was very shy to stand up for myself and speak out. Now I feel I am able to stand up for myself because of this group and training I have received. Before having the women's group, we weren't aware of safe migration. Women would be scammed by brokers and we wouldn't know about the documentation or where to reach out for support overseas. We now know the importance of safe documentation and are able to reach out to the Cambodian embassy if we have problems in the country. The women are braver before and can standup for themselves. We also have some leadership quality. Before it was only men who travelled far from home. Now women do this too. (MW Cambodia)

No 4: Before I joined the group, I was financially dependent on my husband. I migrated to Thailand and when I returned I did not have any savings. I did not get a job in Cambodia and so did not have any income. I only knew my role was to stay at home and care for my family. Now I know I can get my own job, run a business and do everything my husband can do. I have a small shop selling goods at home. My husband supports this, because before he was our only source of income. Now we have two sources of income. (MW Cambodia)

No 5: Now I realise that my work is decent work and contributes greatly to Thailand and my country as well. For example where I work, the husband is a lawyer and wife in a business, they re out of the house between 9 and 5 and I am responsible for them. They are able to contribute to the Thai economy because I am able to support them to work while I look after the home. I send 70% of my salary home to my village. I can see the impacts of this money on my village. I think they are better off that some other places who for example rely on construction work remittances being sent home

which is not as much. So, I see the impacts of me having decent work on my home village as well.
(MW Thailand)

No 6: Before I used to use the word gay as mocking or joking to people. Now I am aware of the term of LGBTQI and intersectionality and I am much more understanding of LGBTQI people and respectful to them (MW Cambodia)

No 7: The major change is about the policy level. Before Cambodia did not have a labour migration policy. Under Triangle we have been able to make it happen. The grievance system has improved a lot. Under the old system the complaint mechanism would take too long. You had to go to the court. The Ministry of Labour did not have a grievance system. When migrant workers had a problem with the recruitment agency, they had to bring the case to the court. This was very challenging for the migrant workers. It could take, 3, 5, 7, even 10 years and even then they might not get the result they wanted. Since Triangle started, ILO has provided capacity to Ministry of Labour and at local level on how to handle cases and the system has significantly improved. (CSO Official)

No 8: Organisational capacity has been a significant change. With Triangle's support we can focus on labour migration. We also have the capacity to support migrant workers not just here but on the move overseas. The connections with other CSOs have been important. ILO has helped us to build a cross-border network. The meetings have helped networking. The project has also helped us improve their collaborative relationships with all the tripartite constituents. We used to see employers and government as confrontational entities. Now we collaborate with them. (CSO Official)

No 9: The most significant change is that before migrant workers were really afraid to open their voice and now they are more willing to ask for their rights because they know more about it. Previously when they went to the court they were scared. We now have mock court sessions to practice with the migrant workers ahead of their appearance. When someone goes to the office for help, we not only help them with the issues, we look at what kind of knowledge they need. They (the migrant workers) are now not afraid to talk about the issues and we are able to collect and share the experiences of migrant workers with newcomers. If you ask questions directly to the migrant workers you can see they are not afraid to talk any more. Previously if they had a campaign, they were afraid to take photos or give their story, but now they are willing to do this. (NGO/CSO Official)

No 10: The officers and activists in our organisation have expanded their horizon to see more broadly in this area. Before the project they worked on a case by case. If there were things they could not do, they would just let the case go. They might know to some extent, and they would give the recommendation as much as they could. If they couldn't do any more, they would send the migrant workers back to the brokers. They wouldn't think to look for additional information. Now, if there is something the officers and activists cannot do, they look at what they need to do to address it. They will find more information on how to resolve the case. They exclude the broker from the case. They will try to get many activists together to try to resolve the case. They would get the activist, the social security officers to discuss the case. It is possible to see some improvements in the relationships at the area level. It means that with the project their attitudes have been improved and they are on the same page and more willing to work together. (NGO/CSO Official)

No 11: The most significant change is that the programme has improved the attention of employers towards migrant worker rights. 10 years ago it was difficult to get members to participate in migration activities. The work of Triangle and the changing market towards migration means it is a priority. Working collaboratively has helped to learn about migrant workers rights and employers know the risks for them if there are sanctions against them if something happens. It is a combination

of Triangle's work and also the changing context in terms of international supply chains and attention to migrant workers. (Employer Representative)

