FINAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

SAFEGUARDING AGAINST AND ADDRESSING FISHERS' EXPLOITATION AT SEA (SAFE Seas)

Credit: SAFE Seas Project

United States Department of Labor

Bureau of International Labor Affairs

Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking

November 2022

Contract Number: 1605DC-18-A-0036 | Order Number: 1605C2-22-F-00026

SUBMITTED TO

United States Department of Labor
Bureau of International Labor Affairs
Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking

ATTENTION

Khalil Jarrett, Contracting Officer's Representative
Bureau of International Labor Affairs
United States Department of Labor
200 Constitution Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20210

SUBMITTED BY

American Institutes for Research
1400 Crystal Drive
10th Floor
Arlington, VA 22202-3289
Phone: (202) 403-5000
FAX: (202) 403-5000

PROJECT

Final Performance Evaluation of SAFE Seas Project
Contract Number: 1605DC-18-A-0036
Order Number: 1605C2-22-F-00026

TASK & DELIVERABLE

Final Performance Evaluation of *Safeguarding Against and Addressing Fishers' Exploitation at Sea* (SAFE Seas) Project
Final Report

AUTHOR

Ruth Bowen, Lead Evaluator

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report presents the findings of the final independent evaluation of the *Safeguarding Against and Addressing Fishers' Exploitation at Sea* (SAFE Seas) project. American Institutes for Research, (AIR) conducted in-country fieldwork for this evaluation from September 5 to 20, 2022, in collaboration with the project team and stakeholders, and prepared the evaluation report according to the terms specified in its contract with the United States Department of Labor (USDOL). The evaluation was led by Ruth Bowen, assisted by evaluation specialists, Ellah Delerio in the Philippines, and Clara Ajisuksmo in Indonesia. AIR is grateful to all the parties involved for their support and valuable contributions.

Funding for this evaluation was provided by the United States Department of Labor. This material does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labor, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

The evaluation team extends its thanks to Plan US National Office, and especially to the SAFE Seas teams in Indonesia and the Philippines for their assistance in coordination and collaboration throughout the evaluation process. We would like to acknowledge the contributions of the project stakeholder participants in Indonesia and the Philippines for devoting time to share their perspectives with the evaluation team.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS iii
LIST OF ACRONYMS vi
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY viii
INTRODUCTION 1
1. PROJECT CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION 2
1.1 PROJECT CONTEXT 2
1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION 2
2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY 7
2.1 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES 7
2.2 METHODOLOGY 7
2.2.1 EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND DATA SOURCES 7
2.2.2 EVALUATION TEAM AND SCHEDULE 9
2.2.3 DATA COLLECTION METHODS AND STAKEHOLDER SAMPLING 9
2.2.4 DATA ANALYSIS 12
2.2.5 STRENGTHS, LIMITATIONS AND MITIGATING MEASURES 12
3. FINDINGS 14
3.1 RELEVANCE AND COHERENCE OF THE PROJECT 14
3.1.1 VALIDITY OF THE PROJECT DESIGN 14
3.1.2 RELEVANCE TO STAKEHOLDER NEEDS 16
3.1.3 COHERENCE WITH GOVERNMENT AND DONOR EFFORTS 18
3.2 EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERVENTIONS 19
3.2.1 IMPLEMENTATION PATH AND RESPONSE TO INTERIM EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS 19
3.2.2 ACHIEVEMENTS IN INDONESIA 22
3.2.3 ACHIEVEMENTS IN THE PHILIPPINES 31
3.2.4 ADDRESSING GENDER ISSUES 41
3.2.5 CROSS-COUNTRY LINKAGES AND KNOWLEDGE CONTRIBUTION 42
3.3 EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION 43
3.3.1 MANAGEMENT AND HUMAN RESOURCES 43
3.3.2 EFECTIVENESS OF THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM 45
3.4 SUSTAINABILITY 47
3.4.1 SUSTAINABILITY PLANS AND EXIT PLANNING 47
3.4.2 PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS FOR SUSTAINABILITY 47
4. LESSONS LEARNED AND EMERGING PRACTICES 50

4.1 LESSONS LEARNED 50
4.2 EMERGING GOOD PRACTICES 50
5. CONCLUSIONS 52
5.1 RELEVANCE AND COHERENCE OF THE PROJECT 52
5.2 EFFECTIVENESS OF THE INTERVENTIONS 52
5.3 EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF MANAGEMENT 55
5.4 SUSTAINABILITY 56
6. RECOMMENDATIONS 60
ANNEX A. PROJECT PERFORMANCE INDICATOR RESULTS AS OF APRIL 2022 ..... A-1
ANNEX B. SAFE SEAS RESPONSE TO INTERIM EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS B-1
ANNEX C. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED C-1
ANNEX D. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS D-1
ANNEX E. EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE E-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Project Outcomes and Outputs 3

Table 2. Evaluation Questions 8

Table 3. Interviewee Sample Size and Characteristics 10

Table 4. Progress toward Regulatory and Policy Improvement 24

Table 5. Progress toward Labor-Inclusive Fishing Vessel Inspection 25

Table 6. Indicators of Progress on Awareness Among Community, Private Sector, and Government 27

Table 7. Progress on Access to Grievance Reporting and Remedy 29

Table 8. Reported Progress Toward Regulatory And Policy Improvement 33

Table 9. Progress toward Labor-Inclusive Fishing Vessel Inspection 36

Table 10. Indicators of progress on awareness among community, private sector and government 38

Table 11. Progress on Access to Grievance Reporting and Remedy 40

Table A-1. Outcome 1: Improved Enforcement to Combat Labor Exploitation Including FL/TIP on Fishing Vessels A-1

Table A-2. Performance Indicator Results for Outcomes and Sub-Outcomes (Except for OTC1) A-2

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AOS	Apostleship of the Seas
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BP2MI	Indonesian Migrant Workers protection Agency (*Badan Perlindungan Pekerka Migran*)
BFAR	Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources, Department of Agriculture, Philippines
BWC	Bureau of Working Conditions, DOLE (Philippines)
BWSC	Bureau of Workers with Special Concerns
CMEP	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
CMMIA	Coordinating Ministry for Maritime and Investment Affairs (Indonesia)
COVID-19	Coronavirus Disease 2019
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DILG	Department of Interior and Local Government (Philippines)
DOJ	Department of Justice (Philippines)
DOLE	Department of Labor and Employment (Philippines)
DFW	Destructive Fishing Watch
DSWD	Department of Social Welfare and Development (Philippines)
FARMC	Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Council (Philippines) at barangay, city, municipality and national levels
FL	Forced Labor
FOA	Funding Opportunity Announcement
GOI	Government of Indonesia
GT	Gross tons
IACAT	Inter-Agency Council against Trafficking (Philippines)
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
ILAB	Bureau of International Labor Affairs
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IRR	Implementing Rules and Regulations (Philippines)
IUU	Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated (Fishing)
LGU	Local Government Unit
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MARINA	Maritime Industry Authority (Philippines)
MAST	Multi-Stakeholder Initiative for Accountable Supply Chains
MDI	Multidisciplinary Inspection

MMAF	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (Indonesia)
MOA/MOU	Memorandum of Agreement/Memorandum of Understanding
MOM	Ministry of Manpower (Indonesia)
MSW	Ministry of Social Welfare (Indonesia)
MOT	Ministry of Transportation (Indonesia)
NAP	National Action Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NPC	National Project Coordinator
OCFT	Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor and Human Trafficking
OND Hesed	Oblates of Notre Dame (OND) Hesed Foundation, Inc.
PCG	Philippine Coast Guard
PD	Project Director
PFVSRR	Philippine Fishing Vessel Safety Rules and Regulations
PIACAT-VAWC	Provincial Inter-agency Council Against Trafficking-Violence against Women and Children, also LIACAT– the local or municipal IACAT.
Plan	Plan International USA
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
PNP-MG	Philippine National Police Maritime Group
SAFE Seas	Safeguarding Against and Addressing Fishers' Exploitation at Sea
SFA	Safe Fishing Alliance
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
TIP	Trafficking in Persons
TOR	Terms of Reference
TOT	Training of Trainers
TPR	Technical Progress Report
TWG	Technical Working Group
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
USG	United States Government
USNO	(Plan International) United States National Office
YCMI	*Yayasan Cayaha Mercusuar Indonesia* ((Lighthouse Foundation Indonesia)
YPII	Yayasan Plan International Indonesia

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

On December 1, 2017, the US Department of Labor's Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB) awarded Plan International USA with a 4-year cooperative agreement worth US$5 million to implement the *Safeguarding Against and Addressing Fishers' Exploitation at Sea* (SAFE Seas) project. The project was extended to November 30, 2022, providing an additional US$500,000. SAFE Seas is managed by Plan International USA and implemented in the field in cooperation with the Plan Asia Regional Office, Yayasan Plan International Indonesia (YPII) in Indonesia, and Plan International country office in the Philippines.[1] The project was implemented in partnership with Destructive Fishing Watch (DFW) in Indonesia and with Oblates of Notre Dame Hesed Foundation (OND Hesed) in the Philippines.

The project aims to combat forced labor (FL) and trafficking in persons (TIP) on fishing vessels in Indonesia and the Philippines. The project design includes two outcomes consisting of 1) improved enforcement to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels, and 2) decreased indicators of labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels following from increased awareness and access to grievance reporting and remediation.

This final evaluation provides ILAB, Plan, and the implementing partners with an assessment of the project's performance and achievements as well as the sustainability of its results. The evaluation methodology was primarily qualitative, drawing on an analysis of project performance reporting and document review, qualitative interviews, and focus group discussions with key informants. Primary data was collected from September 5-12, 2022 in the Philippines, and from September 13-20, 2022 in Indonesia. The evaluators interviewed 109 respondents in the US, Indonesia, and the Philippines, including face-to-face methods as well as online platforms and telephone calls.

MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

RELEVANCE AND COHERENCE. SAFE Seas' interventions designed under the Theory of Change represent a valid response to address the specific factors contributing to labor exploitation of fishers in both countries; but addressing private sector compliance along the employment supply chain could have been given higher priority. The site selection in the two countries and thematic coverage of labor protection in all types of fishing, commercial as well as artisanal, and domestic as well as migrant fishing, led to an ambitious design in practical terms.

In broad terms, SAFE Seas' approach and its interventions proved highly relevant to the needs of its stakeholders, at the national and subnational government levels and among fishing communities and leaders, and their representative associations. Indonesia's Coordinating Ministry for Maritime and Investment Affairs (CMMIA) has been a firm ally of the project since its inception. Nevertheless, in Indonesia there were elements of weak engagement at the national level, and at the provincial level in Central Java. In the Philippines, the Department of Justice (DOJ) and members of the Inter-Agency Council Against Trafficking (IACAT) found the project support highly relevant to their anti-trafficking agenda, while senior level commitment in the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE), Maritime Industry Authority (MARINA), and the Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR) was less apparent. Provincial and municipal members of the Philippines IACAT structure found SAFE Seas' awareness and capacity building efforts a good fit with their interests. The project activities proved highly relevant to the local communities and leaders in each of its project sites in the Philippines and Indonesia.

[1] The report uses "Plan" to refer collectively to Plan International USA, Plan Asia Regional Office, Yayasan Plan International Indonesia, Plan Philippines, and members of the SAFE Seas project management team. References to specific Plan country offices are spelled out.

SAFE Seas' core strategy was to form linkages with national policy and programmes at all levels, and in doing so it remained coherent with government policy in both Indonesia and the Philippines. The project teams coordinated with other donor-led programmes, most evidently in Indonesia, with varying success. Two International Labour Organization (ILO) programs that recently commenced in Indonesia, the Alliance 8.7 Incubator Lab and the Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia program, are building on the momentum toward harmonized fishing labor inspection supported by SAFE Seas. However, the efforts by Plan and the ILO could have been better coordinated, suggesting that donors could be more instrumental in supporting coordination.

EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERVENTIONS. Despite the restrictions imposed by the COVID-19 outbreak midway in the project, SAFE Seas adapted well and has successfully delivered most of its planned interventions. The 12-month cost extension was effectively used in both the Philippines and Indonesia. It enabled the project to roll out capacity building for multi-disciplinary inspection through tools, training manuals and training for marine, labor inspection and social welfare personnel in the two countries; elaborate operating procedures for the fisher center in North Sulawesi and strengthen local government endorsement of safe fishing alliances in different localities.

Following the interim evaluation, the project accepted and acted on most of the evaluation recommendations, particularly regarding sustainability planning and gender interventions. It was less active in responding to the recommendations regarding adjustments to the monitoring and evaluation framework.

Indonesia

Under **Outcome 1**, (Improved enforcement to combat fisher labor exploitation) SAFE Seas Indonesia succeeded in establishing multi-agency forums for promoting fisher labor protection at the national level and in North Sulawesi. In Central Java the effort to create forums at provincial and district levels was less successful, despite pursuit of various strategies, as the project was not able to secure the provincial Governor's engagement and endorsement. The project's contribution to drafting a National Action Plan on Seafarers and Fish Workers' Protection 2021 – 2024 for implementation by the key ministries is a significant achievement. It was submitted for Presidential endorsement by the CMMIA in late 2021, which would make it binding, but this is still pending.

Progress toward developing multi-disciplinary inspection practices has been strongest in North Sulawesi, where a checklist and procedures were trialled by multiple agencies, including the Bitung port authorities and the provincial office of the Ministry of Manpower (MOM). SAFE Seas contributed to the capacity of inspectors of MOM and port authorities from North Sulawesi to understand FL and TIP indicators and to pilot a coordinated approach. This has been taken up as an example at the national level. Conversely, in Tegal Port, under the provincial Governor's authority, trial joint inspections are still pending multi-agency agreement to proceed.

Toward advancing specific efforts to address fisher labor exploitation on domestic and foreign flag vessels, SAFE Seas commissioned a labor supply chain mapping study for fishing crew on Indonesian and foreign flagged vessels; however, dissemination of the study has not been realized.

Outcome 2 sought to prevent labor exploitation and promote fishers' rights through widespread awareness and to improve fishers' access to grievance reporting. The project achieved considerable momentum in the last two years, promoting awareness of fishers' rights, especially among the fishing communities in Bitung in North Sulawesi and Tegal district in Central Java.

Steady progress was made towards increased awareness of FL and trafficking indicators and the labor rights of fishers, especially at the sub-national level, and among the community level actors through the project's village-based networks. SAFE Seas also raised the profile of the issue among the lead agencies at the national level. Private sector engagement through a variety of initiatives saw relatively small-scale but steady support for improving fishing companies' responsibility for fisher training and

labor protection. However, the efforts appear to have been somewhat diluted in the spread across various target groups.

The establishment in 2019 of two local fisher centers for grievance reporting is one of the project's success stories. The centers can be accessed by fishers and family members either through outreach networks, direct visit, or a hotline service. They bring together civil society support groups as well as fisher associations to provide paralegal and referral services, connecting with national remediation services. Since opening, a significant number of cases of fisher labor violations have been received and resolved locally or referred to the national government channels, including cases of compensation to fishers' wives whose husbands disappeared or died at sea.

The key factors that supported the achievements in Indonesia were the ownership of key government stakeholders, including the CMMIA and Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF) at national level, as well as the advocacy skills of the Project Director and the team.

Philippines

Under **Outcome 1**, SAFE Seas Philippines was successful in raising the profile of labor protection of fishers among the existing anti-trafficking structures and fishing inspection bodies and in strengthening collaborative relationships between diverse government and civil society actors, most vigorously at the provincial and municipal level, under the Safe Fishing Alliance umbrella. However, reluctance among the key agencies to assume leadership within the technical working group on seafarers and fishers, particularly on enforcement policy, remained a challenge to progress. Significantly, through its engagement with the IACAT, SAFE Seas influenced the draft national anti-trafficking strategy 2023-2027, embedding a swathe of actions planned to address fisher protection. At the provincial and municipal level, SAFE Seas triggered local government policies for coordinated planning on fisher labor protection in the Palawan and Mindanao project sites, with legal endorsement expected during 2022. At the national level, the project achieved a moderate influence on improving the regulatory and policy framework governing protection of fishing workers. Overall, SAFE Seas has been most successful in providing platforms for discussion of the existing frameworks for fishing labor regulation, represented by DOLE Department Order 156-16[2] rather than advocating new regulations or policies. However, the project's recommendations were incorporated in the revised anti-trafficking law passed in 2022, specifically including maritime agencies BFAR and the PCG among the agencies that should address trafficking, and standardizing DOLE's response to trafficking cases across all sectors, including fishing.

The project strategy towards improved policy and coordination embedded in the existing Philippines institutional coordination platform for trafficking and forced labor proved successful. However, the focus on the forced labor and trafficking in persons governance structure may have diverted efforts from a response to the full continuum of labor abuses in the fishing sector, ranging from minor infringements to the most severe.

Over the project life, SAFE Seas has built momentum towards nationally approved labor-inclusive guidelines for inspection of crews on commercial fishing vessels. The achievements have been strongest at the subnational level in Palawan, with strong interest and commitment to a multi-agency approach. Early success towards the acceptance of a multi-agency approach to inspection was achieved with the first trial inspection conducted in Tay Tay, Palawan in 2019. Given the foundation of interest in a coordinated approach, SAFE Seas Philippines has been able to contribute to joint or harmonized checklists and improved capacity of the actors. The evaluation team observed that a 'one-size fits all' approach has not been pursued; in each locality inspection actors adopted their own

[2] Rules and Regulations Governing the Working and Living Conditions of Fishers on Fishing Vessels Engaged in Commercial Fishing Operation.
https://bwc.dole.gov.ph/images/Issuances/DepartmentOrder/DO_156_16_WorkingandLivingConditionsOfFishersonboardFishingvesselsEngaged_Commercial-FishingOperation.pdf

approach to harmonization – either developing one combined checklist or multiple ones that include labor standards. The project pursued national and local advocacy on multi-disciplinary inspection in parallel, while the main strategy was to lead from the local level, with demonstration models of the approach. However, the procedures developed stop short of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) at provincial level, and a nationally endorsed approach

Under **Outcome 2**, SAFE Seas' efforts to raise awareness at all levels of government, in the private sector, and in fishing communities produced varied improvements in understanding of fishers' conditions and rights. The project's most significant achievements in raising awareness of the issues were observed among local government representatives – provincial, municipal and barangay (the smallest local level of government in the Philippines).

In the target communities there is evidence that fishers and local leaders are more aware of labor rights and standards following the SAFE Seas awareness raising campaigns, but traditional practices, such as debt-taking and unfair payment systems associated with both artisanal and commercial fishing are still ingrained and normalized, associated with reticence to report grievances. The emphasis on building women's awareness of their husbands' or sons' rights was a project innovation, but it was difficult for the evaluation to assess the extent of change in their awareness.

The Philippines's approach to improving fishers' access to grievance reporting was different to Indonesia's, focusing on improving existing services and reporting avenues rather than creating new ones. Progress has been gradual in supporting improved reporting and remediation services, with initiatives to strengthen barangay helpdesks through the Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Councils (FARMCs), as well as capacity built among existing help desk staff operated by the local Social Welfare and Development Offices. Service directories were produced in each locality to assist in case referrals. However, much remains to be done to improve fishers' access to local services, linked with the national systems and offices and responding to the range of labor violations, from minor infringements to trafficking.

Based on the limited evidence available, SAFE Seas made gains in engaging with the tuna industry operators based in General Santos City, evident in a fair-trade statement at the 2022 National Tuna Congress referring to labor standards. But overall, the project could have built a stronger, multiple entry point advocacy strategy to influence the private sector.

GENDER. The gendered impact of fishers' labor exploitation and the role that women in the community can play in defending fisher's working conditions were thoroughly addressed by SAFE Seas. Efforts at the grass-roots level proved most successful in Indonesia; promoting women as leaders in raising awareness in villages in North Sulawesi and Central Java and as advocates for their male relatives in documenting and filing forced labor cases. In the Philippines, SAFE Seas identified the need to build women's alternative livelihoods. The project's gender research points the way for development work to focus on women's empowerment in fishing communities; while questions regarding fishing as a traditionally male domain and LGBTQI rights in the sector remain to be addressed.

EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF MANAGEMENT**.** Project management and communications were found to be effective, with strong oversight and supervision mechanisms. Nevertheless, the complexity of the levels of governance, comprising Plan USNO, Plan Philippines, and YPII, and the requisite dual reporting lines limited efficiency. Throughout the project, the accountability lines were not completely clear between the Project Director (PD), the National Coordinators, and Plan USNO Officers.

The project's human resources allocation was adequate, but stretched at times, in terms of the number of staff at central and field level relative to their workloads. The project attracted staff, both present and former, who demonstrated high levels of commitment to the project mission and work. At the same time, high turnover has been a considerable obstacle in both countries, but most obviously in Indonesia. This affected the continuity of operations, institutional memory, and relationships with stakeholders.

While each implementing partner contributed to the project's success through their experience and networks, Plan encountered challenges in managing its implementing partners. USDOL financial and administrative reporting and documentation requirements proved very challenging for the subgrantee organizations. Future projects might consider alternative arrangements, partnering with NGOs on interventions rather than establishing a formal sub-agreement, when their capacities are in doubt.

Overall, project implementation followed the workplan deliverables, and the project took effective actions to adjust and maintain operations in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, some implementation delays occurred due to the requirements of ILAB processes, such as the approval of the project cost-extension. Plan was able to secure the services of highly experienced technical consultants to provide capacity building and knowledge products, but the project could have been more proactive in launching the products and in using interactive dissemination channels.

SAFE Seas applied a thorough Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP), compliant with ILAB standards, and used in each country to regularly monitor progress against targets and deliverables. The results framework structure could have elevated awareness and remediation access respectively to a higher level of the logical framework to permit better assessment of changes in each area. Additional measures of change in awareness among government officers and private sector groups related to awareness raising interventions could have been included. However, the project managers did not consider amendments to the M&E framework warranted.

SUSTAINABILITY. SAFE Seas teams in each country developed specific sustainability strategies for the continuity of many of the project's outcomes, and exit consultations are underway or planned with the stakeholders in the Philippines and Indonesia. The country teams have worked steadily with their partners to support institutionalized structures to carry the safe fishing agenda forward, contributing to national agendas or action plans for fisher protection.

In Indonesia, the National Action Plan for Protection of Seafarers and Fishers (2021-2024), once endorsed by the President, assures a pathway for sustained national action through government funding. The CMMIA's backing of the NAP provides optimism for its eventual approval. Piloting of multi-disciplinary labor inspection procedures in Bitung port in North Sulawesi has demonstrated a coordinated approach, with the potential for national adoption and replication. The fisher centers in Bitung and Central Java have fulfilled most sustainability requirements in terms of their operational practices, including securing a managing host for the Bitung Center. In Central Java discussions are still underway to identify a host institution.

In the Philippines, collaboration for advocacy on fishers' labor protection was anchored in existing national institutions, promoting the sustainability of coordination on safe fishing. The inclusion of a fisher protection framework within the draft National Strategic Action Plan against Trafficking in Persons (2023-2027) provides a key platform to carry the project agenda forward, provided that the key agencies assume leadership. At the provincial and municipal level, several local government ordinances providing a legal basis and funding to inter-agency planning on fisher protection are in place or under review.

The project enabled wider understanding of the legal and regulatory frameworks governing fishing labor among duty bearers, but industry resistance to implementing DOLE Department Order 156-16 remains, requiring continued consultation with private sector and fisher representative groups, towards its potential revision.

The development of coordinated inspections of fishing vessels is a work in progress in the provincial project sites, with pilot systems for inter-agency approaches developed and evident commitment of the labor and marine authorities to coordinate efforts to detect forced labor and other violations. A joint policy endorsement from the national level is still needed to institutionalize the approach.

Local advocacy networks mobilized by the project through barangay councils and FARMCs appear sustainable, especially given the commitment of individual champions. Longer-term advocacy is needed to change longstanding traditions in fisher recruitment and payment practices.

EVALUATION RATINGS. The evaluation ratings of achievement of outcomes and sustainability are provided in the Conclusions section in the body of the report.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations are directed to Plan for implementation prior to the SAFE Seas closeout; to Plan, ILAB, and other international agencies engaged in promoting labor rights in fishing; and to ILAB on project management considerations. The full text of the recommendations is provided in the report body.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO PLAN FOR SAFE SEAS CLOSEOUT

1. Document and share the SAFE Seas Indonesia fisher center model with stakeholders in Indonesia. Prior to project closure, Plan should fully document the fisher centers in Indonesia, presenting the ideal model for replication or expansion, the potential institutional homes, operational costs, and standardoperating procedures.
2. Consolidate the SAFE Seas Philippines roadmap for fisher grievance reporting and referral. Prior to project end, SAFE Seas Philippines should consolidate recommendations for further development of fisher grievance reporting services and disseminate them to the relevant national stakeholders.
3. Disseminate the labor supply chain mapping studies and Indonesia gender study to national and regional actors. The labor supply chain studies conducted in Indonesia and the Philippines represent valuable knowledge products to inform ongoing efforts. Prior to project closure, or as soon as practicable, Plan should launch and disseminate the labor supply chain studies and the forthcoming Indonesia gender study to national and international actors.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO PLAN, ILAB AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS

4. Future interventions in fisher labor rights protection in these or other countries in the region should limit the project thematic and geographic scope relative to the scale of the project, choosing specific areas of focus, and building on the good practices and lessons of SAFE Seas.
5. Future interventions by Plan International addressing the needs of fishing communities should continue to leverage Plan's expertise in community development and gender-focused interventions. This may include promoting access to alternative livelihoods in impoverished fishing communities as recommended by community members, leaders, and women in the Philippines, alongside expansion of community-level fisher support services.
6. Continue support to Indonesia and the Philippines to institutionalize multi-agency labor inspection of fishing vessels.
    - Both Philippines and Indonesia warrant further technical assistance to consolidate, expand and institutionalize multi-agency inspection procedures. In Indonesia, ongoing action needs to be closely coordinated with government plans and donor-funded efforts, especially those delivered through the ILO's current projects in the region.
    - Ongoing and future projects should aim toward the establishment of nationally endorsed standard operating procedures for multi-disciplinary labor inspection of commercial fishing vessels.
    - Strengthen enforcement frameworks and their application to encompass smaller scale as well as commercial scale vessels in the Philippines and Indonesia.
    - The capacity of inspection authorities could be strengthened through learning missions to countries with advanced fishing crew labor enforcement practices.

7. Continue support in the Philippines and Indonesia for local services for fishers to report grievances and access remedies. Services and systems for fishers to report grievances and seek remediation require ongoing development, institutionalization, and replication, in close coordination with efforts among different donors.

8. Strengthen private sector advocacy strategies in future interventions in Philippines and Indonesia. Future programs should devote efforts to working with the private sector associations and industry leaders per country - vessel owners, operators and recruitment agencies, differentiating strategies for the domestic and migrant private sector actors. Such efforts can be informed by SAFE Seas' labor supply chain mapping studies.

9. Strengthen advocacy for fisher labor standards along fish product supply chains. Sustained improvements to labor practices in the fishing industry in the region require pressure on producers and buyers along the supply chain, including consumer advocacy and cooperation with international buyers in transit countries and markets globally, including the US, EU, Japan and Taiwan.

10. Address Indonesian migrant fisher labor issues through strengthened civil society organization (CSO) networks and bilateral agreements between fishing worker transit and destination countries. Prevention and detection of fisher exploitation on foreign flag vessels should be pursued through CSO networks between sending, transit, and destination countries for migrant fishers and support for bilateral agreements on enforcement, in cooperation among donor-funded projects.

11. Address fishers' labor exploitation within the broad perspective of labor standards and rights. Interventions on labor protection in the fishing sector in Indonesia, Philippines, and other fish producing countries require differentiated strategies addressing the continuum of fisher labor issues, including occupational safety and health breaches, wage theft and unfair payment systems, as well as conditions amounting to forced labor and trafficking.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO ILAB FOR CMEP DEVELOPMENT AND OVERSIGHT

12. Future ILAB intervention designs on labor protection in fishing should ensure a clear logical structure, and in general ensure that grantees are aware of the opportunity to review and adjust various elements of the CMEP during the project, including the results framework sub-outcomes, outputs, and performance indicators.

INTRODUCTION

The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is an office within the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL). ILAB's mission is to promote a fair global playing field for workers in the United States and around the world by enforcing trade commitments, strengthening labor standards, promoting racial and gender equity, and combating international child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

OCFT works to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking around the world through international research, policy engagement, technical cooperation, and raising awareness. Since OCFT's technical cooperation program began in 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated funds annually to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects in more than 90 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL support sustained efforts that address the underlying causes of child labor and forced, including poverty and lack of access to education.

USDOL, through ILAB, contracted American Institutes for Research (AIR) to conduct a final performance evaluation of the *Safeguarding Against and Addressing Fishers' Exploitation at Sea* (SAFE Seas) project. The evaluation provides USDOL and its grantee with an independent assessment of the project's performance, including an in-depth analysis leading to conclusions about the progress against established targets. The evaluation also strives to identify the factors contributing to the results, whether enabling or limiting. The evaluation team conducted a primarily qualitative study to assess the project's effects and the likely sustainability of results. The evaluation identifies relevant lessons and emerging good practices with a view to informing future programming.

The final evaluation report is structured as follows: Section 1 outlines the context of the project and provides an overview of the project logic and interventions. Section 2 describes the evaluation objectives and methodology including the approach to data collection and the challenges encountered and mitigations applied when collecting and analyzing the data. Section 3 presents the evaluation findings, responding to each of the evaluation questions within themes relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. Section 4 highlights the key lessons learned, and the emerging good practices identified by the evaluation team. Section 5 provides conclusions, and Section 6 provides recommendations for future programming, based on the findings of the evaluation.

1. PROJECT CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION

1.1 PROJECT CONTEXT

Labor abuses in the fisheries sector in the region have drawn international concern in recent years. As a global and cross-border industry, work in fishing takes place in an international as well as a national governance context. Efforts are increasing in Southeast Asia toward multi-stakeholder and harmonized action within and among countries to end FL and human trafficking in the fishing industry.

Indonesia and the Philippines are among the largest fish suppliers in the world and marine fishing makes a significant contribution to the economies of both countries. With a growing fishing sector, Indonesia aims to be a leading maritime country. The Philippines is also one of the world's major fish producers and exporters, and home to the "tuna capital", General Santos City.[3]

There have been documented indicators of labor abuse in both countries, including cases of FL and TIP. Forced labor and trafficking of Indonesian fishers occur on both domestic-owned and foreign owned vessels and have mostly been documented in industrial fishing vessels.[4] In the Philippines, many of the fishers are unregistered and work on illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) vessels where mistreatment of workers is prevalent. Evidence of forced labor in the tuna fishing industry in General Santos, among various types of fishing vessels, was documented by Verite in 2016.[5]

Indonesia and the Philippines are signatories to numerous conventions addressing maritime labor rights and forced labor more broadly, including the Forced Labour Convention, Seafarers' Identity Documents Convention, and the Maritime Labour Convention.[6] Both countries have legal frameworks applicable to fishing labor protection, but significant gaps in enforcement have been an ongoing concern. Only one country in Southeast Asia, Thailand, has ratified the ILO Convention No. 188 (2007) on Work in Fishing. Recognizing the need for more vigorous efforts to combat widespread labor abuses in the industry, ILAB's OCFT issued a Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) in 2017 to address FL and TIP on fishing vessels in Asia and the Pacific, naming Indonesia as a pre-selected country, and including the Philippines among potential second countries to be included in the effort. The Philippines was added as the second country as part of Plan USA's proposal selected by ILAB.

1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

USDOL's International Labor Affairs Bureau (ILAB) awarded a $5 million, 4-year cooperative agreement to Plan USA to implement the *Safeguarding Against and Addressing Fishers' Exploitation at Sea* (SAFE Seas) project on December 1, 2017. In November 2021, ILAB approved a cost extension of the project to November 30, 2022, including additional funds of US$500,000. The project is managed by Plan USA and implemented in the field in cooperation with Plan Philippines and Yayasan Plan International Indonesia (YPII). The project implementing partners were Destructive Fishing Watch (DFW) in Indonesia and Oblates of Notre Dame Hesed (OND Hesed) Foundation in the Philippines.[7] SAFE Seas aims to contribute to the reduction of forced labor and trafficking in persons on fishing vessels nationally and in selected districts in Indonesia[8] and the Philippines.[9] The project objective is to *combat forced labor (FL) and human trafficking on fishing vessels in Indonesia and the Philippines.* The project is intended

[3] Fisheries represented US$45 million in exports in 2018. https://trendeconomy.com/data/h2/Philippines/0304; https://www.bfar.da.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/2020-Fisheries-Profile-Final.pdf

[4] ILO. 2013. Caught at Sea. Forced Labour and Trafficking in Fisheries; SAFE Seas. Force Labor and Trafficking in Persons among Fish Workers in Indonesia and the Philippines. Project Pre-Situation Analysis. July 2019.

[5] Verite. 2016. Research on Indicators of Forced Labor in the Supply Chain of Tuna in the Philippines. The handline officers are renowned for taking on additional unregistered crew as 'passengers, to increase the quantity of the catch.

[6] Philippines: https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:11200:0::NO:11200:P11200_COUNTRY_ID:102970. Accessed Oct1522

[7] The subgrantee agreements with these two organizations were active until September 2021.

[8] Working at national level in Jakarta, in Pemalang district and Tegal area in Central Java province, and Bitung district in North Sulawesi province.

[9] Working at national level in Manila, and in Puerto Princesa and Taytay, Palawan; General Santos City, Glan and Kiamba in Sarangani.

to achieve two outcomes - The first Outcome is "Improved enforcement to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels"; and the second is "Decreased indicators of labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels". Table 1 shows the outcomes, five supporting or sub-outcomes and 10 outputs that comprise the project results framework.[10]

TABLE 1. PROJECT OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS

Outcome 1: Improved enforcement to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels
Sub-Outcome 1.1: Regulatory and policy framework to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels improved
Output 1.1.1 Final draft of improved regulations and policy briefs submitted to government
Sub-Outcome 1.2: Quality of labor-inclusive inspections on fishing vessels procedures and implementation improved
Output 1.2.1 Inspection mechanism among related key government agencies is improved
Output 1.2.2 Roadmap for establishing fishing vessel labor-inclusive inter-agency inspections working unit disseminated among relevant stakeholders
Output 1.2.3 Fishing vessels and labor inspectors trained on incorporating labor exploitation including FL/TIP into inspections
Outcome 2: Decreased indicators of labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels
Sub-Outcome 2.1 Improved understanding among government, private sector, local communities and fish workers of acceptable work conditions in the fishing industry
Output 2.1.1: Improved private sector support of government policies related to labor and labor exploitation including FL/TIP in the fishing industry
Output 2.1.2 MAST Initiative (Multi-stakeholder Initiative for Accountable Supply Chains) is introduced in Indonesia and the Philippines
Output 2.1.3: Increased understanding of labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels among fish workers and community members
Sub-Outcome 2.2: Ability of fish workers and their families to report exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels improved
Output 2.2.1: Reporting mechanisms using appropriate technology created/ strengthened
Sub-Outcome 2.3 Improved access to remedies of FL/TIP and/or exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels
Output 2.3.1: Strengthened networks and referral mechanisms for fish workers on fishing vessels, especially for FL/TIP victims
Output 2.3.2: Updated referral network directory for fish workers on fishing vessels, especially for FL/TIP victims

To achieve the objective, SAFE Seas set out to work closely with various actors who deal with forced labor, trafficking in persons and fishery industry regulation issues in each country. At the national and local levels SAFE Seas works with ministries, public agencies, private businesses and associations, and service providers, as well as ships' captains, civil society organizations (CSOs), and communities.

[10] SAFE Seas Results Framework. Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. December 2018.

The project also involves fish workers as individuals or as members of fish worker associations to combat FL/TIP in the selected implementation sites.[11] At the regional and global levels, SAFE Seas engages other international organizations that have experience in FL/TIP to work on solutions, especially in Indonesia where several initiatives have been launched, to help reduce the incidence of FL/TIP through improved regulation and increased awareness.

In both countries, as a crosscutting strategy supporting both outcomes, the project convenes a Safe Fishing Alliance (SFA) at national and local levels, bringing together government, private sector, and civil society representatives, as well as workers associations to guide the project activities. Three working groups are proposed as the standard cross-country approach; the first focusing on policy and regulations; the second on labor inspection; and the third on awareness, access to reporting, and remediation services.

The main strategies and activities under each outcome are as follows:

OUTCOME 1**.** Toward Outcome 1, SAFE Seas works with government and other concerned agencies at national and sub-national levels to bring about improvements in policy and regulatory frameworks for protection of fishers, as well as inclusion of labor standards in fishing vessel inspection.

Sub-outcome 1.1: Regulatory and policy framework

Towards the improvement of the regulatory and policy framework SAFE Seas works via the formation of multi-stakeholder advisory groups, known as SFAs, to drive the project at national and sub-national levels. In Indonesia the SFA is a newly created structure, while in the Philippines it is situated within the existing government mandated Inter-Agency Council Against Trafficking (IACAT).

The project creates opportunities for stakeholders to discuss policy reform both within and outside of the SFA structure, for example with the tuna industry federation in Mindanao in the Philippines. The intention is to review the national policies and regulations on FL and TIP, using the project's pre-situational analysis as a reference guide, and develop a policy milestone plan, and to eventually strengthen regulations and policies, including drafting of policies.

Sub-Outcome 1.2: Quality of labor-inclusive inspections on fishing vessels procedures and implementation improved

The project aims to facilitate improved inspection of labor conditions on fishing vessels by facilitating a coordinated approach among the related agencies that are involved in vessel inspections, in addition to the labor ministries. The approach is dependent on consultation with the related agencies and may take the form of joint agency or multi-disciplinary inspections or harmonized processes across agencies to ensure inclusion of labor inspection and indicators of FL and TIP. Steps involved per country vary, but include providing exposure to international practices, developing harmonized inspection guidelines, trialing multi-agency inspections in provincial locations; revising inspection tools and training inspectors to implement guidelines; supporting the inspection working groups (national/local) to implement, monitoring and learning from multi-disciplinary inspections, and engaging in dialogue with the private sector to prepare them for changes to procedures.

Outcome 2. Activities under Outcome 2 focus on raising awareness among fishers and their communities, the private sector, and government parties on acceptable conditions of work for fishers; increased access of fishers to reporting services in case of grievances; and improved access to remedies. Key activities per sub-outcome include:

[11] In Indonesia, key government stakeholders include the Coordinating Ministry for Maritime and Investment Affairs (CMMIA), the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF), Ministry of Transportation (MOT) and the Ministry of Manpower (MOM). In the Philippines, key government stakeholders are the Department of Labor and Employment's (DOLE) Bureau of Working Conditions (BWC), Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR), Maritime Industry Authority (MARINA), Department of Justice (DOJ), Philippine National Police (PNP), and the Philippine Coast Guard (PCG).

Sub-Outcome 2.1: Improved understanding among government, private sector, local communities, and fish workers of acceptable work conditions in the fishing industry

Awareness raising and education activities are directed at three main groups, fish workers and communities, the private sector, and the government. The main activities comprise awareness raising campaigns within local fishing communities via community meetings and distribution of information, education, and communication (IEC) materials on vessels and in ports; building capacity of community-based organizations to support implementation of the campaign; building private sector support for polices on working conditions in fishing through dialogue and advocacy; and introducing a supply-chain advocacy approach based on the MAST approach in Thailand. This is a joint Thai-US coalition, led by the Thai Labor Rights Protection Network that addresses the root causes of trafficking in the Southeast Asia seafood sector; providing training for private sector recruitment companies on regulations governing fisher employment; and enhancing training for fishing industry workers on fishers' rights and related regulations in fishing industry vocational institutions (Indonesia).

Sub-Outcome 2.2: Ability of fish workers and their families to report exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels improved

Key strategies for strengthening reporting mechanisms are supporting establishment of help desks in fish ports and/or grievance hotlines dedicated to fish workers; establishing an early detection system in local communities through building village-level leadership on awareness of fishers' labor rights and forming linkages with reporting mechanisms; and strengthening the national reporting information system by housing a reporting database and a remediation services database through creation of a web-based portal.

Sub-Outcome 2.3: Improved access to remedies of FL/TIP and/or exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels

Linked with improving reporting services, and adapted to national contexts, the activities supporting access to remedial services involves developing improved service delivery and referral network guidelines; producing an online and hard copy service directory to facilitate referral of victims/survivors to service organizations; strengthening referral networks for remedial services; increasing fishers' awareness of support services; and supporting the service delivery groups to use data on the FishingPort.net.

Implementation sites and partners. In Indonesia, SAFE Seas works in three locations: Jakarta, where national level policy, coordination, and awareness raising activities take place; North Sulawesi Province (Bitung district); and Central Java Province (Tegal district, Brebes district, and Pemalang district). Plan partnered with DFW to implement activities under Outcome 2 in North Sulawesi and Central Java through a sub-agreement from June 2019 to September 2021. In the Philippines, SAFE Seas is implemented at the national level and in Palawan Island (Tay Tay municipality and Puerto Princesa City), General Santos City, and Sarangani Province (Glan and Kiamba municipalities). See the map of project sites in Figure 1. Plan's implementing partner, OND Hesed, was responsible for implementing activities in Sarangani Province and General Santos City from May 2018 until September 2021.

FIGURE 1. MAP OF PROJECT SITES

Credit: SAFE Seas

2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

This section describes the objectives of the final evaluation of SAFE Seas, and the details of the methodology, including the evaluation questions, data sources, schedule, data collection and analysis methods, and the limitations encountered.

2.1 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The evaluation is intended to provide ILAB, Plan International, and the project's implementing partners with an assessment of the project's performance as the project nears completion. The evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations are also intended to inform project actions prior to closeout that may improve the sustainability of the results, and to inform the design of future efforts to eliminate forced labor and human trafficking in fishing.

The specific objectives of the final evaluation, established by the Terms of Reference (TOR, **Annex F**) are to:

- Assess whether the project has achieved its objectives and outcomes, identifying the challenges encountered in doing so, and analyze the driving factors for these challenges;
- Assess the intended and unintended effects of the project;
- Assess the lessons learned and emerging good practices from the project (e.g., strategies and models of intervention) and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future projects in the focus country(ies) and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors;
- Assess which outcomes or outputs can be deemed sustainable; and
- Provide recommendations to inform the project's closeout phase and future efforts towards the protection of fishing workers from labor exploitation.