No 12: Since implementing the Triangle project, the CSOs and trade unions seem to have a better relationship with the Provincial Department of Labour. They always consult with the us now about their activities. Before they didn't know what the Provincial Department of Labour was doing. Now we communicate with one another. (Government Official)

No 13: The authorities now provide support to the MRC for conducting outreach. When they have meetings at the community level, the MRC is allowed to participate. When the MRC conducts workshops, the authority invites people they know who want to migrate to attend. Before the activity was very restricted because they were worried they would be disseminating political information. Now they have worked with the authority they understand more the purpose and are prepared to work with them. The population are more aware and come to ask for support. People are more aware of the services that are provided. (MRC Official)

No 14: I moved to Yangon to work as a domestic worker for the last 4 years. I got to hear about training through my friend and was eager to attend the training. Then I applied and could attend the training in August 2019. I have gained self-confidence after the training. Training includes theoretical and practical lessons including discussions through which we have gained self-confidence, knowledge and skills. Through this training, we came to know that both practice and theory are important. I think some problems between house owners and domestic workers can be settled through by attending this kind of training. I also joined the migrant women's group and am highly passionate to expand this association to help other domestic workers like me, with the training I received from ILO and also from the organisation, I can now train other domestic workers to improve their skills as well as on safe migration in other part of the region in country" (Migrant Worker, Myanmar)

No 15: Our family is poor and I am the only breadwinner of family. I went to Oman as domestic worker during 2022 and 2023. Me and Mom motivated about working abroad as domestic worker as we hear a broker is helping this in our neighbours. The agreement was to give 6 months of my salary to them as agent fees. On arriving in Oman house, I could not bear the workload, I ask agent to change the employer. They allow me to change. But the second house is too big with many family members, every week they have the gathering and I am the only one to do all the household chores. I asked the agent to move to other house but this time, employer didn't allow me and they kept my passport ID. I endured for several months and my health deteriorated, I tried many ways online seeking any kind of assistance to get back to Myanmar. I directly send email to ILO Yangon office. Few weeks later I was contacted by the partner (name withheld). I explained about my situation and they gave me instruction to get my passport back from employer and to go to agency office in Oman. After several attempts of begging from employer, they finally gave me passport, and I went to agency office on my own. They kept me there for few days and finally they gave me flight ticket to get back to Yangon. The partner reached out to my family and they helped writing up the case filing to township police. Their intervention helped me to escape from that unbearable situation.

That experience alerted me the unethical act of those brokers happening in my neighbours. My friends reached out to me and said his wife and two other girls were in trouble being sold at China border at brothel house. I consulted this case with the partner and luckily I could connect them via Facebook messenger. At first the two girls didn't trust me, they were stuck there without know how to return. The two girls were young around the age of 18 years. I assisted to get the car to bring those girls back to Yangon. The partner helped them to get the money back from this bad broker. But

the police didn't take any action like imprisonment. Though the cases were settled through money, I didn't want those kinds of brokers to continue doing like this to other young people like us.

Anyway, I am glad that I could help those two girls together with the partner. For the time being, I can't support my family, with some saving money, I will take some training courses, I will prepare more before I work abroad. The MRC also make me aware about safe migration and steps need for better migration. It would be good if I can get support to attend English language and new skills on catering and cafeteria. I pray for some support to get my dream come true. I need to work abroad in better condition and want to support for my parent's health and education for my little sister.
(Migrant Worker, Myanmar)

No. 16: I own a café shop where young people can get together at my shop. I was once the migrant; I work in Thailand for 2 years and returned. It was just migration with no documents but I could save some money and can open this small shop. I attend this bakery training in 2021 I also received some additional training from ILO in SIYB and SCORE. It helped me a lot, I gained more knowledge on systematic management of my café. I think market and network is the important thing in business to sustain. (Migrant Worker- Myanmar)

No. 17: We are members of a women group established with the guidance of the partner (name withheld). With trainer from the partner, we get together and can make products like (Fried banana chip snacks) and sell them at local market or event. We are happy to see this kind of group activity and feel proud of ourselves especially when we see money after selling those products. We have lots of banana plants in our backyard and didn't know before we can make this kind of nutritious, tasty and crunchy banana snacks and can make money out of it. We can also feed own kids replacing high price imported snacks from China and Thailand. It is also safe and nutritious. We want to learn more and want more opportunity to sell this kind of new products to be more profitable for ourselves as well as for villages. (Women's Group- Myanmar)