2.2 METHODOLOGY

2.2.1 EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND DATA SOURCES

The evaluation responds to a set of questions developed by ILAB in consultation with Plan International and AIR. These questions address themes within the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. **Table 2** lists the evaluation questions and the section of the report where each question is answered. The detailed matrix of questions and the data collection method applied for each is found in the TOR.

TABLE 2. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

No.	Question	Report Section
Relevance and Coherence		
1	To what degree is the project design, theory of change and intervention logic appropriate and adequate to combat forced labor and human trafficking on fishing vessels in Indonesia and the Philippines?	3.1.1
2	To what extent are the project strategies relevant to the specific needs of project participants, communities, and other stakeholders?	3.1.2
3	To what extent has the project established links and coordinated with government-led efforts to eliminate FL and TIP and with other donor-funded interventions?	3.1.3
Effectiveness and Efficiency		
4	To what extent is the project making progress towards its primary objective and planned outcomes? What are the key results achieved so far, specifically regarding improving the: a) regulatory and policy framework to combat labor exploitation on fishing vessels and the quality of labor-inclusive inspections on fishing vessels? b) understanding among government, private sector, local communities, and fish workers of acceptable work conditions in the fishing industry? c) ability to fish workers and their families to report exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels? d) access of fishery workers to remedies of FL/TIP or exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels?	3.2
5	What are the key internal or external factors that limit or facilitate the achievement of project outcomes?	3.2
6	How effective and efficient are the project's intervention and management strategies? What are the key strengths and weaknesses in project implementation and management? What areas could have been improved?	3.3.1
7	To what extent were the midterm evaluation's recommendations adopted by the project management?	3.2.1
8	Does the project's Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP) provide a valid means to monitor project progress and achievements; and to what extent has the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system been effectively used by the project to inform management decision making?	3.3.2
9	To what extent has gender mainstreaming been addressed by the project? Has the project integrated gender equality as a cross-cutting concern throughout its methodology and all deliverables?	3.2.5
10	How has the COVID-19 pandemic influenced project results and effectiveness, and how has the project adapted to this changing context	3.2.1, 3.2.2,3.2.3
Sustainability		
11	To what extent has a phase out strategy been defined and what steps have been taken to ensure sustainability?	3.4.1

No.	Question	Report Section
12	To what extent are the project's plans for sustainability adapted to the local level, national level, and capacity of implementing partners?[12]	3.4.1

The evaluation team addressed the evaluation questions using multiple sources of evidence – document review, in-person and remote interviews, and focus groups. The sources of data combined primary qualitative data with secondary qualitative and quantitative data, to the extent that it was available, as described below.

2.2.2 EVALUATION TEAM AND SCHEDULE

The evaluation team comprised of a lead evaluator and two national evaluation specialists, one in the Philippines and one in Indonesia. In Indonesia, the team was supported by interpreters for stakeholder interviews and meetings conducted in Indonesian.

The team conducted the evaluation through three main phases - desk review and data collection planning, data collection, and data analysis and reporting - in collaboration with the SAFE Seas project team and ILAB. The desk review and data collection planning phase began in July 2022 with a kick-off meeting held between ILAB, SAFE Seas representatives, and the evaluation team. At ILAB's request, the SAFE Seas team provided an initial schedule and list of stakeholders for consideration by the evaluation team. The evaluation team then coordinated with the project teams in the Philippines and Indonesia to refine the stakeholder list and develop the detailed data collection itinerary per country. The aim of the stakeholder selection was to provide the evaluation team with as wide a cross-section as possible of the project stakeholders to provide a holistic view of the project's performance.

The review of project documents, products and background materials began during the preparation phase and continued throughout the evaluation process.

The evaluation team coordinated with the project to ensure that the evaluation data collection process did not interrupt the scheduled SAFE Seas Philippines project stakeholder Summit, held on September 22 and 23, 2022. The team therefore conducted a small number of orientation interviews with the Project Director and Plan US representatives, in addition to the briefing with the ILAB project manager, prior to the field work to optimize the time available in-country.[13]

The in-country field work was conducted from September 5 to 20, beginning in the Philippines (September 5 to 12) and continuing in Indonesia (September 13 to 20). To further optimize the breadth of stakeholder consultation within the timeframe, the national consultant in Indonesia conducted several interviews in Central Java project sites on September 5-6. In the Philippines, stakeholder interviews were held in Manila and Palawan, while in Indonesia interviews were held at national level in Jakarta and at subnational level in Central Java and North Sulawesi provinces.

2.2.3 DATA COLLECTION METHODS AND STAKEHOLDER SAMPLING

The evaluation team used the following methods to gather primary and secondary data:

DOCUMENT REVIEW. The evaluation team reviewed numerous project documents and context publications including the project document, CMEP, Pre-situational Analysis Report, semi-annual

[12] The evaluation also assesses the likely prospect of sustainability for key project outcomes as required by the TOR.

[13] The Plan US project manager left their position at Plan International during this period, so the briefing was held with the Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Learning Manager at Plan US.

Technical Progress Reports, project modification approvals, technical and knowledge products, communications campaign materials, and other supporting materials. **Annex C** provides a complete list of the documents reviewed.

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS. The evaluation team collected primary data using in-person and remote KIIs and FGDs designed to obtain perspectives from a comprehensive range of stakeholders on the project's implementation and progress. The data collection instruments are included at **Annex E.**

The ILAB and Plan interviews were comprised of representatives from ILAB, Plan International National Offices (including current and former officers during the life of the project), the SAFE Seas project staff (including a former National Coordinator in Indonesia), and implementing partner staff. Stakeholder KIIs and FGDs were held in each country with national government and other national-level stakeholders, subnational stakeholders from government, private sector, and fisher communities and their representatives from the project sites.

At the community level, the evaluation team visited one fishing community directly in the Philippines where they interviewed a representative of the village council and a group of fishers and fishers' family members, fisher representatives, and local community authorities. In Indonesia the team interviewed members of fishing communities on Lembeh island, Bitung, North Sulawesi, and in Tegal district, Central Java. They also observed onshore port operations in Bitung Oceanic Port.

The team interviewed a total of 109 respondents, (44 percent female and 56 percent male),[14] including 11 respondents at the international level, 17 SAFE Seas project staff, 42 stakeholders in the Philippines, and 39 stakeholders in Indonesia.

Table 3 shows the sample characteristics by stakeholder group and gender identity.

TABLE 3. INTERVIEWEE SAMPLE SIZE AND CHARACTERISTICS

Stakeholder Group	Male	Female	Total	Respondents
ILAB		2	2	Project manager, former project manager Plan USNO
Plan US National Office		3	3	Current and former project management team
Plan Philippines		1	1	Program Specialist
YPII	3	2	5	Executive Director, program managers
SAFE Seas Project Team	**11**	**6**	**17**	
Project Management	2		2	Project Director, M&E Manager
Project staff Philippines	5	5	10	Coordinator, team members
Project staff Indonesia	3		3	Indonesia coordinator, fisher center field officers
Consultants	1	1	2	Inspection manual and training

[14] Based on self-identified gender. None of the interviewees self-identified as non-binary.

Stakeholder Group	Male	Female	Total	Respondents
Philippines Stakeholders	**17**	**25**	**42**	
Former implementing partner	1	1	2	OND Hesed
National government	1	6	7	DOJ, DOLE, police, national coast guard, Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Local government – Mindanao and Palawan	11	14	25	Members of sub-national IACATs), barangay councilors, FARMCs
Community representatives	4	4	8	Barangay councilor, community members in Barangay Mandaragat
Indonesia Stakeholders	**30**	**9**	**39**	
Former implementing partner	2		2	Destructive Fishing Watch
National government/ILO	5		5	CMMIA, MMAF
Local government & university	15	2	17	MOM, MMAF, University of Diponogoro
Private sector	2		2	Fishing vessel operators
Civil society and community representatives	6	7	13	Fisher Center actors, village leaders and community members in North Sulawesi and Central Java
Total	**61**	**48**	**109**	

EXIT MEETINGS AND STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS. Following the stakeholder interviews, the evaluation team and SAFE Seas staff organized stakeholder workshops in each country (September 12 in Manila, the Philippines and September 20 in Jakarta, Indonesia) to present the preliminary findings of the evaluation and to seek further inputs from the stakeholders, particularly on questions of sustainability pathways. These two workshops were organized for the purpose of the evaluation and were separate from the stakeholder workshop USDOL staff attended September 22-23. In the Philippines the stakeholder workshop was held in an online format via Zoom and attended by approximately 30 stakeholders from national and provincial sites. Discussion was held in plenary format, facilitated by the evaluation team. In Indonesia the workshop was conducted in a hybrid format and project staff gathered stakeholders in person at venues in Jakarta, North Sulawesi and Tegal, Central Java, with online interpreting provided. Sixty-seven (67) participants attended, including 17 at national level (Plan and project staff included), 25 in North Sulawesi, and 25 in Central Java. The gender breakdown was 69 percent male and 31 percent female. Participants in Indonesia were organized into breakout groups by location to respond to questions posed by the evaluation team regarding a) the project results that should be sustained and b) the recommended pathway towards their sustainability. The hybrid workshop format in Indonesia, where stakeholders responded to the discussion questions in break-out groups by location, produced significantly more response to the evaluation findings and the discussion questions than in the Philippines, where the participants' feedback was solicited online and in plenary mode. The evaluation team also held exit meetings with the project staff in each country to discuss the initial findings.

A fieldwork de-brief meeting was held with ILAB representatives on October 5, 2022, to present the evaluation team's reflections on the fieldwork and initial findings.

2.2.4 DATA ANALYSIS

The lead evaluator synthesized and consolidated the evaluation material from the range of data sources and stakeholder perspectives, triangulating information to strengthen the credibility and validity of the findings in response to each evaluation question. During the consolidation and analysis process, the evaluation team requested further assistance from Plan International to clarify any questions or request missing or additional information.

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS**.** The evaluator categorized and synthesized the data captured from the KII and FGD transcripts according to the evaluation questions. The qualitative data summaries were then triangulated with the data obtained from the CMEP reporting to develop the evaluation's findings.

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS**.** Secondary data consisted principally of CMEP monitoring data. The lead evaluator analyzed project monitoring data to assess the performance of activities relative to expected results and summarized the latest available Technical Progress Report (TPR) reporting of project results (April 2022 TPR), both quantitative and qualitative data for comparison with project targets. The evaluation team's analysis of these data was compared and correlated with the findings from the qualitative data collection.

2.2.5 STRENGTHS, LIMITATIONS, AND MITIGATING MEASURES

The ability to conduct in-person data collection following the relaxation of COVID-19 restrictions enabled the evaluation team to gain a much richer understanding of the project context than a virtual mode would permit. The schedule and the range of stakeholders whom the team was able to interview proved satisfactory overall, especially among multiple government levels in the Philippines and at sub-national level in Indonesia. However, some limitations arose from the relatively short timeframe available per country as described below.

Time limitations. The timing of the SAFE Seas Philippines Project Summit (22-23 September 2022) and other commitments of the project team limited the overall time available for the project to host the in-country evaluation field work to 16 days. The SAFE Seas team and the evaluation team, in collaboration with ILAB, agreed to schedule the in-country data collection prior to the SAFE Seas Philippines project exit Summit. The schedule was also determined by the need to circulate the evaluation report for comment prior to the project completion.

As noted, the limitation was mitigated by conducting a small number of staff interviews online prior to the country visits, and in the Philippines, the project team gathered multiple stakeholders from national and sub-national levels in a single venue in both Manila, Mindanao, and Palawan. This aided the efficiency of the process in the Philippines, but the timetable only permitted the team to visit one fishing community directly, while barangay level representatives interviewed were mostly active leaders in project activities. This was mitigated by drawing on project testimonies from the barangay level as well as interviews conducted with community members in the interim evaluation. In Indonesia, the national consultant conducted data collection in Central Java prior to the arrival of the lead consultant, which enabled stakeholders to be interviewed in both implementation sites. Nevertheless, more community level interviews would have been preferred, as well as more interviews with fishing industry representatives in both countries. No private sector representatives were nominated for interview in the Philippines by the SAFE Seas staff.

Stakeholder availability. In Indonesia, only two ministries were represented in interviews representing national actors in the Safe Fishing Alliance. Representatives of the Ministry of Manpower were included in the itinerary but were not available at the appointed time, nor for subsequent online meetings, despite attempts to reach them and the option to provide written responses by email to evaluation questions. The project team explained that the ministry has had a relatively low level of engagement

in project activities and in the national Safe Fishing Alliance. In seeking to gauge the engagement of all the project's target stakeholders, the evaluation team mitigated the gap at national level by requesting documentary evidence of meetings with national level parties, or relevant activities of the national government ministries.

The Plan USNO and the SAFE Seas project team experienced staff turnover, particularly in the second half of the project, but the evaluation team was able to secure interviews with former Plan US project managers and a former National Project Coordinator in Indonesia.

Planning phase efficiency. Time was lost and the methodology hindered in the initial planning and stakeholder identification phase as the project country teams produced draft itineraries and stakeholder lists, at ILAB's request, prior to the introduction of the lead evaluator and project team. This resulted in multiple revisions of the itinerary to ensure that key stakeholder groups were included, such as private sector stakeholder representatives, and adequate time to interview project staff. As a lesson for future evaluations, it is important for the evaluator to have the opportunity to provide the project team guidance on the stakeholder sampling and schedule development as early as possible in the planning.

3. FINDINGS

This section presents the evaluation findings in response to the evaluation questions, organized according to the criteria: relevance and coherence of the project; effectiveness of the interventions – providing an assessment of the extent of SAFE Seas' achievements; effectiveness and efficiency of management; and sustainability. The discussion considers the project's performance per country and at a cross-country level where appropriate.

3.1 RELEVANCE AND COHERENCE OF THE PROJECT

This section answers the evaluation questions related to the validity of the project design; in essence, did the project do "the right things" to respond to the issues? It also considers the extent to which the project continued to be relevant to stakeholders' expressed needs, particularly those expressed in the evaluation interviews, and the extent to which the project established links with government-led efforts to eliminate FL and TIP and with other donor-funded interventions, with a focus on development since the interim evaluation.

This section responds to the evaluation questions concerning the relevance and validity of the project design to combat FL and human trafficking in fishing vessels in Indonesia and the Philippines; the extent of relevance to the needs of project participants, communities, and other stakeholders; and the extent of coherence and coordination with government-led efforts and other donor-funded interventions.

3.1.1 VALIDITY OF THE PROJECT DESIGN

- The interventions designed under the Theory of Change represent a valid response to address the specific factors contributing to labor exploitation of fishers in both countries, but addressing private sector compliance in various parts of the employment supply chain could have been given higher priority.
- The site selection and thematic coverage of labor protection in all types of fishing, commercial as well as artisanal, and domestic as well as migrant fishing led to an ambitious design in practical terms.

Context, site selection and problem analysis. Indonesia was pre-selected in the FOA, based on widely documented cases of labor exploitation of fishers, both domestic and foreign flag. The Philippines was nominated by Plan among several possible countries. The project's situational analysis confirmed that labor abuse in fishing is a significant concern in both the Philippines and Indonesia, justifying the selection of the country for SAFE Seas. At the same time, the structure of the industry is different in the two countries. Indonesia has a larger proportion of commercial fishing and fishers engaged on foreign flag vessels, while the Philippines has a mix of artisanal fishing (making up a large proportion of fishing in Palawan) and commercial fishing (concentrated in major ports such as General Santos City and Navotas Fish Port in Manila), with a small proportion engaged in foreign-flag fishing.

In each country, commercial fishing and artisanal or municipal fishing are governed by various government departments and regulations. Exploitative practices occur in both commercial and artisanal fishing, as confirmed by the SAFE Seas experience under project implementation and its research studies. The project designed context-appropriate strategies to address the issues in all its sites, but this made for a very wide scope of intervention, considering the mix of artisanal and commercial fishing in the Philippines sites, and the mix of domestic and foreign-flag recruitment in Indonesia.

The project's understanding of the issues to be addressed was enhanced through the Pre-situational Analysis studies conducted in each country. In the Philippines in particular, the situation analysis identified issues of child labor in artisanal and small-scale commercial fleets, where children frequently work with their families; while in General Santos, FL is associated with IUU fishing, leaving unregistered fishers open to abuse.

SAFE Seas' analysis of the contributing factors to forced labor was quite comprehensive in each country. The key issues identified in Indonesia were: the lack of harmonization between the existing framework of regulatory laws and policies; multiple jurisdictions of the agencies with mandate to inspect fishing vessels and lack of coordinated procedures, as well as limited inspection resources; frequent disregard among private sector recruitment agencies for foreign flag vessels; lack of awareness of their rights among fishers themselves and lack of awareness of the issue among the general public; and under-developed and inaccessible systems and services for grievance reporting.

In the Philippines, similarly, the legal and regulatory structure addressing fishers' conditions exists and is aligned with ILO C.188 but is poorly enforced and not accepted by all stakeholders. Regarding inspection practice, there was a lack of institutional capacity and procedures for monitoring, inspection, and enforcement among multiple agencies with relevant mandates, as well as a lack of systematic documentation of cases of labor exploitation and FL/TIP. The project document also noted lack of policy to provide incentives to encourage good labor practices; the vulnerability of fishers and their lack of awareness of their rights together with a lack of broader societal awareness (fishers in both commercial and artisanal fishing accept debt bondage as the "norm"); and under-developed grievance reporting and remediation services.

However, the factors in non-compliance among various fishing industry actors along the supply chain were perhaps not fully understood at the time of the project design but have become more apparent as the project teams deepened their knowledge and experience in each context, and through further research commissioned by the project. In the latter half of the project, studies of the fishing labor supply chain were initiated in each country to delve deeper into fishing recruitment practices and the points at which labor rights issues arise. The Indonesia supply chain mapping draft report was completed in April 2021, while the labor supply chain mapping study in the Philippines began in 2022 and will be completed in mid-November.[15] The timing of the research studies did not permit adjustment to the design of the project activities themselves, but they do shed light on critical issues for future interventions to address, as discussed in Section 3.2.

SAFE Seas also made concerted efforts to understand the gendered impacts of labor exploitation in fishing, for example through a gender-focused study in the Philippines completed in 2020, which contributed to the design of activities involving women across the Philippines project sites. A second gender study is underway in Indonesia with expected completion in the third week of November 2022, prior to the project closure.

Validity of the theory of change and designed strategies. The project theory of change is presented in the FOA (FOA-ILAB-17-04) setting out the project objective, outcomes, and supporting outcomes. This was based on ILAB's initial analysis of the factors contributing to labor abuse in fishing in the Asia Pacific region and specific research in Indonesia. Plan's SAFE Seas proposal followed this design, introducing its own specific strategies for the two countries, and making some adaptation in the CMEP development and under implementation. The framework proposed two major clusters of strategies – those aimed at improving the governance of fishers' protection, through harmonization of rules and coordinated enforcement procedures (Outcome 1), and those aimed at improving the prevention of fishers' exploitation through multi-stakeholder awareness of fishers' rights and their access to grievance reporting services (Outcome 2). Broadly speaking, Outcome 1 strategies are focused on regulatory frameworks and duty-bearers, while Outcome 2 is focused on fishers' awareness and access to community-based services. The theory represented in the project document and project publications is that:

[15] Both studies were conducted by Humanity Research consultancy.

IF:

- Government regulations policies and institutional capacity to combat labor exploitation of fishing vessels are improved;
- Workers' understanding of acceptable working conditions and government policies is improved;
- Private sector support for acceptable working conditions is improved; and
- Workers' access to reporting and remediation services is increased;

THEN the systems for prevention of and enforcement against labor exploitation and FL on fishing vessels will be improved, thus contributing to decreased incidence of FL and other forms of labor abuse of fishers.

The results framework derives from this TOC and essentially includes four strategic pillars – regulatory and policy change and coordination among institutions (SO 1.1); improved labor inspection of fishing vessels (SO 1.2), improved awareness among fishers, government, and the private sector (2.1), and improved access to reporting and remediation (SO 2.2 and SO 2.3).

The evaluation considers that the scope of interventions represented in the four pillars is valid, and that each of the strategy areas addresses key problems identified in the project's analysis and which continued to exist.

Given the key issue of limited coordination among government actors in each country, SAFE Seas' overarching approach of bringing government and other stakeholders together through forums at the national and sub-national levels to discuss the issues and drive the agenda forward, proved to be a valid and mostly relevant strategy in Indonesia and the Philippines. The relevance to specific actors and their engagement with the project varied, as will be discussed below.

The evaluation analysis noted some weaker elements in the overall logic and design strategies. Chief among these, the design includes but does not place a major emphasis on a range of strategies to influence the private sector, including exerting external pressure through consumer pressure. The trade unions, including the Indonesian Migrant Workers' Union (SBMI) and the Center of United and Progressive Workers in the Philippines, could have been more engaged in the alliances to influence private sector practices.

3.1.2 RELEVANCE TO STAKEHOLDER NEEDS

- In broad terms, SAFE Seas' approach and its interventions proved highly relevant to the needs of its stakeholders at the level of national and subnational government and among fishing communities and their representative associations in both countries. Indonesia's CMMIA has seen the value of the project throughout, and the project gained strong traction with the government in North Sulawesi. Nevertheless, in Indonesia there were pockets of weak engagement among some key actors at national level and at the provincial level in Central Java. In the Philippines, the DOJ and members of the IACAT found the project support highly relevant to their anti-trafficking agenda, while the high-level response within the DOLE, MARINA, and the Department of Agriculture's BFAR is less apparent.
- The project activities proved highly relevant to the communities in each of its project sites in the Philippines and Indonesia.