No. 18: I migrated to Mae Sai, Thailand, in 2020 and worked as a construction worker. After working three months at a construction site in Thailand, I sustained a workplace accident, and I am now paralyzed due to a spinal injury. I couldn't work anymore and returned home from Thailand. The employer told me that he would not cover my medical costs because I did not have legal status in Thailand. The partner (name withheld) visited me very often and provided me with counselling and other supports. They linked me with other services for persons with disabilities. I don't feel any loneliness after all the visits from the partner. I thank the Centre staff for their support and for empowering me to access information and services. I would like to start a fishpond business, which my parents can also support. the partner is helping me to develop my business plan, and I'm so happy this plan is going to become a reality in my life. (Migrant Worker- Myanmar)

No. 19: Through friends and websites, I learned about Ha Tinh employment service centre, a unit under the Department of Labor. Movement - War Invalids and Society. In order to meet the needs and aspirations of people of different ages, the centre has gone to communes and wards to announce information and fully transmit information on websites so that you can have can receive information easily. Thanks to the reputation of the Centre, me and other students trusted the Centre instead of other companies sending workers to work abroad.

After receiving enthusiastic advice from the staff at the centre, through the EPS program, I took the Korean language proficiency test. In Korea, I earned more income for myself and experienced learning many new things such as working style, culture and people here. Because from the beginning, the Centre set me goals in advance, so in addition to working 8 to 10 hours, I also

improved my Korean knowledge. Here, I interacted with local people and improved my language skills. I took the Korean language certification exam so I could meet the needs of my job in the future. While working in Korea, I always received text messages from centre staff to encourage my efforts in my work, asking about my work and the company's remuneration policies, and whether I needed any support.

After 4 years of working and studying in Korea, I was really satisfied with my decision. I was able to help my parents financially, repair their house. There is an accumulation for myself and especially since I passed the Topic 5 Korean certificate. I am grateful to the Ha Tinh Employment Service Centre and more. I am always grateful to the MRC office staff for guiding me to have a good life, always creating conditions, encouraging and accompanying me. (Migrant Worker- Viet Nam)

No. 20: Before immigrating, I saw that my friends were working in Japan, so I also intended to go to earn more money and also to wanted know how they lived abroad and wanted to live like them. Many companies also come to the commune to find workers to send them, but the cost is more than 400 million and they are guaranteed to pass the entrance exam after 3 months of learning the language at their company. My family didn't have enough money at that time. My parents would have had to borrow a lot if I participated. Furthermore, no one in my family has gone to work abroad, so I was also worried because she didn't know if the business is reputable? Have I been scammed? Through the awareness session of the Employment Service Centre held in the commune, I came to ask for advice. The staff at the Employment Service Centre advised me to go to Japan to order to work in electronics and microchips (2017 - 2021) as an intern. They also guided me through the procedures and recommended places for medical examination. While studying foreign languages at the company, they still regularly contacted me to check on my study and exam status. When I came to Japan, we still kept in touch via Zalo. I had been there for nearly 2 years when the covid epidemic occurred, and the staff advised and helped me contact the union working with the business so that I could enjoy 1 month's salary during the blockade period, unable to go to work because of the epidemic or contact someone to help when they are sick. They also encouraged me to take advantage of the time to study Japanese on the weekends. When returning home, the staff also helped advise me on the procedures for me to receive nearly 130 million in insurance money from the Japanese company. Recently, I has also passed the N2 Japanese certificate exam. After about 2 months, the Centre also introduced me to work as a Japanese language lecturer at the labour export company that I am currently working at. I also saved some money to help her family. I feel I have been very lucky to have had the support of the Employment Service Centre and the staff over the years. (Migrant Worker- Viet Nam)