Indonesia

Since its inception, SAFE Seas has been relevant to the GOI stated intentions to improve coordinated action to protect fishing workers at home and on foreign-flag vessels. The project team collaborated with the multi-sector agencies from the outset to discuss and design the project implementation. The focal point ministries involved were the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF), the Ministry of Manpower (MOM) and the Ministry of Transport (MOT, under the lead of the CMMIA). The CMMIA

representatives have found the project highly relevant to Indonesia's needs and have shared the resourcing of meetings and events, according to the representative interviewed by the evaluation team. MMAF support and appreciation of the project also appears to have been steady, and evident in the inauguration of the SAFE Seas fisher center in Tegal by the former Minister. MOM engagement in the National Team or Taskforce supported by the project has varied by all accounts, but it was not possible to hear their perspective directly. Another stakeholder observed that different staff of the ministry are involved in the national team activities and policy drafting at the ministry which undermines the coherence of efforts.

Regionally, agencies in North Sulawesi province exhibit the strongest support and interest in the SAFE Seas agenda. Engaging the provincial governor and hence sub-national ministries in Central Java has been a stumbling block to building an advocacy alliance there, despite the range of networking and advocacy strategies employed by SAFE Seas. In each target province, the response of the relevant agencies has been quite different, where most government agencies, including the MOM and port authorities are highly engaged in North Sulawesi, while the province MMAF representatives at the Tegalsari port express strong interest and cooperation in the activities in Central Java. A port authority representative expressed that the project has been relevant to both fishers and boat owners:

> "What is very important about the SAFE Seas project is that it not only helps fishing ship crews, but also involves boat owners to improve fisher's welfare. In this project we can empower boat owners to further improve the welfare of fishers"

Other parties that appreciated the relevance of the SAFE Seas advocacy over the project life include academics at the University of Central Java, who promoted the SFA in Central Java, as well as polytechnic colleges in Bitung (Marine Polytechnic KP, Bitung) and in Central Java that provide basic safety training to fishers. As noted in the interim evaluation, the Bitung polytechnic noted the low take-up of the Basic Safety Training course and hoped that the fisher associations could encourage their members to take the training.

In the community areas covered, representatives of the CSO groups working on fishers' rights conveyed the great significance of this project to them, pointing out that before SAFE Seas, no other development project has paid attention to the well-being of fishers. They highly appreciated the opportunity provided to build networks and extend their services through the project. In both Tegal and Bitung the village cadres trained by the project highly appreciated being able to support their communities with awareness on the regulations and the companies which are "blacklisted".

Philippines

The **national** government representatives interviewed during the final evaluation, some of whom were the same individuals interviewed at midterm, continue to reflect that the project has been relevant to their interests to see labor conditions in fishing well-regulated through the laws and their application. The membership of the IACAT taskforce on seafarers and fishers, including DOJ as the chair, DOLE, and the BFAR representative - a recent addition to the taskforce, found that the project supported their existing efforts and provided an important space for discussion of the issues. Representatives of IACAT members conveyed the view, however, that the decision-making levels of their departments are not yet able to fully commit to taking the lead on the enforcement harmonizing agenda. This could pose a risk to the implementation progress of the IACAT draft Philippines National Strategic Action Plan Against Trafficking in Persons (2023-2027), as discussed further in the report. SAFE Seas staff additionally informed the evaluation team that membership of the taskforce has fluctuated during the term of the project. For example, Greenpeace is no longer active in the alliance. The SAFE Seas staff attributed this to turnover in the organization and the interests of individual representatives.

The most fervent expressions of support for the project's work were heard from representatives at the **sub-national level of government** who greatly valued the support in raising the profile of the issue on local government agendas. The evaluation team frequently heard from various government officers, including maritime police, social welfare officers and coast guard representatives that the project has "opened their eyes" to the problems faced by fishers, bringing the issue into public visibility, and supporting the concerned departments to work together at the provincial and city levels.

Among the communities, represented by barangay councils as well as barangay levels of the FARMCs, the project's orientation/education efforts were highly appreciated by representatives interviewed by the team. Among the FARMC leaders, some have direct experience of violence perpetrated against them as fishing crew members and highly value SAFE Seas' contribution to enforcement, including detection and prosecution of cases. These expressions of support are recounted further in Section 3.2. Women in the communities, most of whom are wives or mothers of fishers, or who join in family-scale fishing, would like to see additional support to develop alternative livelihoods to reduce their vulnerability, though this was not an avenue within the project scope.

The final evaluation had no access to fishing vessel operators and companies to assess their perceptions. The project reports indicate that local fishing operators were receptive to the orientation sessions held together with fishing companies, while the project continued networking with the SOCCSKARGEN Federation of Fisheries and Allied Industries (SFAII) in Mindanao region[16].

3.1.3 COHERENCE WITH GOVERNMENT AND DONOR EFFORTS

Coherence with government policy and programs. The project is well aligned with the Government of Indonesia's (GOI) ongoing efforts to protect the rights of fishers, led by the CMMIA and the MMAF. From 2015, the government began introducing legislation to protect fisher's labor rights with the issue of three regulations by the MMAF (Regulation No. 35/2015 on Human Rights Certification in the Fishery Industry, Regulation No. 42/2016 on the Sea Working Agreement, and Regulation No. 42/17 on Human Rights Certification in the Fishing Industry. Recently in June 2022, the GOI issued a regulation No. 22/2022 on the Placement and Protection of the Crew of Migrant Trading Vessels and Fishing Crews, ratifying the 2017 law on protection of migrant workers under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Manpower. The project's support to improving vessel inspection is coherent with the MMAF regulations, while its broader advocacy for fair recruitment of Indonesian migrant fishers is supportive of MOM policy frameworks for the protection of migrant workers.

The remediation services introduced at the community level have additionally been linked with the national reporting mechanisms, for example, through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for migrant fisher grievances.

In the Philippines, the project is well aligned with the legal framework for anti-trafficking in persons represented in Republic Act (RA) No. 9208, as amended by RA No. 10364, 2012. Under the DOJ, the IACAT operates a hotline number and referral system. It is also coherent with government efforts to promulgate the laws and regulations on work in fishing covered by the following regulations:

- DOLE Department Order 156-16: Rules and Regulations Governing the Working and Living Conditions of Fishers on Board Fishing Vessels Engaged in Commercial Fishing Operation[17]
- Maritime Industry Authority (MARINA): Philippine Fishing Vessel Safety Rules and Regulations (PFVSRR)
- Philippines Fisheries Code

[16] Refers to the region comprising South Cotabato, Cotabato, Sultan Kadarat, Sarangani and General Santos.

[17] https://www.dole.gov.ph/news/department-order-no-156-16-rules-and-regulations-governing-the-working-and-living-conditions-of-fishers-on-board-fishing-vessels-engaged-in-commercial-fishing-operation/

The backbone of the project strategy was to establish close linkages with government efforts, chiefly through the Inter-Agency Council Against Trafficking and its Technical Working Group on Seafarers and Fishers. In addition to working closely with IACAT and its respective provincial and municipal iterations, SAFE Seas has established bilateral linkages through memoranda of understanding and agreements with DOLE, MARINA, and DOJ, the convenor of the IACAT.

The project also works closely with the FARMC council structure, a government endorsed council, particularly channeling advocacy efforts through the subnational levels of the council.

Coherence with other donor-funded efforts. The interest of donors to support labor rights of fishers in Southeast Asia and the Pacific has expanded in recent years and several projects are operating in the region, including in Indonesia and the Philippines. Two ILO projects are of most relevance to the SAFE Seas intervention - the Alliance 8.7 Incubator Lab, focused on fishing in Indonesia (funded by Norway) [18], and the Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia project. SAFE Seas has collaborated with the Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia project since its inception, and recently participated in the SEA forum on decent work in labor and seafood processing hosted by the ILO in Bali. SAFE Seas has collaborated with ILO's Alliance 8.7 Incubator Lab (fishing component), since it began in 2021, inviting ILO to meetings and vice versa. Nevertheless, SAFE Seas and ILO Alliance 8.7 Incubator both address the same objective regarding labor inspection in fishing, and ILO recently participated in national level discussions on labor inspection, hosted by the MMAF, to which SAFE Seas has not been party. Mutually supportive efforts could benefit from coordination at the donor level and through respective government labor office representatives.

3.2 EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERVENTIONS

This section discusses SAFE Seas' progress and achievements compared with its objectives, as well as unexpected results, and the factors supporting or constraining the achievements.

The assessment begins with an overview of implementation progress, including an appraisal of the Grantee's response to the interim evaluation recommendations (Section 3.2.1). It then examines the extent of the achievements and intervening factors in Indonesia and the Philippines in turn, according to the project's outcomes (Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3). The report then examines the project's effectiveness in responding to gender issues related to labor exploitation in fishing (Section 3.2.4). Lastly, this section includes a discussion of cross-border effects, and contributions to knowledge (Section 3.2.5).

3.2.1 IMPLEMENTATION PATH AND RESPONSE TO INTERIM EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

- Despite the restrictions on movement imposed by COVID-19 midway in the project life, SAFE Seas has successfully delivered most of its planned interventions.
- SAFE Seas used the additional 12 months effectively in both the Philippines and Indonesia. Key examples include rolling out capacity building for multi-disciplinary inspection through tools, training manuals and training for marine, labor inspection, and social welfare personnel in the two countries; elaborating upon operating procedures for the fisher center in North Sulawesi; and strengthening of the community based early warning networks.
- The project accepted and addressed most of the interim evaluation recommendations, particularly regarding to sustainability planning and gender interventions. It was less proactive in responding to the recommendations regarding adjustments to the monitoring and evaluation framework.

Progress of implementation. Looking at the overall implementation pathway of SAFE Seas in the two countries, the project has successfully delivered most of its planned interventions, especially with the benefit of the one-year extension. While Indonesia was the pre-selected country for implementation of

[18] ILO. Indonesia. https://www.ilo.org/jakarta/whatwedo/eventsandmeetings/WCMS_840361/lang--en/index.htm Accessed 28 September 2022

SAFE Seas, the project got off to a later start in the country due to initial delay in approval by the Government of Indonesia. This delay reportedly occurred in part due to Government questions regarding the transfer of YPII from a national to a local organization in early 2018. Rather than the intended start in January 2018, SAFE Seas was eventually launched in October 2018, due to the efforts by YPII and the SAFE Seas Project Director and the incumbent NPC, effectively allowing just over three years for project implementation. In contrast, SAFE Seas commenced operations in the Philippines in early 2018, providing four years for implementation, prior to the granting on the Cost Extension. The Philippines experienced an initial interruption at the management level in late 2019 when the National Project Coordinator resigned, but the current NPC has been in post since April 2020.

By midterm in early 2020, the country teams had successfully laid the partnerships groundwork of the project and made progress in finding avenues for advocacy interventions at the national level in both the Philippines and Indonesia. Progress in advancing sub-national level advocacy was taking off in the Philippines by early 2020, while Indonesia's community level initiatives were in their infancy, based on interviews at midterm and TPR reports to April 2020. With the outbreak of COVID-19 in March 2020, the project experienced significant delays, but the teams found successful ways to adjust their activities to online or social distancing mode. There were intermittent lockdowns in the Philippines and Indonesia throughout 2020 and 2021, when staff could not travel between the central project office and the field, and international travel was prohibited between the two countries. By 2022, operations were largely back to normal, while the teams continued to apply government guidelines regarding mask wearing and physical distancing at meeting venues. (See further discussion in Section 3.3).

Several planned interventions have not been implemented due to restrictions imposed by the pandemic. These include the intended overseas field visit by inspection authorities in other countries in or beyond the region to learn from international good practice in labor-inclusive sea-based enforcement approaches.

Responding to the project's request for additional time to consolidate the progress and complete planned work planned, USDOL granted a cost extension in October 2021, extending the SAFE Seas timeframe to November 2022. The evaluation found overall that the additional 12 months have been effectively used in both the Philippines and Indonesia, particularly in the development of multi-disciplinary inspection training manuals and provision of training for multiple inspection personnel in the two countries, as well as elaboration of operating procedures for the fisher center in North Sulawesi and strengthening of the community-based early warning networks. The project gained modest ground in delivering activities to support building reporting and grievance helpdesks in the Philippines. On the other hand, some activities have been delayed, such as the completion of the supply chain studies that could have informed advocacy with stakeholders earlier.

Response to the Interim Evaluation Recommendations. Overall, the project took actions in the directions suggested by the recommendations, while some recommendations could have been further utilized, particularly those regarding monitoring and evaluation, sustainability planning and documentation, and engagement with the private sector.

The interim evaluation conducted field work in October to November 2020, postponed from March 2020 due to the outbreak of COVID-19. The draft report was made available to the grantee and the project team in January 2021.[19] As required under its Cooperative Agreement the grant recipient considered the recommendations and provided a formal response setting out intended actions to implement the recommendations it accepted. **Annex B** presents the table of recommendations and the Grantee's response, with annotations made by the evaluator.[20]

[19] The final non-PII version of the interim evaluation report was completed in March 2021.

[20] The Project submitted its response to the evaluation recommendations during 2021.

Several recommendations were addressed project-wide (concerning the project extension, CMEP, sustainability planning, and gender responsiveness) or were applicable to both countries, while others were addressed respectively to Indonesia and the Philippines. The scope included sustainability and exit planning (No. 2), improvements to the CMEP framework and application (No. 3),

At project wide level, the evaluation lent support to the proposal for an extension, (No. 1) and the process of formulating the proposal began in early 2021. However, it took several months for Plan to prepare and submit the proposal in compliance with ILAB requirements, and then for the USDOL to approve it, with some negative impacts on retaining staff and hiring new staff.

Sustainability planning (No. 2), Responding to the recommendation for more specific sustainability plans and milestone targets, SAFE Seas produced an updated Sustainability Plan, attached to the October 2021 TPR. The country teams set out strategies for each of the key results areas but did not clearly differentiate between the exit planning in the case of proposed extension being approved or not approved.

CMEP monitoring and evaluation adjustments (No. 3). The evaluation recommended some additional output indicators to better capture the cross-country results, as well as the progress of coordination at the national level. These were not accepted, but the project did not offer a reason in its formal response. Via interviews, staff conveyed that the CMEP was considered difficult to change or that change was not permitted. The element that was accepted was to provide qualitative/narrative explanations of quantitative indicator results. However, based on review of October 2021 and April 2022 Annex A reports, this has not been consistently applied.

Gender responsiveness. The project teams made substantial efforts to increase the responsiveness and relevance to women members of fishing communities (No. 4). This was done through both the situational analysis in General Santos in the Philippines, and through interventions focused on building the capacity of women in the community to be alert to fisher labor abuse in their families and wider community. (See further discussion in Section 3.2.4).

Regarding **sharing SAFE Seas lessons and good practices in Southeast Asia**, capitalizing on cross-country experience (No. 5), the project response was that regional activity is beyond the project scope. Nevertheless, the project proceeded to share the identified good practices with the ILO's Ship to Shore Rights Project, active in 10 countries of Southeast Asia and addressing migrant fishing workers' rights.

SAFE Seas Indonesia response. Indonesia accepted the recommendation to enhance coordination and communication with its partner DFW (No. 6), but different understandings of areas of responsibility persisted, as well as issues with quality of reporting and transparency, and SAFE Seas did not renew the sub-agreement when it expired in September 2021.

SAFE Seas accepted the recommendation (No. 7) to prioritize areas for support to the National Action Plan on (Seafarers and Fishers 2021-2024), proposing that the project would advocate for the National Action Plan to be legally binding through a presidential order and encouraging the national team to conduct advocacy on this at various government levels. Progress on this front is discussed in section 3.2.2. However, documented progress has been limited in 2021 and 2022, either towards the presidential endorsement or the support by the national team for the NAP at national and sub-national levels.

SAFE Seas accepted the recommendation (No. 8) to step up efforts to consolidate the SFA in Central Java, and the project engaged with the provincial MMAF to this end, but the project team did not comment on the suggestion to provide fishing vessel data to the governor of Central Java or share experience from North Sulawesi, though experience sharing did occur in 2022 with the joint training of inspection officers.

The project followed the recommendation to consolidate the fisher center operations, completing SOPs for the Bitung fisher center and identifying a host for the center, but the transition plan for new institutional manager has not yet been resolved in Tegal.

Expansion of private sector advocacy (No. 10) was not pursued in Indonesia, with the reason that it would be expanded once the extension was granted. Though SAFE Seas Indonesia has engaged with the vessel operating companies in North Sulawesi and Tegal, it fell beyond the scope and timeframe to expand activities substantially.

The recommendation (No. 11) regarding improvements to fisher education was accepted, and SAFE Seas Indonesia developed fisher rights education materials for use in fisher training in polytechnics institute in Bitung. The evaluation team did not have the opportunity to interview polytechnic staff but were provided with an example of the learning materials..

SAFE Seas Philippines response. Partially accepting the recommendation regarding staffing shortfalls in Mindanao and Palawan (No. 12), OND Hesed hired additional staff to support fieldwork in Sarangani and General Santos prior to their contract end in September 2021. In Palawan, Plan recruited an additional officer to support field M&E activities in April 2022, bringing the number of field staff to three.

Following the recommendation to prioritize and strengthen the national SFA strategy (No.13), the project team discussed strategies around advocacy on DOLE DO 156-16, but challenges remain in terms of leadership of the national enforcement agenda on fishing and seafarers.

Regarding private sector engagement (No.14), the recommendation was not accepted given the time frame, assuming a closure of November 2021, while the final year has not permitted a substantial expansion. The supply chain mapping study has the benefit of supporting future endeavours beyond SAFE Seas.

At the sub-national level, the Philippines strategy was aligned with the recommendation (No. 15) to strengthen the capacity of the FARMCs to continue advocacy for fishers but stopped short of a training of trainers approach. Similarly, the Philippines team pursued the recommendation (No. 16) to consult with partners on the best model to enhance fisher grievance reporting services. This was in fact in line with their existing approach at the time of the midterm in late 2020, but consultations are still underway.

The project team considered recommendation (No. 17) for data collection on labor abuses in fishing and streamlining data bases to be beyond the scope of the project.

3.2.2 ACHIEVEMENTS IN INDONESIA

The following discussion examines the effectiveness of SAFE Seas' interventions in Indonesia, including achievements and challenges across the project's outcomes and sub-outcomes. The analysis draws on evaluation interviews and project reports and incorporates the project's reported indicator results as of April 2022. **Annex A** presents the project's reported performance on the full set of CMEP results.

OUTCOME 1: IMPROVED ENFORCEMENT TO COMBAT LABOR EXPLOITATION ON FISHING VESSELS

Sub-outcome 1.1 Regulatory and Policy Framework to Combat Labor Exploitation on Fishing Vessels

- SAFE Seas Indonesia succeeded in initiating multi-agency forums for promoting fisher labor protection at the national level and in North Sulawesi. In Central Java the effort to create a forum at provincial and district level was less successful and was not endorsed by the governor.
- The project has made significant progress towards a National Action Plan on Seafarers and Fish Workers Protection, 2021 – 2024, completed as a draft, but endorsement by Presidential order is still pending.

- Toward guidance for ongoing efforts to address fisher labor exploitation on domestic and foreign flag vessels, SAFE Seas commissioned a Supply Chain Mapping study for fishing crew on Indonesian and foreign flagged vessels; however, dissemination has not been carried out.

The discussion below elaborates the detailed findings on the extent of the project's success supporting the regulatory and policy framework in Indonesia and the contributing factors identified by the evaluation.

Building institutional collaboration. The central aim of the project and strategy was to support structures for collaboration at national and sub-national levels to carry forward the agenda of protection of fishers.

Through the concerted efforts of the PD and Indonesia NPC in 2019, SAFE Seas was successful in supporting the formation of a National Team on Fishing Workers' Protection with representatives from 14 agencies, led by the CMMIA, and including the three core ministries involved in the regulation of fishing labor – MOM, MMAF, and MOT. SAFE Seas' direct involvement in supporting the team proceeded from 2019 to late 2021. During the past year, the National SFA team has continued to be active; for example, members attended regional meetings on fisher protection in Taiwan, but the project has had less involvement in supporting the National Team as a whole in the past year. According to the PD and NPC, the approach in the past year has been to allow the national stakeholders to take ownership and steer the national team activities themselves. The evaluation was able to interview representatives from CMMIA and MMAF who attested to the relevance of the national team but indicated that stronger collaboration was still needed from the MOM and MOT. The project itself has not been able to engage these ministries to a significant extent within the collaborative forum. The turnover in SAFE Seas leadership in Indonesia may also have contributed to the slow progress, based on a government representative comment.

As discussed in Section 3.1, in Bitung the wide range of government actors appreciate the importance of the huge North Sulawesi fishing industry to their provincial economy and the place of decent working conditions for fishers in the sustainability of the industry.

In Central Java a provincial forum with membership of government offices was established, but it has not become functional as a multi-stakeholder team, and the official endorsement of the forum by the governor is still pending. During the interim evaluation, one of the reasons given was that provincial government representatives have interests in fishing, representing conflicts of interest. The project staff expressed the view that the provincial MMAF has been actively engaged in project activities, but it has been more difficult to engage the provincial MOM.

In terms of the project's quantitative target, the April 2022 TPR for Indonesia notes that the project target of 10 advisory groups created to promote the safe fishing agenda has been achieved, with advisory groups established across the national level and two provincial sites.[21] However, the quantitative report does not reflect the functioning of the groups which varies considerably between the two provinces and among the sub-groups. As far as the evaluation could ascertain, there is one active national forum or team, divided into three working groups, and two active forums in North Sulawesi, one at Province level and one in Bitung District. In Central Java, a forum has been formed at the provincial level but is awaiting endorsement by provincial governor and is therefore less active. There is no active multi-agency forum at the Tegal district level. (See Annex A).

Improvements to the regulatory and policy frameworks. During 2020 and 2021 the project supported the national team in the development of the National Action Plan on protection of Seafarers and Fishers for 2021-2024 under the leadership of CMMIA. The approval of this plan would provide for

[21] The target represents four working groups at the national level, including the overall team and three thematic working groups on inspection, policy, and awareness; and three advisory groups in each of North Sulawesi and Central Java provinces, mirroring the national structure.

national-level actions to harmonize policies, labor inspection processes, and remediation related to fisher protection. However, one year after the "academic draft" was submitted to the president's office the NAP remains unsigned. The reasons for this are unclear but may relate to a parallel proposal submitted to the presidents' office by the MOM.

Table 4 shows the results reported against the relevant indicators for the sub-outcome as of April 2022 TPR reporting.[22]

TABLE 4. PROGRESS TOWARD REGULATORY AND POLICY IMPROVEMENT

Indicator	Reported narrative results
SO1.1a. Number of policies, regulations of implementation guidelines created and disseminated End of project target: 2 April 2022 target: 2 April 2022 actual:2	• The National Team on Fishworkers' Protection completed a National Action Plan on Protection of Seafarers and Fishers for 2020-2024 in September 2020 (amended to 2021-2024). The plan covers policy harmonization, inspection processes, and remedial processes. The "academic draft" of the plan was submitted to the President's office for endorsement in early 2021, but its approval by presidential order is pending. • Guidance letter on COVID-19 prevention for fishers issued by the MMAF.
SO1.1b. Number of regional and local regulatory frameworks aligned with national frameworks End of project target: 2 April Target: 2 Actual: 2	• **North Sulawesi**: The provincial governor issued a decree to establish the safe fishing working group in March 2020, setting out the tasks and membership of the group and implementation policy. The signed decree was shared with SAFE Seas in April 2020. • The second subnational framework or regulation is not specified in the reporting • **Central Java:** No regulatory frameworks on fisher labor issued with project support

In a further effort to offer forward-looking policy guidance to the national policy makers, SAFE Seas commissioned a supply chain mapping study to investigate practices in the fisher labor supply chain for both Indonesian and foreign flag vessels with a view to develop policy and more effective advocacy in the recruitment process. The study commenced in early 2021 and the final draft (dated April 2021) is attached to the April 2022 TPR. The study not only maps the recruitment and work practices in domestic and foreign flag fishing, but provides recommendations for action by individual ministries, inter-agency collaboration, and avenues for international agencies to support. The evaluation found this study to be of high quality, but one that would have well served the project earlier in its lifespan. The report proposes an overarching roadmap for addressing FL/TIP of Indonesia fishers on domestic vessels through legal and implementation measures, and on foreign flag vessels through international dialogue with flag states. However, it does not take full account in its recommendations of some of SAFE Seas' initiatives that are already well underway, such as coordinated labor inspection of crews.

[22] The tables reflect the project's TPR reported results, supplemented with factual information obtained by the evaluator where the CMEP was incomplete.

The report received USDOL approval in January 2022. [23] The lack of a public launch, seminar or innovative communications event for government and international actors, may be a lost opportunity to see the findings implemented or influence national and international agencies in Indonesia.

Sub-national policy development. The establishment of the North Sulawesi SFA, including its tasks and membership was endorsed by provincial governor decree in March 2020. This ensured continued collaborative action at the province level. In Bitung district a similar document has been prepared but is still awaiting endorsement by the mayor. These policies confirm the solidity of the government commitment to address the issue. In Central Java similar policies have eluded the project, where there is commitment from the provincial MMAF, but less buy-in from the MOM and the provincial governor.

Sub-outcome 1.2: Quality of Labor-Inclusive Inspections on Fishing Vessels

- Progress toward developing joint or multi-disciplinary inspection practices has been strongest in North Sulawesi, where a checklist and procedures were trialled by multiple agencies in including the Bitung port authorities and provincial office of the MOM. In Tegal Port, which comes under the Provincial governor authority, approval has not been given for trial joint inspections to proceed.
- SAFE Seas contributed to capacity of inspectors of MOM and port authorities from North Sulawesi to understand FL and TIP indicators and to pilot a coordinated approach.
- SAFE Seas support to a nationally endorsed system has been limited to discussion of a policy brief and sharing experience from the North Sulawesi multi-disciplinary inspection capacity and piloting. The North Sulawesi joint inspection piloting and tools have been shared with national level ministries, including the MMAF in 2022.

Toward the goal of improving the labor inspection of fishing vessels, the project worked in parallel at the national and provincial levels through advocacy and capacity building interventions over the life of the project. The jurisdiction for inspection of fishing vessels is complex, as it is divided between the Ministry of Manpower, Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, and the Ministry of Transport, while oversight of vessel inspection lies with the MMAF for oceanic ports, and with the provincial governor in smaller/district ports. While the national ministries can establish policies they cannot direct the provincial level, and therefore the policies and procedures need to be established simultaneously at the national and provincial levels.

Selected indicator results reported as of April 2022 are shown in Table 5. This is followed by a discussion of the interventions' success and intervening factors.

TABLE 5. PROGRESS TOWARD LABOR-INCLUSIVE FISHING VESSEL INSPECTION

Indicator	Reported narrative results
OTC1: Improved enforcement to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels Milestone 3 (Oct 2020 – Sept 2021): The related government stakeholders receive improved labor inspection procedures or tools which have labor exploitation indicators including FL/TIP	SAFE Seas conducted training on multidisciplinary inspection for inspectors from relevant agencies in North Sulawesi in March 2022, using the manual and checklist collaboratively developed with the assistance of a consultant team.
SO1.2 Number of joint inspections conducted by members of interagency groups	As reported in October 2020, SAFE Seas facilitated a trial joint fishing vessel inspection in North Sulawesi port in September 2020.

[23] The April 2022 TPR states that the report received USDOL approval in December 2021.

End of project target: 2 April 2022 target: 2 April 2022 actual: 1	As of April 2022 reporting, a second joint inspection was planned and took place in July 2022 as a follow-up to the multidisciplinary inspection training.
OTP 1.2.2 Number of stakeholders that have implemented the roadmap End of Project target: 2 April 2022 target: 2 April 2022 actual: 1	SAFE Seas Indonesia has produced a roadmap of multidisciplinary inspection for labor protection on domestic and foreign fishing vessels. The narrative TPR report refers to the policy brief and roadmap produced by a consultant and shared with national and provincial inspection stakeholders.

From late 2019, the project held a series of meetings with government stakeholders and national and provincial levels resulting in a set of recommendations that were agreed upon by the national SFA representatives. Since then, progress has been strongest in North Sulawesi. SAFE Seas supported the related agencies to develop a joint checklist, taking account of international labor standards, that was pilot tested in 2020, with the participation of the Port authorities and agreement of industry representatives.

To expedite the development of a national policy and road map to multidisciplinary inspection the project called upon international expertise (Sustainability Incubator consultants) to consult with the partners and develop a policy brief in April 2021. The roadmap does not appear to have been adopted by the SFA at national level but has served more as an academic brief and suggested guide.

During the past year, SAFE Seas intensified its efforts supporting multidisciplinary inspection tools and procedures and trialling them, with capacity development focused on authorities in North Sulawesi. SAFE Seas commissioned technical support from the Sustainability Incubator consultant, working together with a local consultant, to develop a training manual for multi-disciplinary Inspection based on a consultation process with relevant agencies.[24] In March 2022, the consultants facilitated a training using the modules, guidelines, and checklist provided. It was attended by inspection personnel from North Sulawesi MOM, MMAF oceanic port authorities, and three inspectors from Central Java, as well as ILO and NGO observers. A key follow-up to the training was the implementation of a joint inspection conducted in July with three days of activities: refresher of the tools and planning on who does what and using which tools (Day 1); physical inspections at Bitung port with participation of MOM, MMAF personnel, and the harbormaster (Day 2); and discussion of findings, formulation of recommendations, reporting responsibilities next steps (Day 3). Provincial MOM officers noted that a further joint inspection was conducted in September 2022.

North Sulawesi MOM, Bitung district MOM officers, and the Bitung port authority (MMAF) representatives highly valued the support from the project to promote joint or multi-agency inspection.

> "*The Office of Manpower does not have the authority to carry out inspection of fishing vessels, they need permission to carry out inspection from the Office of Marine and Fisheries and the harbormaster. Therefore, the joint inspection initiative from SAFE Seas is very important.*" - **Bitung MOM representative**

[24] The manual is intended as a training of trainers product that senior officers can roll out. It contains education modules on FL and TIP as well as exercises mapping the roles of the related inspection agencies in Indonesia and the relevant referral pathways for different labor violations.

North Sulawesi MOM officers noted that the MOM still lacks human resources for inspections, as well as the authority to cover vessels of different sizes (below 30 GT), so coordination among agencies is required.

In Central Java, the Indonesia team was not able to advance training for inspectors and trial inspections as the Provincial SFA is not as committed as in North Sulawesi, and their buy-in to the approach is still low. The inspection activities require the approval of the Central Java provincial governor as the Tegal port falls under their jurisdiction.

In recent months, North Sulawesi MOM and MMAF officers shared their experience of developing procedures and practices with their counterparts in the National Team as the national level government is gradually advancing the issue.

Outcome 2. Decreased Indicators of FL/TIP among Fishing Vessel Workers

Towards prevention of labor abuse, as well as access to remediation in cases of labor exploitation, SAFE Seas Indonesia worked in parallel towards the dual objectives of improving levels of awareness among the fishing communities, duty-bearers, and private sector operators, and creating accessible reporting and remediation networks for fishers experiencing problems of labor exploitation. In practice, the strategies for delivering both outcomes were frequently integrated, particularly at the community level, where interventions towards both awareness and access to reporting channels were delivered through the project-initiated fisher centers. However, in line with the project's performance reporting structure we discuss these efforts separately. [25]

Sub-Outcome 2.1 Awareness of Fishers, Government and Private Sector

- In the second half of the project, the project achieved strong momentum in promoting awareness of fishers' rights, especially among the fishing communities themselves in Bitung in North Sulawesi and Tegal district in Central Java.
- The Indonesia team made relatively strong progress towards increased awareness of FL and trafficking indicators/labor rights of fishers, especially at the sub-national, and among the communities. It also raised the profile of the issue at national level.
- Private sector engagement, through a variety of initiatives, saw relatively small-scale but steady support for improving vessel companies' responsibility for fisher training and labor protection.
- Overall, the efforts appear to have been somewhat diluted in the wide spread of initiatives across various target groups.

The project's awareness raising plans and intended audiences were ambitious, spanning government officers, communities, and private sector actors in two localities. The following examines the effectiveness of the main strategies, beginning with the quantitative results reported. Table 6 summarizes the results reported for the relevant indicators in April 2022.

TABLE 6. INDICATORS OF PROGRESS ON AWARENESS AMONG COMMUNITY, PRIVATE SECTOR, AND GOVERNMENT

Indicator	Reported narrative results
OTC 2a. Percent of surveyed fish workers who understand the meaning of FL/TIP End of project target: 70% April 2021 result: 55%	• Result not available. • Survey conducted in August 2022 will be reported in October TPR.

[25] The results against the two indicators at outcome level for Outcome 2 (OTC2a and OTC2b) are reported in the sections addressing awareness and grievance reporting services.

Indicator	Reported narrative results
OTP 2.1.1a Number of private sector fishing companies/boat owners that sponsor FL/TIP training for their fish workers End of project target: 10 April 2022 target: 10 Actual April 2022: 4	• Target not achieved due to COVID-19 outbreak in Indonesia and government mobility restriction policy. • Indonesia plans to achieve the remaining targets in the next reporting period.
OTP 2.1.1b Number of workplaces displaying materials on indicators of FL/TIP and contact information in public view End of project target: 20 April 2022 target: 20 Actual April 2022: 21	Achieved target. SAFE Seas posted IEC materials at fishing workplaces in Tegal and Bitung
OTP 2.1.2 Number of stakeholders that attend presentations on the Multi-Stakeholder Initiative for Accountable Supply Chains End of project target: 45 Actual April 2022: 53	Conducted an orientation to the approach attended by 11 fishery companies and four institutional representatives. Postponed from 2020 due to COVID-19 restrictions.
OTP 2.1.3 Communities with early detection plans in place and operational End of Project Target: 2 Actual April 2022: 2	Early detection systems working at village level in Tegal and Bitung

Regarding quantitative evidence on shift in awareness among fishers themselves, the Project's survey of fishers' awareness of the meaning of FL and TIP, conducted annually since 2020, provides one potential indicator of progress. In 2021, the rate of fishers surveyed reporting understanding of FL/TIP had increased to 55 percent from a low baseline of four percent in 2020. However, the August 2022 survey data will be released in the October 2022 TPR.

Fisher education and community awareness raising. SAFE Seas Indonesia introduced a range of approaches to raise awareness of fishers themselves, as well as their communities. Apart from simple IEC materials, elaborate board games were developed and used by village cadres, demonstrating the pitfalls of not having the correct fishing documents, for example.

At a community-level the most integrated approach was perhaps the community-level awareness spreading by village leaders, especially as rolled out in Tegal sub-districts.

The role of training institutions in fisher education and training was leveraged in both Bitung and in Tegal through the district polytechnics. According to the project's response to the interim evaluation recommendation, SAFE Seas developed curriculum materials for the standard Basic Safety Training for fishers, with modules on FL and fishers' rights. The evaluation team did not ascertain to what extent these are being used in regular Basic Safety Training. This area has the potential for more intensive development in future projects in Indonesia.

Overall, despite a wide range of efforts, the effects or impacts on the actions and awareness of fishers and their family members are hard to ascertain. The project survey of knowledge does not include an element on changing practices. The interim evaluation's suggestion to conduct qualitative outcomes FGDs was considered beyond the time and resources available. However, FGDs with fishers' wives reported in the April 2022 TPR suggest that they have a good level of awareness of the documents required by fishers.

Private sector. COVID-19 restrictions delayed some of the planned activities to engage private sector actors; however, the project did initiate and complete a range of initiatives, especially in the last year. The early approach to engage private sector companies in the awareness campaign was to post IEC materials in privately owned ports with the port managers' permission, and to collaborate with vessel owners to provide training for their crews including labor protection education. As discussed in the interim evaluation, SAFE Seas also provided training to several recruitment companies on legal requirements for fishers' basic safety certification, contracts, and insurance. More recently, the first coordination meeting for private sector engagement in the fishing port of Tegalsari was held in December 2021. Participants included companies that export fish and squid catch to Japan, China, and the United States. The evaluation team met two representatives whose companies had hosted the training and were generally supportive of the need to ensure fishers' contracts and health insurance are in order. The human resources officer interviewed from one company was especially keen on advancing training opportunities for Indonesian fishers to create a better job path.

The Indonesia Supply Chain Mapping study provides a useful set of directions for expanding work with recruitment actors, but these actions are mostly beyond the timeframe of the project.

Sub-outcomes 2.2 and 2.3: Progress on Access to Grievance Reporting and Remediation Services

- The establishment of two fisher centers for grievance reporting in late 2019 is one of the success stories of SAFE Seas in Indonesia. As a key innovation, SAFE Seas created two well-functioning fisher centers in each of Bitung and Tegal port areas, serving as focal points for advocacy as well as fisher grievance reporting, legal assistance and referrals.
- The centers have proven to be readily accessed by fishers and their family members and bring together civil society support groups, as well as fisher associations where they exist, to provide paralegal and referral services, also connecting with national remediation services.
- Since the two centers opened a significant number of fisher labor violations have been received and resolved or referred to the national government channels, including cases of compensation to fishers' wives whose husbands disappeared or died at sea.

Table 7 presents the quantitative results on selected indicators, which is followed by a discussion of the success factors and challenges.

TABLE 7. PROGRESS ON ACCESS TO GRIEVANCE REPORTING AND REMEDY

Indicator	Reported narrative results
OTC2b. Number of fish workers who reported seeking service after receiving SAFE Seas campaign information Project target: 31 April 2022 target: 15 Actual April 2022: 69	During the reporting period 207 fishers reported FL/TIP grievances to the fisher centers and requested support for referrals.[26]

[26] It is not clear how the project's narrative report for April 2022 aligns with the quantitative report.

Indicator	Reported narrative results
SO 2.2 Number of cases reported through project supported services (helpdesks, hotlines) End of project target:30 Actual (cumulative) April 2022: 76	SAFE Seas achieved the indicator earlier than expected. In the reporting period to April 2022, Fisher Centers in Tegal, Central Java and Bitung, North Sulawesi received 12 cases from workers on Indonesia-flagged vessels.
SO 2.3 Number of Service delivery guidelines formulated by multi-stakeholder working group End of Project target: 1 April 2022 target: 1 Actual April 2022: 2	Fisher centers have completed two guidelines: 1. Instructions on how to refer a case of FL/TIP in the referral system 2. How to handle a grievance.
OTP 2.3.2 Number of district referral network directories created and widely disseminated in project districts End of project target: Actual April 2022: 3	Completed referral network directories for use by fisher centers and the public, including a national referral directory and one for each of North Sulawesi and Central Java.

The establishment of two fisher centers in Bitung, North Sulawesi and Tegal, Central Java, is an outstanding success story of SAFE Seas. The centers have evolved along slightly different lines in each location, according to the context and the local CSO networks available, but the main functions are to act as a focal point for awareness raising through outreach to fisher communities and to provide legal support and referrals to fishers or their family members seeking remediation of labor complaints.

Established in late 2019, the centers were conceived by the SAFE Seas Project Director and initially operated by staff of DFW under their implementing agreement and continued to be operated by Plan-hired staff from late 2021 onwards. The Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries officially inaugurated the Tegal fisher center in Central Java in July 2020.

The Bitung Fisher Center is currently managed by a Plan officer who is also the chairperson of a local foundation, YCMI (*Yayasan Cahaya Mercusuar Indonesia*/"Shining Lighthouse Foundation for Fishers") which provides legal support services for fishers' complaints. The fisher center operates in a neighbourhood house in the vicinity of Bitung port. It brings together legal support services provided by YCMI staff, the North Sulawesi fishers' labor association, SAKTI (*Serikat Awak Kapal Perikanan Bersatu Sulawesi Utara*) that was formed partly through being empowered by SAFE Seas' advocacy, and a network of paralegal village volunteers trained by YCMI who form networks in nearby villages.[27] The evaluation team met a leader of SAKTI, which has a membership of 250 fishers, who is also a paralegal volunteer and continues to work as a fisher.

The evaluation team's interviews with YCMI staff, community cadres, and the center manager demonstrated the commitment they bring to defending the rights of fishers. The centers record the number and category of complaints received monthly.

[27] Paralegal volunteers receive three days' training from the ministry of Law and Human Rights and undertake three- month internships to get a certificate. There is a partnership between the fisher center and the ministry.

Most of the female cadres are housewives who do not have permanent jobs, while most of the male cadres are casual/non-permanent workers. The volunteers explained that most crew members from these communities are invited to work at sea without the required documents, so forced labor is a frequent occurrence. They informed the evaluation team that before SAFE Seas, various complaints from fishermen were not responded to because, according to them, the government did not care about fishers' lives.

> "*With the SAFE Seas project, there is a lot of openness from the government to provide protection to fishers. I have experience, when I was a student in junior high school, during school holiday I just jumped into the ships and saw fishers experience forced labor, so, I'm motivated and eager to help fishers.*" - **Male cadre/paralegal**

In both Central Java and Bitung the project provides access to the fisher center in two major ways, either by direct visit to the center or by contacting the hotline numbers provided. Upon receiving a call, the staff of the center make an appointment with the client to follow up to obtain more information and evidence to be recorded.

The grievance reporting mechanisms differ between the two locations. Since the project has established paralegal cadres in the villages in North Sulawesi, which play a kind of extension service of the center, the fishers and the family members often feel more secure and confident to report an incident to the paralegal member in their village. The Central Java fisher center does not have paralegal officers, but links with village cadres and village government leaders to receive cases. The fishers' protection cadres in Central Java and village office staff play significant roles to receive the reports from fishers and their families and will facilitate the connection with the center. As there are often risks involved in reporting a grievance to the Center in person, fishers and their family members often prefer to contact and to file the complaints via phone, SMS, or WhatsApp. The staff of the center will then conduct a follow-up visit.

SAFE Seas and the local participating agencies have discussed future plans for the centers during the last two years and raised various options for the future home and hosts of the centers. Among the options for support of the Tegal Center, the legal aid department within the University of Diponogoro is interested to provide legal aid volunteers to the center as part of its community service program. These developments are discussed in the Sustainability section of this report.

Since DFW's sub-agreement ended the organization went on to set up its own fisher center hotline service called the "National Fisher Center". Although DFW took the phone number from the SAFE Seas Bitung Center, which was not appreciated by the ongoing Bitung center staff, the action has expanded the services available. See Section 3.4 – Sustainability - for further discussion.

3.2.3 ACHIEVEMENTS IN THE PHILIPPINES

The following section examines the achievements and challenges in the Philippines for the two outcomes and their sub-outcomes, drawing on interviews, and project reports and incorporating the project's reported indicator results as of April 2022. Annex A presents the project's reported performance on the full set of CMEP results.