No 21: I went to Japan from December 2020 to December 2023. In Japan, I painted motorbike and motorcycle parts. Currently, I am unmarried and living with my parents. My family has no one working abroad. When I graduated from high school, I did not pass the university entrance exam. At that time, I had no intention of working abroad, but through the employment exchange held in the commune, I asked my parents if she could try to find out information about working abroad at the centre. Ha Tinh employment service. After consulting directly with my father, she and my family decided to work abroad and chose Japan because it was safe for our daughter. When I arrived at the place where I worked for about a month, I found that even though my job was protected, I still felt it had health effects such as difficulty breathing. I shared this with officials at the employment service centre. Afterwards, officials at the employment service centre contacted the union to tell the company to change my job to a more suitable position. The company also immediately changed my to a job that no longer had direct contact with paint. Thanks to the Centre, I also received 50% rent support from the company and free food during the 2 months of covid. Currently, the Centre has also

introduced me to some Japanese companies in Vietnam to work for, but I do want to quit and find a job with a better salary. (Migrant Worker- Viet Nam)

No 22: I finished high school and got married in 2017, giving birth to a baby in 2018. In 2019, my husband told me to go to Thailand to sell illegal food with him until 2021. I have had 1 more child since 2018. I did not know Thai or any foreign language during my time in Thailand. When in Thailand, all communication is with the husband, and I only looked after the children. In Thailand, when your child gets sick, the cost is very high because you don't have insurance. Life was also difficult so I returned to Vietnam. After meeting the staff of the Employment Service Centre in the commune, I went to the Employment Service Centre and received a lot of information about employment. I found that getting a job in Viet Nam was not difficult and safe, so she asked the officials here about jobs for her husband. I also phoned her husband and he also called the centre staff directly to ask. After a few conversations, my husband told me he would return soon, not work there anymore and look for a job domestically. (Migrant Worker- Viet Nam)

No. 23: Before learning about going to Japan, I was introduced and fully guided by the Ha Tinh Employment Service Centre about policies and tools and reputable company. During the process of learning a foreign language, I was also asked by the Centre about my work orientation. Before leaving the country, I was also guided through the procedures by the Centre along with documents containing contact information in case of problems. When working in Japan, the Centre and the union also supported me to receive full benefits when sick. When I returned home and planned to go to Korea, I was introduced by the Centre to a form suitable to my economic conditions. Currently, I am also studying Korean at the Centre and studying the E9 program in the manufacturing industry. When I returned from Japan, I was able to buy land to build a house, my economy was more stable, I was able to take care of my family, and my wife and children had a full life. I myself also learned more about how to live together, how to treat people, learned a lot at work, and gained a lot of experience to start a new job. (Migrant Worker- Viet Nam)

No. 24: I was advised by the Ha Tinh Employment Service Centre on choosing orders with suitable occupations, advising on appropriate exit costs, and supporting quick exit. By early 2021 I went to Taiwan. When I first arrived, the Centre also took care of me and answered my difficulties regarding accommodation and living conditions. While working in Taiwan, I was able to be financially independent and support my family, and experienced and learned the working style and working environment abroad. When I return home, I still believe in choosing Ha Tinh Employment Service Centre. Currently, I am also studying at the Centre under the EPS program. I am also receiving positive information from the Centre such as: early and reputable access to exam schedules and related information, low costs, loan support for disadvantaged families, and a good learning and food environment. Stay in a fun, friendly dormitory close to family. My goal is to gain some capital to help my family renovate the house, have some money to save to buy a used car, gain more labour skills and communication skills, and become financially independent. I took a Korean language course and paid off some debt for house construction fees and interest. (Migrant Worker, Viet Nam)

Annex 9: Sample Interview Guides

FGD Guide for Migrant Workers who used the MRCs

Informed consent:

My name is Chris (or National Consultant). I'm an independent evaluator conducting the final evaluation of the TRIANGLE programme managed by ILO, and funded by the Canadian Government and Australian Government. We are also speaking with other migrants who received services through the programme in various other communities in Cambodia, Thailand, Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Viet Nam as well as other stakeholders who have participated in the programme.

Nothing you say will be attributed personally to you, we'll anonymize the findings. Your name will not appear in any reports or shared with your employer or the government. If you say something and then later decide you don't want that recorded, then please speak to me after the meeting and I will ensure it is crossed out from the notes.

Are you happy to continue?