Outcome 1: Improved Enforcement to combat labor exploitation on fishing vessels

Sub-outcome 1.1 Regulatory and policy framework to combat labor exploitation on fishing vessels

- SAFE Seas Philippines has been successful in raising the profile of labor protection of fishers among the existing anti-trafficking structures and fishing inspection bodies and in strengthening the collaborative relationships between diverse government and civil society actors at national level, and most vigorously

at the provincial and municipal level, under the SAFE Fishing Alliance umbrella. Establishing leadership of the various working groups at national level remained an ongoing challenge.

- The project made a significant contribution to the inclusion of a broad framework for fisher labor protection in the draft National Strategic Action Plan Against Trafficking in Persons (2023 – 2027).
- At the national level, the project has had a moderate influence on improvement in the regulatory and policy framework governing action to protect fishing workers. SAFE Seas has been successful in providing platforms for discussion of the existing frameworks for fishing labor regulation through the DO 156-16 [28] rather than supporting new enforcement policies. At the provincial level, significant achievements were made towards local government policies for coordination among agencies on fisher labor protection at the provincial and municipal level in the project sites in Palawan and Mindanao, with legal endorsement of these policies expected during 2022.
- The project strategy towards improved policy and coordination was embedded in the existing Philippines institutional coordination platform for trafficking and forced labor. This proved successful, however, the focus on the forced labor and trafficking in persons governance structure may have diverted efforts from the response to the full continuum of labor abuses in fishing, from minor infringements to the most severe.

The details of the findings and the contributing factors identified by the evaluation are elaborated upon below.

Building institutional collaboration through SFAs.[29] The central pillar of the advocacy strategy in the Philippines was to build institutional alliances to carry relevant policy and enforcement improvements forward, at national and at the sub-national level. Quantitatively, the PMP reporting notes that the number of 'advisory groups' created was on track in April 2022. See Annex A.

The Philippines team initially looked into setting up a separate Safe Fishing Alliance structure, but by early 2020, under leadership of the new NPC, the team decided to use the existing Inter-agency Council Against Trafficking (IACAT) structure as the central institutional entry point and home for the Safe Fishing Alliance. The IACAT has a **Technical Working Group on Seafarers and Fishers**, set up in 2015 by the *Manila International Dialogue on Human Trafficking* and supported by the Netherlands Embassy. The evaluation notes that channelling advocacy efforts through the TWG was a strategic decision promoting sustainability and efficiency. Within the TWG, SAFE Seas acted as the Secretariat and supported the formation of three sub-groups, addressing harmonization of regulations and policy, enforcement and labor inspection, and awareness, education and access to reporting and remedy for victims. The TWG on seafarers and fishers continues to meet on an ad-hoc basis, with inputs from the SAFE seas staff at national level and has served as a forum for discussion of policy and vessel inspection procedures. The evaluation heard that membership has fluctuated, for example Greenpeace is no longer an active member. Informants to the evaluation appreciated Plan's support in providing a space for the agencies to discuss the issues.

> "The project really opened up a space for conversations about the issues" - IACAT TWG member

At the time of the interim evaluation, no clear leadership of the national SFA agenda had emerged within the TWG on seafarers and fishers under IACAT. The ongoing challenge noted by key informants to the final evaluation is that in the absence of SAFE Seas, the institutional leadership of the TWG is

[28] Rules and Regulations Governing the Working and Living Conditions of Fishers on Fishing Vessels Engaged in Commercial Fishing Operation. https://bwc.dole.gov.ph/images/Issuances/DepartmentOrder/DO_156_16_WorkingandLivingConditionsOfFishersonboardFishingvesselsEngaged_Commercial-FishingOperation.pdf

[29] Policy amendment or creation is interlinked with institutional coordination and collaboration – some of the policy is about coordinated procedures, while the platform structure also supports the overall advocacy agenda. Some policies at province level endorse and legalise this platform.

not firm to promote the multi-agency agenda at national level, particularly as it relates to labor inspection. This question is addressed further below regarding the project's enforcement and multi-disciplinary inspection outcomes, as well as the sustainability of the progress on enforcement practices.

At the **sub-national level**, SAFE Seas made considerable efforts to strengthen or re-activate existing local IACAT structures to take up the issues of forced labor and TIP on fishing vessels – these multi-agency structures exist at provincial, municipality, and city level – known as Provincial Inter-agency Council Against Trafficking (PIACAT) and Local Inter-agency Council/Taskforce Against Trafficking-Violence Against Women and Children (LIACAT-VAWC), respectively. Support to create safe fishing alliances within these councils was particularly successful in Palawan province and at the Puerto Princesa and Tay Tay sites. In Mindanao, the project also galvanized interest within the Sarangani and General Santos councils to set up "sea-based" task groups.

A striking finding of the evaluation was the commitment demonstrated by members of these advisory groups to raising awareness of fishing labor standards and the drive for coordinated efforts by the responsible agencies on all fronts – awareness, enforcement, and access to remedy. One of the municipal representatives of the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) from Tay Tay municipality explained the importance of coordination among agencies in supporting victims of trafficking on fishing vessels, based on her participation in the trial vessel inspection in Tay Tay.

As an enabling factor, the project has been able to identify and nurture leading champions for fisher labor protection, such as municipal officers of the DSWD, barangay councillors in Tay Tay, and members of the barangay FARMCs. As noted earlier in the report regarding the activities' relevance to local needs, the direct experience of abuse of some of the local FARMC leaders brought a stronger drive to their advocacy.

Improvements to the national regulatory and policy framework. Given the gaps in jurisdiction and practice among Philippines' agencies governing fishing activities, at the national level SAFE Seas set out to build cooperation and partnerships among the related agencies – especially DOLE, the Department of Agriculture's BFAR, MARINA, and the DOJ-IACAT – toward harmonization of policies and regulations governing work in fishing.

Table 8 shows the results reported against the relevant indicators for the sub-outcome as of April 2022.[30]

TABLE 8. REPORTED PROGRESS TOWARD REGULATORY AND POLICY IMPROVEMENT

Indicator	Reported narrative results
SO1.1a. Number of policies, regulations or implementation guidelines created and disseminated End of project target: 3 April 2022 target: 2 April 2022 actual: 1	• **National:** SAFE Seas provided inputs to the draft Philippines National Strategic Action Plan on Trafficking in Persons, (2023-2027), including provisions on regulating fisher recruitment and compensation systems (Apr-Oct 2022 period - not yet reported) • Contributed to the draft of the expanded anti-trafficking code RA 11862 in 2022, to extend the mandate of DOLE (Apr-Oct 2022 period - not yet reported) • **Sarangani Province:** Passing of provincial council resolution to make Plan International a member of PIACAT-VAWC and forming a sea-based task force under the PIACAT.

[30] The outcome level indicator pertains to progress on multi-agency labor inspection and is presented under that section.

	• Collaboration with PIACAT to finalize the implementing rules and regulations to include fishing vessel workers in an existing provincial ordinance addressing FL/TIP. • **Palawan:** Advanced a local government ordinance in Puerto Princesa city to create a sea-based taskforce and penalties for fishing labor violations; and Tay Tay municipality, progress towards amendment to the existing city ordinance of FL/TIP to institutionalize the SFA (hoped to be passed before end of project)
SO1.1b. Number of regional and local regulatory frameworks aligned with national frameworks End of project target: 3 April 2022 target: 3 Actual April 2022: 3	• **Sarangani Province**: Collaborated with stakeholders for the creation of a sea-based task force in the existing provincial ordinance for FL/TIP. • **General Santos City**: the local legislative body is in the process of reactivating the local taskforce for anti-trafficking and to include fishing vessels in its scope • **Palawan Province:** Two proposed local ordinances are at the stage of public hearing in the two project sites. May 2022 local elections affected the legislation of these proposed policies.

In April 2022, the quantitative target to create and disseminate policies, regulations, or implementation guidelines had not been achieved, but the indicator does not specify whether guidelines/policies are to be introduced at the national or sub-national level and is therefore not highly useful. Nevertheless, the April 2022 reporting records two policies against the target. A further result that the team and local stakeholders hope will be achieved within the life of the project is the passing of municipal ordinances in Tay Tay and Puerto Princesa to give legal recognition to the SFA and a budget allocation.

Through the SFA TWG, as well as bilateral advocacy with individual government departments, the project aimed to influence improved coordination and awareness among the agencies regarding inspection and prosecution and remediation services in cases of labor exploitation or abuse at the national and the local level. Through most of the project life, progress in policy development was most marked at the local level; however, SAFE Seas contributed to two significant national policy developments realized in 2022 (post-April 2022 TPR reporting). The first was the contribution of detailed recommendations for amendment of the Expanded Anti-Trafficking in Persons Act (Republic Act 11862) proposed via the Senate. The approved bill contains provisions for an expanded DOLE mandate to standardize labor conditions for employment of persons across all sectors, locally and overseas, and inclusion of BFAR and the PCG in the list of agencies that should have programs to address FL and TIP.

Secondly, SAFE Seas was the primary contributor to a framework for advancing the protection of fishers within the new draft Philippines National Strategic Action Plan on Trafficking in Persons (2023-2027). The plan includes a broad range of actions encompassing improvements to legal assistance in filing of TIP in fishing cases, institutionalizing training for law enforcers and frontliners at sea on victim identification, tripartite coordination among government, fishers' representatives and the private sector, revision to fisher remuneration regulations and joint inspection policies and continued awareness raising programs. If realized, to a great extent the framework carries the SAFE Seas agenda forward. This outcome is noted in our discussion of sustainability in Section 3.4.

SAFE Seas provided forums for discussion of the existing fishing vessel labor enforcement policy for fishing vessel crews, namely DOLE Department Order 156-16, but stopped short of advocating specific changes to the policy. From the project team's perspective, while there is a need for consultation to

help make the regulation applicable, the process of reviewing and conducting consultations to revise DO 156-16 to better reflect the Philippines context is an enormous and complex task and would require a longer period of technical support and advocacy. Interviews with DOLE representatives (Bureau of Working Conditions) and other stakeholders indicated that they are not ready to engage in a full-scale consultation on the regulation.

Discussion with tuna industry representatives on fishing vessels conditions (DO 156-16). Throughout the project, SAFE Seas engaged with the tuna industry on fisher working conditions and the applicability of DOLE DO 156-16, with varying degrees of success. The prevailing attitude of the fishing sector is that the regulation is not applicable to them because the specific details of fishing vessel size and construction do not fit the Philippines context. Since DOLE inspection of fishing operations is rare, many operators continue to ignore the regulation.

The evaluation team observed that some of the discussions taking place during the midterm evaluation in 2020 are still ongoing at the national level regarding issues including the leadership on fishing labor enforcement policy, the need to harmonize policies and potentially to amend the DOLE regulation.

The challenges for the project in influencing or contributing to policy change were many, including the changeover in government personnel, as well as the complex governance processes involved.

Sub-national policy development. At local levels, the project's influence and contribution to policy on action to address fisher's rights has been tangible, supported by the field staff in the provincial project sites. The field staff included those employed by Plan in Palawan and by the implementing partner OND Hesed in Mindanao sites until the end of their sub-agreement in September 2021.

Hand in hand with the strong engagement of the local actors in the SFAs, the project gained the support of local government elected leaders in Palawan. The key policy results achieved or almost realized are the drafting of an Executive Order in Puerto Princesa and a Municipal ordinance in Tay Tay that will give the respective SFAs a recognized legal status and budget to carry out advocacy activities. The first hearing of the ordinance in Tay Tay Municipality took place in September 2022. This was underway during the midterm evaluation but was recently held up by local LGU elections in 2022. (See sustainability discussion in Section 3.4)

In Sarangani Province and General Santos City some interruptions to progress were experienced due to government personnel turnover as well as staff turnover, but OND's networks were helpful in achieving the drafting of new Implementing Rules and Regulations in both localities for the creation of a sea-based taskforce under the Local Inter-Agency Taskforce against Trafficking and Violence Against Women and Children.

Sub-outcome 1.2: Quality of Labor-Inclusive Inspections on Fishing Vessels

- Over the project life, SAFE Seas has built momentum towards nationally approved labor inclusive guidelines for inspection of crews of commercial fishing vessels. The Philippines achieved early success towards the acceptance of a multi-agency approach to inspection with the first trial conducted in Tay Tay in 2019. The achievements have been most marked at the subnational level in Palawan where strong interest and commitment to multi-agency approach. Given the foundation of interest in a coordinated approach, SAFE Seas Philippines has been able to contribute to joint or harmonized checklists and capacity of the actors. But the procedures stop short of SOPs and a nationally endorsed approach.
- The evaluation team observed that a 'one-size fits all' approach has not been pursued; in each locality inspection actors adopted their own approach to harmonization – either through one combined checklist or multiple checklists that include labor standards.
- The national and local advocacy on MDI worked in parallel but the strategy was to lead from the bottom, with examples of the approach demonstrated.

Over the project life, significant achievements have been made towards introducing systems of multi-disciplinary inspection in the two project districts in Palawan.

Selected indicator results as of April 2022 are given in Table 9. This is followed by a discussion of the interventions' success and intervening factors.

TABLE 9. PROGRESS TOWARD LABOR-INCLUSIVE FISHING VESSEL INSPECTION

Indicator	Reported narrative results
OTC1: Improved enforcement to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels Milestone 3 (Oct 2020 – Sept 2021): The related government stakeholders receive improved labor inspection procedures or tools which have labor exploitation indicators including FL/TIP	• The Philippines team achieved the milestone in 2020, with the development of the joint checklist in Tay Tay, Palawan. The evaluation notes, however, that receiving a labor inspection tool incorporating labor exploitation indicators at the municipal level does not equate with national endorsement.
SO1.2 Number of joint inspections conducted by members of interagency groups End of project target:1 April 2022 target: 1 April 2022 actual: 1	• SAFE Seas supported the first pilot joint inspection in Tay Tay, Palawan, during the April 2020 reporting period. This activity pre-tested the joint inspection checklist produced by the local inspection working group. • As of April 2022, the project continued to collaborate with the stakeholders to strengthen the FL/TIP referral and reporting systems for the fishing sector. • In the current period to October 2022 (not yet reported) inspectors in General Santos conducted a trial inspection following the MDI training in July 2022.
OTP 1.2.2 Number of stakeholders that have implemented the roadmap for labor-inclusive fishing vessel inspections End of Project target: 2 April 2022 target: 2 April 2022 actual: 3	• Three LGUs have legislation passed or underway that includes the lens of FL/TIP in fishing vessels.

The Philippines team's approach has been to build interest and capacity at the sub-national level and present the experience to the national level. Over the life of the project, SAFE Seas has supported the concerned agencies to produce checklists and procedures for joint or coordinated labor inspection approaches. One of the ground-breaking events was the trial joint unannounced inspection in Tay Tay municipality in late 2019, involving several maritime authorities, social welfare personnel and the Office of Manpower. The discovery of minors working on board the vessel highlighted the importance of such unannounced inspections, but at the same time raised some local opposition at the mayoral level.

To expedite the development of a national road map, the project brought in international expertise (Sustainability Incubator - Hawaii-based consultants) to consult with the partners and develop a policy brief in April 2021. However, the evaluation did not receive any comments from stakeholders regarding

the roadmap, which was described as guidance or suggestion by the project team representatives. It was not formally adopted by national authorities per se but was presented to the members of the IACAT TWG for their consideration.

From early 2021 onward, SAFE Seas secured the consultant from Sustainability Incubator to develop a multidisciplinary training manual through a participatory process of consultation with the relevant agencies and then to introduce training of trainers using the manual in July 2022. This was attended by 60 participants from a wide range of related agencies. The evaluation interviews highlighted that the training was well-received and enlightening for those less familiar, but some observers noted that too much time was spent on definitions of trafficking and forced labour and that a more practical approach to responding to specific cases could have been incorporated.

The agency representatives interviewed by the evaluation team described the different approaches that have been taken to formulating harmonized inspection. For example, Tay Tay agencies have a combined checklist, while in Puerto Princesa the agencies prefer to operate separately.

There is an ongoing need on a practical level for the maritime agencies to lend additional support to DOLE inspectors to carry out their mandate as DOLE lacks vessels to inspect at sea. Moreover, DOLE is only permitted to conduct unannounced or 'surprise' inspections in instances where they receive reports of labor violations or complaints, including from workers or from other government agencies.

Regarding the next steps, key informants from related agencies in Palawan expressed that standard operating procedures still need to be developed for the multi-agency approach to become operationalised. This was echoed by national respondents from DOLE and by several project staff, who noted that a Joint Memorandum Circular among national level agencies is still required to formalise the multi-agency approach to fishing vessel labor inspection.

OUTCOME 2. Decreased indicators of FL/TIP among fishing vessel workers

Throughout the project, the Philippines team made considerable progress across the two outcomes, particularly through its awareness raising efforts. The communications strategy was of high quality as observed in the materials produced. The second sub-outcome area is principally focused on strengthening existing reporting services and resources.

Sub-outcome 2.1 Awareness of fishers, government and private sector

- Efforts to raise awareness at all levels of government, in the private sector, and in fishing communities produced varied changes in levels of understanding of the issues and rights. The project's most significant achievements in raising awareness of the issues were observed qualitatively among government agency representatives at the provincial and city level.
- In the communities, there is evidence that fishers and leaders are more aware of labor standards but traditional practices, such as debt taking and unfair payment systems, are still ingrained and normalized. The emphasis on women's role in awareness of their husbands' or sons' rights was an innovation but changes in their awareness was not assessed.
- Private sector engagement and change in attitudes was difficult to assess, given limited evidence, and overall, the project could have built a stronger advocacy strategy. However, the project made gains in engaging with the tuna industry based in General Santos, resulting in a fair-trade statement at the Tuna Congress of 2022 – including mention of labor standards.

Further discussion of the quantitative indicator results and the factors affecting the achievements is provided below.

Table 10 summarizes the results reported for the relevant indicators in April 2022. Regarding quantitative evidence of a shift in awareness among fishers themselves, the survey of fishers' awareness provides an indicator of progress, but the August 2022 endline survey data will be released in the October 2022 TPR.

TABLE 10. INDICATORS OF PROGRESS ON AWARENESS AMONG COMMUNITY, PRIVATE SECTOR AND GOVERNMENT

Indicator	Reported narrative results
OTC 2a. Percent of surveyed fish workers who understand the meaning of FL/TIP End of project target: 70% April 2021: 40%	• August 2022 survey results will be available following the submission of the October 2022 TPR
OTP 2.1.1a Number of private sector fishing companies/boat owners that sponsor FL/TIP training for their fish workers End of project target: 10 April 2022 target: 5 Actual April 2022: 26	• **Puerto Princesa**: In earlier reporting, by October 2020 the project had engaged with 13 vessel owners. • **General Santos City**: Continuous collaboration with SFAII to engage vessel owners in hosting training. During 2020 and 2021 SFAII declined to agree to training activities due to the pandemic.
OTP 2.1.1b Number of workplaces displaying materials on indicators of FL/TIP and contact information in public view End of project target: 20 April 2022 target: 20 Actual April 2022: 24	• Exceeded target and maintained presence in those areas/workplaces

In the Philippines, the communication strategies and IEC materials were well developed and observed to be of high quality, employing a variety of social media messaging, IEC tarpaulins, and community meetings. One of the important interventions was the inclusion of fishers' wives in communication activities in all project sites.

Among communities, measurement of change was not conclusive, but interviews at midterm and end of project suggest that awareness is growing, while practices exposing fishers to exploitation are still ingrained as normal. However, project and US Plan staff observed that a more behavior-based strategy could have been introduced at an earlier stage.

Local government awareness. The evaluation team met with local government representatives from across the project sites, representing offices of PNP Maritime Group, Philippine Coast Guard, Department of Social Welfare and Development, and prosecutors from across the project sites in Palawan and Mindanao. These officers expressed the strength of commitment to addressing labor conditions of fishing workers - as expressed by one officer, "fishers bring so much wealth to our country and yet they are the poorest in the community".

Several respondents, including a prosecutor, highlighted how the project had made them aware of these issues for the first time. Another uniformed officer from the PNP Maritime Group, Palawan, expressed tearfully the way the project meetings had raised her awareness of risks of abuse faced by fishers and her commitment to looking after fishers' rights.

Barangay councillors were especially grateful to the project for raising the issues in their barangays. One of the project's successful strategies was to nurture barangay champions to expand the advocacy messages.

Community awareness. Plan and its implementing partner OND Hesed worked at the barangay level, in two barangays in each city or municipal site.

During the final evaluation the team met with one community group in a barangay in Puerto Princesa. Remote interviews were held with community representatives from barangays in Tay Tay and from Mindanao during the midterm evaluation, and the evaluator also referred to these interviews.

Drawing on these interviews, community and local government informants highlighted fisher communities' lack of alternative livelihoods, forcing the fishers to return to exploitative conditions. Community and barangay officials recommended future support to skill development for women in the communities as an alternative source of income. While this was beyond the scope and intention of this project, such interventions could be included in a future intervention with a different design and focus to that of SAFE Seas.

Despite the advocacy efforts and growing awareness of fishers' rights, the key informants advised the evaluation team that many of the traditional practices remain, suggesting that awareness does not by itself lead to empowerment and alternative practices.

Private sector. Efforts to influence private sector attitudes and work practices were delivered through seminars, networking with the SFAII, and participation in the General Santos annual tuna congress. The effectiveness of the interventions has been mixed, as far as the evaluation team could ascertain. Initially SFAII was critical of the SAFE Seas video displayed at the 2019 Tuna Congress for its portrayal of egregious practices in the industry. However, the relationship with SAFE Seas improved and some companies participated in training activities for their crews. By 2022, the Tuna Congress organised by SFAII adopted a resolution on fair trade. SAFFAI was instrumental in education of its fish workers. According to Mindanao field staff, Plan coordinated with SAFFAI to raise awareness on fisher rights in 2022, but they could not meet with stakeholders face to face due to the pandemic. According to them, the IEC materials were very beneficial in 2021 when the awareness was very low.

As noted in Section 3.1, given the part played by the private sector in committing labor abuses, strategies to changes attitudes and practices is critical. The project did not engage with consumers or other actors along the purchasing supply chain – although a labor supply chain mapping study was introduced late in the project life in mid-2022. This could have served to direct the strategies if completed earlier.

Assessing the communications strategy, some observers said that the behavior change communications strategies introduced after the mid-point could have begun earlier, and moreover that communications strategies could have been elevated in the logical framework with targets to be counted in terms of delivery. As an advocacy project, it was expressed that the methods could have been more extensive and more varied, including greater level engagement with the media toward influencing public and private sector attitudes.

Progress on Access to Grievance Reporting and Remediation Services (SO 2.2 and SO 2.3)

- The Philippines team has taken a different approach to improving fishers' access to reporting compared with Indonesia, focussing on improvement of existing services and avenues rather than creating new ones. Progress has been gradual in supporting improvement to services.
- SAFE Seas has supported capacity of existing help desk staff operated by the local City Social Welfare and Development Offices and produced service directories for use of the service providers in referrals. However, there is still much to be done to improve fishers' access to local services, linked with the national system.

Table 11 presents the results reported for selected indicators.

TABLE 11. PROGRESS ON ACCESS TO GRIEVANCE REPORTING AND REMEDY

Indicator	Narrative reported results
OTC2b. Number of fish workers who reported seeking services after receiving SAFE Seas campaign information Project target: 50 April 2022 target: 35 Actual April 2022: 38	Over 20 Filipino fishers were supported in March 2022 through the Apostleship of the Seas center of OND Hesed (to be included in October 2022 TPR). Evaluator note: the April 2022 TPR provides the same narrative for OTC2b and SO2.2 below.
SO 2.2 Number of cases reported through project supported services (helpdesks, hotlines) Project target: 12 April 2022 target: Actual April 2022: 38	Over 20 Filipino fishers were supported in March 2022 through the AOS center of OND Hesed (To be included in October 2022 TPR). In 2020, OND Hesed assisted the repatriation of 33 fishers whose wives reported their detention in Indonesia for illegal entry. The SAFE Seas staff coordinated with the Fisher Center in Bitung North Sulawesi to secure their release.
SO 2.3 Number of Service delivery guidelines formulated by multi-stakeholders	This is an ongoing process with the stakeholders to strengthen existing referral and reporting systems in the project sites of Palawan, Sarangani Province and General Santos City. The support to development of service delivery guidelines and directories was ongoing at the time of the evaluation field work in September 2022.
OTP 2.3.2 Number of Referral network directories created and widely disseminated in project districts	As above

Prior to the SAFE Seas interventions, a national reporting and referral system for TIP cases was in place but was not well known at the local level and not specific to reporting in the fishing sector. The project has helped disseminate information on the referral system, but capacity of local agencies to execute it remains low partly due to low reporting and/or case intake, as explained by local and national service providers.

Service delivery guidelines are being developed with SAFE Seas support across sites, containing case referral flowcharts and a directory of service providers serving local agencies.

Development of accessible reporting mechanisms intended for fishers is still in their infancy. Different models are being considered, including helpdesks as implemented in General Santos through OND's AOS service, virtual case intake by hotline reporting, and the barangay-based reporting helpdesk in Puerto Princesa in Palawan.

The Apostleship of the Seas already operates a help desk in the port in General Santos, but is not necessarily sustainable as it is operated by one committed individual. In General Santos, AOS played a key role in identifying cases and repatriation of victims detained in Indonesia. AOS is a programme of OND Hesed, affiliated with the Stella Maris organization.

In the past year, the project provided support to the anti-trafficking helpdesks operated by the city Social Welfare and Development Office, while in Palawan, Barangay FARMCs and barangay offices have been strengthened to receive reports. In this way, several local mechanisms for fishers to report cases have been enhanced.

While the Project Director has encouraged the fishers' center model to be applied in adapted form in the Philippines sites, the Philippines team viewed it to not be so "strategic" with current mechanisms (design, location, administration), and potentially harmful to fishers if they are seen to report grievances in person. Hence a viability study is underway at the time of the evaluation field visit to investigate whether the concerns may be more operational in nature.

3.2.4 ADDRESSING GENDER ISSUES

One of the unplanned outcomes of SAFE Seas in the Philippines and Indonesia was to raise the profile of the gendered effects of labor abuse in fishing and the potential for empowerment of women and other family members as advocates for fisher's labor rights, at the household level and in the community. While the project results framework does not contain specific gender outputs and outcomes, the project teams and their partners made concerted efforts to draw attention to gender dimensions of labor abuse in fishing, especially following the interim evaluation.

SAFE Seas' actions included research documenting the effects of labor abuse in fishing on women and capacity building of women community members. Regarding research, the project published a groundbreaking study produced by Rapid Asia in 2020, focused on women's concerns in fishing communities in Sarangani and General Santos. The study highlights the impacts of labor abuse on fishers' wives and families, including the precariousness of their lives in the absence of income security and social safety nets and their vulnerability in case of fishing accidents and loss of life at sea.[31] This research was the basis of a gender brief published on the Plan USA website.[32] The evaluation team also reflects on the interviews conducted at midterm with fishers' wives in both countries, who expressed the devastating impact of egregious treatment of their husbands on their emotional and economic well-being. SAFE Seas also commissioned a study of the gendered impacts of labor exploitation in the fishing sector in Indonesian project sites, due for completion in November 2022.

The project ensured that women were targeted in advocacy campaigns and also promoted their active role in delivering awareness messages. In both countries SAFE Seas recognized that women as wives and relatives of fishers are frequently the ones to alert CSO networks and local government authorities about fishers trapped at sea or suffering other labor violations. Its activities focused on raising women's knowledge of labor rights and capacity to use grievance reporting channels, acting as advocates on behalf of their husbands in documenting and filing forced labor cases.[33] In Indonesia in particular, the project ensured that women have a high profile among the community volunteers and paralegal assistants. The evaluation team's interviews with women cadres and paralegal volunteers in Bitung showed the high commitment of these women to defending fishers' rights. In Tegal, the

[31] Rapid Asia for Plan USA. Effects of Forced Labor and Trafficking in Persons on Female Relatives of Male Fishers.
[32] https://planusa-org-staging.s3.amazonaws.com/public/uploads/2021/06/SAFE_Seas_Gender_Brief_Plan_USA.pdf

[33] Plan Philippines posted video to YouTube illustrating women community members' roles as advocates: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q-4zWPvXyBs.

project reported on focus groups held with women in the communities to assess their knowledge of the documents required by fishers and empower them to support their husbands to have legal permission in place before working at sea. In the Philippines, local women leaders were prominent champions defending fishers' conditions, especially because many of them grew up in fishing families.

SAFE Seas' experience of developing gendered approaches provides a strong foundation for future gender-responsive support to fishing communities and the prevention of labor abuses in the sector. The evaluation team observes that gender norms in the fishing industry remain solidly intact, however. For instance, fishing is still seen very much as a man's job. There is potential to introduce strategies that address and transform gender and social norms that may disadvantage women and other persons in their diversity, including LGBTQI individuals.

3.2.5 CROSS-COUNTRY LINKAGES AND KNOWLEDGE CONTRIBUTION

Cross-country linkages. The project framework does not have an output or outcome regarding cross-country activities such as lesson sharing between the two countries or linkages between government authorities on bilateral agreements for rescue and repatriation. Nevertheless, the project capitalized upon the selection of Indonesia and the Philippines, and the geographical proximity of Mindanao in the Philippines and North Sulawesi province in Indonesia. The international fishing grounds of the two countries border there and fish stocks are rapidly depleting there with increasing rates of IUU fishing in Indonesian fishing grounds. SAFE Seas networks in General Santos and in Bitung have been able to connect with each other, in at least one prominent case, through the bridge of the project, to assist in the repatriation of Filipino fishers.

The extent of sharing emerging practices and approaches between the two countries and in the wider region has been limited. During the pandemic it was not possible for project staff to travel between countries. Since borders have now opened for international travel, arrangements are underway for stakeholders from the Philippines to visit North Sulawesi and the Bitung fisher center to learn about its operation. Such sharing of experiences between the countries, whether in person or virtually, could have been more embedded in the project design.

In the region more broadly, SAFE Seas via the Project Director participates in ASEAN-level dialogue on labor protection in fishing, for example through Fair Seas Labor Conference on Decent Work and Resilience in Fishing and Seafood Processing, hosted by the ILO Ship to Shore Rights Southeast Asia Project in coordination with the CMMIA in September 2022.[34]

Contribution to knowledge. SAFE Seas has produced a substantial body of knowledge in the form of research documents and training manuals. Some of the products that USDOL has approved for publication have been posted on the ILAB website and occasionally on the Plan USA website, including a gender brief based on the gender research conducted in the Philippines[35]. To a limited extent the project has shared its knowledge products with labor rights actors in the region, but this could have been expanded, as noted elsewhere in the report. As far as the evaluator could ascertain, the Labor Supply Chain Mapping Study in Indonesia has not yet been shared with other international agencies working in the country. The release of knowledge products seems to have been hampered to a degree by administrative approval processes in both Plan and ILAB.

[34] https://fairseaslabourconference.org/

[35] https://www.planusa.org/projects/indonesia-philippines-safeguarding-against-addressing-fishers-exploitation-at-sea/

3.3 EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

This section assesses the effectiveness and efficiency of SAFE Seas' management and implementation arrangements, considering the management structure, human resources, coordination with implementing partners and the effectiveness and application of the Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP).

3.3.1 MANAGEMENT AND HUMAN RESOURCES

- The project's governance through Plan US, Plan Philippines, and YPII provided a high level of accountability and quality control, but the management structure was complex, leading to occasional lack of clarity in supervision and reporting lines.
- The staffing level of the project was sufficient, though field staff were sometimes stretched, and high staff turnover has been a significant issue, not entirely overcome by deployment of Plan national office personnel.
- The selection of implementing partners with appropriate networks and experience added value, but their lack of experience with internationally funded projects remained a challenge for project management.

Management structure

The management structure was comprised of Plan US and the respective Plan country offices, with the Project Director (PD) and M&E Manager initially sitting at the Regional Office.[36] This arrangement was adjusted mid-way, when the regional office ceased project management functions and the PD and M&E management roles were then operationally managed through YPII. The levels of management afforded strong accountability and quality control processes, and the evaluation noted that the USNO project management team, including the Technical Project Manager, Grant Manager, and the Senior Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Learning Advisor, provided extensive technical and administrative support to the SAFE Seas project team.

The findings of the interim evaluation identified some disadvantages of the management structure, which were reiterated in the final evaluation interviews. Inefficiencies arose from the multiple reporting lines involved for project teams per country. As a federation, each Plan country office integrates projects within its country and performance monitoring programs. Hence, reporting lines flowed from the country team to the project management team (PD and M&E Manager) and the USNO, and also to the Philippines/Indonesia national office line management structure. The structure led to some lack of clarity in the roles and management responsibility of the PD, which was designed to focus on technical direction but also included some management responsibilities, including a role in staff selection. In Indonesia, the PD had a more direct role in project implementation than in Philippines, partly due to the travel limitations.

One of the advantages of the project's integration within Plan country office programs was that additional Plan human resources could be delegated when required, but overall, the governance structure had too many levels of reporting and accountability according to some Plan national office staff. It may have been more effective to place the cross-country positions, i.e. the Project Director and the M&E Manager, with the Plan USNO, providing the PD management responsibility as well as technical responsibility. This would also have placed a larger amount of governance responsibility with Plan US, which would have been appropriate to the funding distribution, according to national Plan staff.

Implementing partner coordination

A shared implementation model at country level between Plan SAFE Seas and two local implementing partners was a key element of the implementation strategy. In principle, extending the advocacy

[36] The full title of the project-wide monitoring and evaluation manager position is Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting Manager, as referenced in the SAFE Seas Technical Progress Reports.

networks through the judicious selection of partners was a worthy strategy but Plan encountered challenges managing partners' administrative and financial reporting. To a certain extent the partnership agreements proved effective, especially in the Philippines where OND Hesed was well connected with the communities in Sarangani and General Santos, and with the AOS fisher help desk in General Santos Port. However, as relayed by Plan US, YPII, and Plan Philippines, both partner organizations lacked experience implementing projects of this type, with high standards of administrative reporting and accounting as required by major donors such as USDOL.

According to Plan US and YPII staff both partners required a considerable amount of coaching and supervision to be able to meet the accountability standards required by USDOL. On top of this there were concerns at Plan International/YPII that DFW claimed some of the project efforts as its own, rather than under the SAFE Seas project banner. As emerged in the interim evaluation, there were conflicting understandings between DFW and Plan SAFE Seas officers about division of tasks between them. This continued post-midterm based on the final evaluation interviews. Based partly on these challenges, the agreements were not renewed into the cost-extension period once the partnership contracts expired.

Plan staff reflected that it might be preferable to partner with local NGOs for particular activities but not to sign formal implementation agreements, except in cases where the partner has a strong track record on USDOL or similar donor-supported projects.

Human Resources Quantity and Quality

The project design included a relatively lean staff complement, especially at the field level, where the areas to be covered were quite extensive. Addressing the workload in the field offices in the Philippines, an additional officer was recruited in 2022 to support M&E activities in Palawan.

Based on stakeholder comments, the project has attracted staff with high levels of commitment to promoting the rights of fishers as well as relevant skills and expertise in areas including government advocacy and communications.

Both the Philippines and Indonesia Plan and partner teams experienced high rates of staff turnover. In the Philippines, turnover was common at the field level, except for one officer who remained for the project duration. Turnover was particularly high in Indonesia, where there have been four incumbents in the National Project Coordinator (NPC) positions, as well as interim management periods by YPII officers. The reasons for staff resignation do not appear to be consistent. For example, the incumbent who resigned in July 2021 took up another job when the extension of the project was not yet confirmed beyond November 2021. The Indonesia communications officer and national M&E Officer resigned early in the project extension period, and it was not possible to replace them given the short time frame remaining. As a result, the current staffing in Indonesia in 2022 is lean, comprising the NPC, an administrative officer, and two field officers in Bitung and Tegal. In practice, the project-wide M&E Manager also fulfils the M&E function in Indonesia, and the PD assists the NPC, who had limited prior involvement in the project through YPII. This turnover has had some negative impacts on implementation effectiveness and efficiency, including on the team's institutional memory and on government partner confidence and relationships.

Dissemination of knowledge products. As noted earlier, public release and effective dissemination of specific knowledge products could have been timelier. The evaluation noted a lack of clarity among the management at Plan USNO and at the project level on the publication status of the Indonesia Labor Supply Chain Mapping Study completed in April 2021.

The evaluation team went to some lengths to determine the status of USDOL approval of the report for public release and dissemination. The project team initially expressed uncertainty whether USDOL had approved it for release. During the preparation of the evaluation report, USDOL confirmed to the evaluation team that the report was approved in January 2022. Given the approaching close of the

project, the opportunity to share the results via a launch or seminar for interested development actors in Indonesia may be lost.

The Philippines Labor Supply Chain Mapping Study is expected to be submitted to USDOL for approval in mid-November, and practically speaking may not be ready to publish prior to project end. This also applies to the gender impact study conducted in Indonesia that the project plans to submit to USDOL in the third week of November 2022.

3.3.2 EFECTIVENESS OF THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

The Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP) developed by Plan with initial support from ILAB provides a systematic means to capture change at each level of the project logic, outcome, sub-outcome and output. Overall, the CMEP represented a valid means to monitor performance and results.

The evaluation noted some elements of the CMEP that could have been stronger.[37] At the structural level of sub-outcomes and outputs, there are one or two elements of the project's endeavors that could have been better captured at output level. These include progress on establishing SFAs in support of the project agenda, and a possible output for cross-country sharing, although this was not an initial element of the design.

Regarding the validity of indicators, in an effort to capture qualitative and progressive change, SAFE Seas introduced some innovations in the form of year-long milestone targets to be achieved in measuring progress toward improved multi-agency inspection of fishing vessels, which were an improvement on quantitative indicator targets. Nevertheless, the end of this particular outcome remained open-ended regarding what the project expected to achieve by the end of the project – whether at provincial level or in terms of nationally endorsed practices. The project team did not adjust the outputs or indicators in the CMEP during the project, apart from dropping a specific particular output and indicator related to the MAST approach (Output 2.1.2) that was not considered fitting to the Philippines context. The staff perception conveyed to the evaluation team was that the process of adjusting the CMEP and obtaining ILAB approval would be too demanding.

Most of the indicators of achievement were valid and well-defined, but there were some shortcomings – some were closely related to each other, or overlapping, so that the reporting of results was duplicated, (SO2.2a and 2.1b). Others were not very meaningful through a purely quantitative measure, and a narrative explanation of quantitative target results in the PMP report was not consistently provided, meaning that some of the results reported are hard to interpret from an outside perspective. The evaluator notes several ambiguities of meaning in the summary of CMEP reporting as of April 2022 TPR included in Annex A. Supplementing the standard CMEP system, the Plan USNO Senior Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Learning Advisor introduced a stoplight system (red-yellow-green) to highlight which outputs were on track and which were lagging, which the team found useful as a monitoring tool.

Regarding assessment of changes in attitudes among the target audiences of the campaigns, annual sample surveys of awareness among fishers (and members of fisher households in 2021) were conducted from 2020 onwards to provide an approximate indication of change in awareness of FL and TIP that could be associated with the project activities. These provide a general indication of changing knowledge levels among fishers, but there were challenges in meeting the required samples sizes, especially during COVID-19. The interim evaluation suggested the use of focus group discussions, along the lines of the Outcome Harvesting methodology, to capture changes in community behavior as well as knowledge, but this was beyond the resources and time available to the project. Direct changes in attitudes or practices among vessel owners and fishing company managers were not

[37] The interim evaluation provided a critique of the outcome structure and language, particularly regarding the overarching scope of Outcome 2: Decreased incidence of labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels.

captured in the output measurements, apart from a proxy indicator of the number of companies allowing IEC materials to be posted on their premises, and the number hosting training on FL/TIP for their workers. This was partly because expected results regarding the private sector interventions were structured at an output level in the results hierarchy (Output 2.1.1: Improved private sector support of government policies), rather than at sub-outcome level, and were grouped together with improved awareness among government and communities.

The semi-annual narrative Technical Progress Reports provide a wealth of information on the project's progress and achievements, with rich details included in the form of project 'infostories'. The reports could have been improved by including a summary statement of progress against each sub-outcome per country, even when there was no substantive change for a particular result area in the reporting period.

3.4 SUSTAINABILITY

This section examines SAFE Seas' strategies to promote sustainability, exit planning, and an assessment of the prospects for sustaining the key results as the project approaches its conclusion.

3.4.1 SUSTAINABILITY PLANS AND EXIT PLANNING

- Specific sustainability strategies have been put in place for the continuity of many of the project's outcomes, and exit consultations are underway or planned with the stakeholders in the Philippines and Indonesia.
- While the project cannot ensure sustainability of its results, the country teams have worked steadily with their partners to support institutionalized structures to carry the safe fishing agenda forward, contribute to national action plans against trafficking in the sector, as well as to find new owners for the community-based reporting and advocacy services in Indonesia.

As observed in the interim evaluation report, the project's initial sustainability strategy was valid in approach but lacking specific plans and targets. Its fundamental approach was to establish multi-stakeholder alliances at national, provincial, and municipal or district levels to drive the project and become integrated in the institutional context. Additionally, it aimed to build sustained capacity, especially among government agencies to undertake improved on-vessel inspections, and to build sustained resources, for example, by including FL indicators and labor-inclusive inspection procedures into training for new inspectors.

Following the interim evaluation recommendations, SAFE Seas elaborated its sustainability plan in more specific terms, setting out the pathway towards sustaining results in each country according to outcome area (including the national and local taskforces for advancing the policy agenda, national action planning approval, established policy and procedures on multi-agency labor protection of fishers, pathways for institutionalizing improved inspection coverage, and sustained local services for fishers to report labor issues). The detailed plan was submitted with the October 2021 TPR.

Towards the project phaseout, the Philippines team held a National Project Summit from September 22-23, 2022 to discuss sustainability plans with a wide range of stakeholders from national level and the provincial sites. The evaluation was not able to draw on the results of the Summit as a report is not yet available. In Indonesia, an exit meeting is planned in early November to showcase the achievements of the project and its partners, and bilateral discussions are underway with the fisher center operators.

3.4.2 PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS FOR SUSTAINABILITY

INDONESIA

Inter-agency collaboration on policy and enforcement. The continued existence of the National Team for the Protection of Seafarers and Fishworkers is assured through the government decree that established it. However, the active engagement of the core government agencies in joint efforts is not certain, while some ministries continue to pursue their own mandates with less focus on collaboration. Nevertheless, the CMMAI, which chairs the National Team, has a firm commitment to a coordinated approach. The National Action Plan on Seafarers and Fishers Protection, 2021- 2024 is a milestone achievement, with Indonesia noted as only the second country in the world to have an NAP for these workers. The realization of this plan still depends on the Presidential endorsement, as noted in previous sections of this evaluation. Regardless of the endorsement, national ministry representatives indicated that they will continue to follow the NAP.