Questions

1. Can you all briefly introduce yourselves- who you are, who is in your family, how many children you have etc? Who in your family has migrated or is planning to?
2. What were the reasons you have for considering migration/for migrating?
3. What were the key challenges you faced in getting information about migration?
4. What information and/or support did you get from the MRC?
5. How did you access the MRC? (ie in-person, in the community, online etc)
6. Had you heard this information before? Was there any new information you heard?
7. How satisfied with the support you received?
8. What changes have occurred to you, your family or your workplace as a result of the programme? Ask for specific details
9. (if necessary) Are there any negative change you can think of?
10. What has been the most significant of the changes (either positive or negative)?
11. Do you have any particular example of story to illustrate this change you would be willing to share?
12. *See below for more information on this
13. Are there any recommendations you how to improve the MRC in the future?

Interview Guide For Government Officials

Informed consent:

My name is _____. I'm part of the evaluation team conducting the final evaluation of the TRIANGLE programme implemented by the ILO and funded by the Canadian Government and the Australian Government. I'm speaking to you because you are a key stakeholder in this programme, and your thoughts on its implementation to date and recommendations for the remainder of the programme and beyond would be very helpful. The evaluation team is also speaking to other key stakeholders in a number of countries who have been part of the programme's work and will use the information from interviews to produce a report with key findings, lessons learned and recommendations. We will ensure that all the information you share today is anonymized. We may use quotes for the interviews in the report but will ensure they cannot be traced back to you. If you say anything which you want removed from the notes and not shared, please let me know. Are you happy to continue with the interview?

Questions

1. Can you briefly describe your role and responsibilities and the remit of your department/ministry?
2. What has been your involvement in the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme to date?
3. Are you given the opportunity to have input into the design of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme's activities?
4. What are the key challenges your country faces with regards to labour migration governance?
5. How has the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme helped you address these challenges?
6. Are there specific challenges women migrants face? What is your government doing to address these? Has the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme supported you in this?
7. Have there been specific policies or guidelines that have been developed as a result of this project or that the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has supported you to develop? If so what? Follow up with specific questions for each country
8. What have been the strengths of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme?
9. What have been the weaknesses or challenges?
10. How was the programme affected by Covid? How effectively did the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme respond to the challenges of Covid-19?
11. What have been the most significant achievements of TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme? (ask for concrete examples)
12. Of these, what has been the most significant change you have seen as a result of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme? (ask for a story to illustrate this is possible)
13. What plans do you have for the continuation of the activities in the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme after it has completed? Are these budgeted?
14. How effectively does the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme connect activities at the regional ASEAN level with the national level?
15. Are there examples of the policy changes, operational approaches etc as a result of activities of your country in the AFML or other regional bodies?
16. What recommendations do you have for the rest of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme?

KII or FGD Guide MRC Staff

Informed consent:

My name is _____. I'm part of the evaluation team conducting the final evaluation of the TRIANGLE programme implemented by the ILO and funded by the Canadian Government and the Australian Government. I'm speaking to you because you are a key stakeholder in this programme, and your thoughts on its implementation to date and recommendations for the remainder of the programme and beyond would be very helpful. The evaluation team is also speaking to other key stakeholders in a number of countries who have been part of the programme's work and will use the information from interviews to produce a report with key findings, lessons learned and recommendations. We will ensure that all the information you share today is anonymized. We may use quotes for the interviews in the report but will ensure they cannot be traced back to you. If you say anything which you want removed from the notes and not shared, please let me know. Are you happy to continue with the interview?

Questions

1. Please introduce your organisation and your role in it?
2. Can you all explain what role you play in the MRC?
3. What services does the MRC offer?
4. What are the key needs of migrant workers who use the MRC?
5. What support has the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme given you to support the MRC meeting these needs?
6. Can you give concrete examples of how?
7. Are there particular needs for women users? Has the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme helped the MRC meet these?
8. (if not addressed in the previous question), can you explain what steps have been taken to establish the women's migration forum? How effectively is it operating?
9. Is the MRC accessible for all migrants in the area? Are there barriers that prevent people accessing the services? How do you address this?
10. What do you understand about disability inclusion? Do you think you have the necessary knowledge to ensure persons with disabilities are getting effective services?
11. What are the key strengths of the MRC?
12. What are the main weaknesses or gaps of the MRC?
13. Have you seen any changes in migrants as a result of the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme?
14. Can you explain what these are?
15. Do you have any particular example of story to illustrate these changes you would be willing to share?
16. Are you happy with the support that the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme has given you?
17. Do you have recommendations for the TRIANGLE in ASEAN programme for the future?