Sub-nationally, as discussed earlier, continued inter-agency collaboration with leadership by the provincial Ministry of Manpower is assured in North Sulawesi through the provincial decree, and likely to be supported in Bitung through the mayor's awaited endorsement. The prospects of a provincial SFA remaining in place in Central Java, and functioning are not certain.

Multi-agency inspection procedures and capacity. A strong momentum has been established towards multiagency involvement in fishing labor inspection, especially within the commercial sector of the industry in domestic fishing. Inspectors' continued use of the tools, procedures, and experience in Bitung appears likely, though there is no evidence to suggest plans to use the manual in other fishing ports in the country, Beyond SAFE Seas, other projects are continuing to support standardization of vessel inspection; therefore, the gains supported appear to be on a steady course for expansion.

Community awareness levels and mechanisms. The awareness raising community network in Bitung looks to have strong prospects of continuity, associated with the Fisher Center hub, given the CSO support and the commitment of the village volunteer network. This would be strengthened by modest funding for the travel costs of the volunteers, who informed the evaluation team that this was a burden for them. Similarly, in Tegal district, the project has helped establish an active network led by village government and the commitment of these leaders to continue the advocacy was evident in the evaluation interviews.

Fisher Centers. The continued management of the Bitung Fisher Center is assured through YCMI, and the port authority has offered a physical space for the center since the operators will not have sufficient budget to pay for the current premises. The operations and running procedures are well established for the center to continue. In Tegal, discussions were still underway at the time of writing regarding which institution could continue to manage the fisher center. Possibilities include the Tegal Port authority or the local office of the migrant workers agency, BP2MI. The University of Diponogoro has also offered to provide on-site paralegal services. The CMMIA and the MMAF representatives at the evaluation stakeholder workshop expressed an interest in support for new centers in various ports throughout the country.

PHILIPPINES

Platforms for coordination of services and advocacy on fishers' labor rights. In the Philippines, SAFE Seas' principal sustainability strategy is to anchor the activities at all levels within existing government and advisory structures, primarily the IACAT, but also the FARMCs networks and the existing social services under the provincial and municipal offices of the DSWD. Improved coordination mechanisms at national and sub-national levels are both a means and an end in SAFE Seas' strategy for sustainably improving fishers' working conditions and protecting them from labor abuse. At the national level, the IACAT has been strengthened as a forum for coordination on fisher protection by the recent inclusion of BFAR in the council, which promises to improve coordination between DOLE and BFAR. Of great significance, the recent draft Philippines National Strategic Action Plan Against Trafficking in Persons (2023-2027) includes a strong framework for collaborative action for fishers' protection going forward, contributed by the project. As noted earlier, high level commitment of the key agencies will be required to realize the aims.

The SFA networks have reached varying levels of sustainability in each project locality, primarily through strengthening fishers task forces within provincial and city level inter-agency councils against trafficking. Exploring different legal mechanisms to sustain the SFAs, the project has worked with the local IACATs in Palawan and General Santos to integrate fishers' concerns in their agendas. The continued functioning of the SFAs is expected to be assured with the city/municipal mayoral endorsement of the sea-based taskforces within the existing IACAT structures in Tay Tay and Puerto Princesa. Tay Tay municipal agency representatives expressed the view that a particular unit will need to take the lead in convening the SFA once institutionalized by the resolution. The Tay Tay Municipal Agriculture Office (the home of BFAR within the municipality), appears willing to take on the convenor role, based on the evaluation team interview with the representative.

At the barangay level, through the participating barangay councils and the barangay FARMC leaders and members, commitment to continue advocating for fishers' protection is high. Although barangay council representatives from Palawan told the evaluation team that they are not ready for SAFE Seas

to leave, as they have just begun to understand the issues, continued advocacy actions appear to be assured, especially through the FARMC institution.

Enforcement systems for responding to labor violations including FL/TIP. The project contributed significant steps forward in a multi-agency approach to vessel labor inspection. This was most successful at the sub-national level, and particularly in Palawan where harmonized trial inspections were carried out using multi-agency checklists. At the same time, the approach to harmonization has varied per locality. The concept of several agencies conducting inspections together does not appear to be sustainable given differing schedules and officer availability. Rather the marine patrol agencies such as BFAR and the PNP Maritime Group are open to including FL indicators in their routine and unannounced inspections at sea. The training of representatives from multiple agencies promoted an understanding of the roles of each agency in enforcement and the referral pathways once cases are identified. One of the MDI trainers informed the evaluation team that BFAR representatives are open to including labor aspects in their training of marine inspectors. However, further operationalizing of the approach will likely require a standard operating procedure guideline to be adopted by the related government agencies at the national level and approved through a joint memorandum circular.

Regarding the effective implementation of Philippine regulations governing commercial fishing labor, further consultative review of the DOLE regulation DO 156-16 remains to be achieved, involving private sector and fisher representative groups, since there is still considerable resistance among vessel owners to implementing the regulation.

Community awareness of fishers' rights. Although tangible evidence is limited, there appears to be a groundswell of awareness about the risks of forced labor involved in debt taking and traditional payment systems, but widescale change in ingrained traditional practices is a long way off. Given that the project covered the whole range of fishing practices, from large scale commercial vessels involved in *purse seine* fishing[38], and handline fishing vessels of varying sizes, each sector requires specific strategies in the future to raise fishers' awareness of the regulations and payment conditions legally required in each sector of the industry.

Improved access to grievance procedures and remedies. The avenues and service models for fishers to report and seek remedies for incidents of labor abuse are still subject to ongoing discussion in the Philippines. The sustainable outcomes to date are improved resources for service providers in the form of referral directories and improved capacity for helpdesk officers within the City Social Welfare Department and barangay FARMCs. As noted earlier, the potential for a fisher center as a focal point for awareness and a point for reporting along the Indonesia model is the subject of current feasibility study.

[38] *Purse seine* fishing is a type of wild catch fishing using a large net under the vessel with a drawstring like a purse. It is common on vessels operating out of General Santos.

4. LESSONS LEARNED AND EMERGING GOOD PRACTICES

The implementation of SAFE Seas has provided a rich opportunity for learning that can be applied to future endeavors to counter labor abuse and promote acceptable labor standards in fishing. The lessons reflect learning from both successes and limitations of the project gathered from a variety of perspectives. The emerging good practices are those practices or models identified by the evaluation team and respondents that have been especially effective toward achieving the project goals or which warrant replication.

4.1 LESSONS LEARNED

- Long term interventions are required to support policy and regulatory change in the sector. In both the Philippines and Indonesia, progress has been made towards policy change (for example regarding multi-disciplinary labor inspection) that is fully endorsed at national or province level as applicable, but at national level in particular, the consultation processes involved in policy review are lengthy, even when the government institutions are committed to the review process and the issues addressed.

- The scope of the project was ambitious, both geographically and thematically. SAFE Seas addressed all levels of intervention, national, subnational, and community, as well as all types of fishing found in Indonesia and the Philippines. The design may have benefited from a narrower focus on commercial fishing, or on a particular level of intervention.

- The complexity of governance of the fishing sector needs to be taken into account in design of both prevention and enforcement strategies. The fishing sector is highly varied, including vessel size, local or foreign flag, and the attendant risks of labor abuse. It is necessary to develop targeted strategies to address the labor conditions of fishers in different sectors of the industry.

- Extensive use of public media and sophisticated behavior change communications is required for advocacy-focused projects. The development of a comprehensive communications strategy was pursued in both countries, and social media use was most vigorous in the Philippines. The communications strategy could have been advanced earlier and more comprehensively project wide. Associated with advocacy interventions, the measurement of change in behavior and attitudes needs to be further developed.

- Monitoring and evaluation capacity needs to be highly developed for a project of this complexity, with policy and advocacy outcomes. SAFE Seas staff were challenged to come up with sensitive indicators of advocacy results, and to consistently explain the results reported in the data reporting forms.

4.2 EMERGING GOOD PRACTICES

- Support to inter-agency forums on fishers' protection. The project's support to inter-agency fora to address fishers' labor concerns, whether at national or subnational level, represents a valuable practice that evolved in different ways in the Philippines and Indonesia. In both countries the creation or strengthening of such taskforces enabled better collaboration between the key actors and a basis for national action planning to address the issues.

- Community-based fisher centers in Indonesia as an accessible focal point for labor grievance reporting and advocacy. The model has been well developed in Indonesia, especially in Bitung in North Sulawesi, and has the potential for replication elsewhere in the country. Fisher centers may be relevant in the Philippines or other countries with adaptation, taking into consideration the intended functions of the center, physical location and operational issues.

- Piloting procedures for multidisciplinary fishing vessel labor inspection. A good practice developed by SAFE Seas in both countries was to bring the relevant agencies together to develop processes for harmonized or multi-agency approaches to inspections – building an emerging model that can be shared with other areas and expanded to the national level policy. Part of the learning regarding MDI is that different approaches are possible and preferred by the authorities in different port locations; it does not have to be a physically joint inspection where the main agencies board vessels together, but various sea-based authorities can include labor issues within their inspection routines.

- Mobilizing local advocates for fishers' rights. In the Philippines, SAFE Seas partnered with community representatives in activity implementation and mobilized champions for fishers' rights among barangay councilors, FARMCs, and fishers themselves, building community support for local government legislation where necessary to support plans and budget resources.

- Building grassroots networks at the village level adapted to the Indonesia context. In Tegal in Central Java and Bitung district in North Sulawesi, SAFE Seas mobilized village leaders and networks of cadres to raise fishing communities' knowledge of fishing recruitment regulations and case reporting channels.

- Gendered advocacy approach. SAFE Seas developed a variety of strategies for engaging women in community advocacy, based initially on research on women's needs in fishing communities. In Indonesia, SAFE Seas conducted community-based training for women members of targeted fishing communities to support the early detection and reporting of cases of labor abuse. For example, women villagers in Central Java were provided training on legal rights of fishers, and in North Sulawesi, women were prominent among the trained advocacy volunteers. In the Philippines, project partner OND Hesed worked closely with women in the target communities, raising their confidence to report labor abuses.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are organized according to the themes of relevance and coherence, effectiveness of the interventions, effectiveness and efficiency of management, and sustainability. Lastly, the evaluation provides ratings for the project's outcome achievements and sustainability per country, according to ILAB rating criteria (specified in the TOR - Annex F).

5.1 RELEVANCE AND COHERENCE OF THE PROJECT

SAFE Seas' interventions designed under its Theory of Change represent a valid response to address the specific factors contributing to fishers' labor exploitation in both countries but addressing private sector compliance in various parts of the employment supply chain could have been given higher priority. The site selection in the two countries and thematic coverage of labor protection in all types of fishing, commercial as well as artisanal, domestic as well as migrant fishing, led to an ambitious design in practical terms.

In broad terms, SAFE Seas' approach and its interventions proved highly relevant to the needs of its stakeholders, at the national and subnational government levels and among fishing communities and leaders, and their representative associations. Nevertheless, in Indonesia support for the project agenda varied, with elements of weak engagement at the national level and in Central Java. In the Philippines, the leadership of the IACAT found the project support highly relevant to their anti-trafficking agenda while commitment at the senior level in DOLE, MARINA, and the Department of Agriculture's BFAR is less apparent. Provincial and municipal members of the Philippines IACAT structure found SAFE Seas' awareness and capacity building efforts fit with their interests. The project activities proved highly relevant to the local communities and leaders in each of the project sites in the Philippines and Indonesia.

SAFE Seas' core strategy was to form linkages with national policy and programs at all levels, and in doing so it remained coherent with government policy in both Indonesia and the Philippines. The project teams coordinated with other donor-led programs, most evidently in Indonesia, with varying success. Two concurrent ILO programs in Indonesia are building on the momentum toward harmonized fishing labor inspection supported by SAFE Seas, but the efforts of Plan and ILO could have been better coordinated, suggesting that donors could be more instrumental in supporting coordination.

5.2 EFFECTIVENESS OF THE INTERVENTIONS

Despite the restrictions imposed by the COVID-19 outbreak midway in the project, SAFE Seas adapted well and has successfully delivered most of its planned interventions. The 12-month cost extension was effectively used in both the Philippines and Indonesia. It enabled the project to roll out capacity building for multi-disciplinary inspection through tools, training manuals, and training for marine, labor inspection, and social welfare personnel in the two countries; elaboration of operating procedures for the fisher centers in North Sulawesi and Tegal; and strengthening local government endorsement of safe fishing alliances in different localities.

Following the interim evaluation, the project accepted and acted on most of the evaluation recommendations, particularly regarding sustainability planning and gender interventions. It was less active in responding to the recommendations regarding adjustments to the monitoring and evaluation framework.

INDONESIA

Under **Outcome 1**, SAFE Seas Indonesia succeeded in establishing multi-agency forums for promoting fisher labor protection at the national level and in North Sulawesi. In Central Java the project made concerted efforts to create a forum at provincial and district levels but was less successful as the governor's support was not forthcoming. The project's contribution to the drafting of a National Action Plan on Seafarers and Fish Workers' Protection 2021 – 2024, was a significant achievement. It was submitted by the CMMIA for Presidential endorsement in late 2021, but full endorsement by Presidential order that would make it binding is still pending.

Progress toward developing multi-disciplinary inspection practices has been strongest in North Sulawesi, where SAFE Seas contributed to the capacity of inspectors of MOM and Port authorities to understand FL and TIP indicators, and pilot a coordinated approach based on a harmonized checklist. This has been taken up as an example at the national level. Conversely in Tegal Port, under the provincial governor authority, trial joint inspections are pending multi-agency agreement and government approval.

Toward advancing efforts to address specific fisher labor exploitation issues on domestic and foreign flag vessels, SAFE Seas commissioned a Labor Supply Chain Mapping study that provides useful insights for future interventions. However, dissemination of the findings has not been fully realized, thus reducing its value.

Outcome 2 sought to prevent labor exploitation and promote their rights through widespread awareness and to improve fishers' access to grievance reporting. The project achieved considerable momentum in the last two years, promoting awareness of fishers' rights, especially among the fishing communities themselves in Bitung in North Sulawesi and Tegal district in Central Java.

Steady progress was made towards increased awareness of FL and trafficking indicators/labor rights of fishers, especially at the sub-national level, and among the community level actors through the project's village-based networks. It also raised the profile of the issue among the lead agencies at the national level. Private sector engagement through a variety of initiatives saw relatively small-scale but steady support for improving fishing companies' responsibility for fisher training and labor protection. However, overall, the efforts appear to have been somewhat diluted in the spread across various target groups.

The establishment of two local fisher centers for grievance reporting is one of the project's success stories. The centers offer various access options for fishers and family members, either through networks, direct visit or by the hotline service. They bring together with civil society support groups, as well as fisher associations where they exist, to provide paralegal and referral services, connecting with national remediation services. Since the two centers opened a significant number of cases of fisher labor violations have been received and resolved or referred to the national government channels, including cases of compensation to fishers' wives whose husbands disappeared or died at sea.

The factors that supported the achievements in Indonesia were the ownership of key government stakeholders, including the CMMIA and MMAF at national level, as well as the advocacy skills of the project director and the team.

PHILIPPINES

Under **Outcome 1**, SAFE Seas Philippines has been successful in raising the profile of labor protection of fishers among the existing anti-trafficking structures and fishing inspection bodies and in strengthening the collaborative relationships between diverse government and civil society actors, most vigorously at the provincial and municipal level, under the SAFE Fishing Alliance umbrella. Reluctance at the senior level of key agencies to take the lead in the technical working group under IACAT, especially regarding enforcement, remained a challenge to progress.

At the national level, SAFE Seas achieved a moderate influence on improving the regulatory and policy framework governing protection of fishing workers. Regarding regulatory policy, SAFE Seas has been most successful in providing platforms for discussion of the existing frameworks for fishing labor regulation, represented by DOLE Department Order 156-16[39] rather than advocating new regulations or policies. However, the project's influence is seen in the revised anti-trafficking law passed in 2022, bringing BFAR and the PCG among the agencies mandated to address trafficking, and standardizing DOLE's response to trafficking cases across all sectors including fishing. Of great significance, through SAFE Seas' engagement with IACAT a fisher labor protection plan was included in the draft national anti-trafficking strategy 2023-2027, embedding a swathe of multi-stakeholder plans.

At the provincial level, significant achievements were made towards local government policies for coordination among agencies on fisher labor protection at the provincial and municipal level in the project sites in Mindanao and Palawan, with further legal endorsements expected during 2022.

The project strategy towards improved policy and coordination was embedded in the existing Philippines institutional coordination platform for trafficking and forced labor. This proved successful; however, the focus on the forced labor and trafficking in persons governance structure may have diverted efforts from the response to the full continuum of labor abuses, from minor infringements to the most severe.

Over the life of the project, SAFE Seas built momentum towards nationally approved labor inclusive guidelines for inspection of crews of commercial fishing vessels. The achievements have been most marked at the subnational level in Palawan with strong interest and commitment to a multi-agency approach. Given the foundation of interest in a coordinated approach, SAFE Seas Philippines supported local inspection actors to develop joint or harmonized checklists and built their capacity to understand FL and TIP indicators.

The evaluation team observed that a 'one-size fits all' approach has not been pursued; in each locality inspection actors adopted their own approach to harmonization – either through one combined checklist or multiple ones that include labor standards. The project pursued national and local advocacy on MDI in parallel but the eventual strategy was to lead from the local level, with demonstration examples. Based on stakeholder views, the need remains to establish SOPs for the harmonized approach and a national government endorsement.

Under **Outcome 2**, SAFE Seas' efforts to raise awareness at all levels of government, in the private sector, and in fishing communities produced varied improvements in levels of understanding of fishers' working conditions and their rights. The project's most significant achievements in raising awareness of the issues were observed among government agency representatives at local government levels – provincial, municipal, and barangay.

There is evidence that fishers and local leaders are more aware of labor rights and standards following the SAFE Seas awareness raising campaigns in the target communities, but traditional practices, such as debt taking and unfair payment systems associated with both artisanal and commercial fishing are still ingrained and normalized, associated with reticence to report grievances. The emphasis on women's role in raising awareness of their husbands' or sons' rights was a project innovation, but the extent of changes in their awareness was difficult for the evaluation to assess.

SAFE Seas Philippines took a different approach to Indonesia to improve fishers' access to grievance reporting and remediation, focusing on improving existing services and reporting channels rather than creating new ones. Progress was gradual in supporting improvement to reporting and remediation

[39] Rules and Regulations Governing the Working and Living Conditions of Fishers on Fishing Vessels Engaged in Commercial Fishing Operation. https://bwc.dole.gov.ph/images/Issuances/DepartmentOrder/DO_156_16_WorkingandLivingConditionsOfFishersonboardFishingvesselsEngaged_Commercial-FishingOperation.pdf

services, with initiatives to strengthen barangay helpdesks through the FARMCs as well as capacity built among existing help desk staff operated by the local City Social Welfare and Development Offices. Service directories were produced in each locality to assist in case referrals. However, there is still much to be done to improve fishers' access to local services, linked with the national systems and offices responsible for the range of labor violations, from minor infringements to FL and trafficking.

Based on the limited evidence available, SAFE Seas made gains in engaging with the tuna industry operators based in General Santos, contributing to a fair-trade statement at the 2022 Tuna Congress, including mention of labor standards. But the evaluation concluded that overall the project could have built a stronger, multiple entry point advocacy strategy to influence private sector stakeholders.

Gender. SAFE Seas invested substantially in understanding the impacts of labor exploitation in fishing on women and families. It applied this understanding initially in raising women's awareness of fishers' labor rights and progressively promoting women as community leaders in defending fisher's working conditions in Indonesia and the Philippines. Efforts at the grassroots level proved most successful in Indonesia, where women were promoted as leaders in community-based awareness raising, and fishers' wives were enabled to act as advocates for their husbands in documenting and filing cases of forced labor. In the Philippines, SAFE Seas identified the need to build women's alternative livelihoods to reduce their dependence on fishing. The project's gender research lays the groundwork for future development work focused on the empowerment of women in fishing communities in both countries. Going beyond this, questions regarding fishing as a traditionally male employment domain and LGBTQI rights remain to be addressed.

5.3 EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF MANAGEMENT

Project management and communications was found to be effective with strong oversight and supervision mechanisms. Nevertheless, the complexity of the levels of governance, comprising Plan USNO, Plan Philippines, and Yayasan Plan International Indonesia and the dual reporting lines limited efficiency. Throughout the project, the accountability lines were not completely clear between the PD, the National Coordinators, and Plan USNO Officers, although Project reports are endorsed by both the PD and a representative of Plan US. In future multi-country donor funded projects it may be advisable to clarify the PD role and place it with the Grantee office.

The project's human resources allocation was adequate, but stretched at times, in terms of the number of staff at central and field level relative to their workloads. The project attracted staff, both present and former, who demonstrated high levels of commitment to the project mission and work. At the same time, high turnover has been a considerable obstacle in both countries, but most obviously in Indonesia. This affected the continuity of operations and institutional memory and relationships with stakeholders. The reasons were varied, including workload, and competing opportunities that arose when the project extension was awaiting confirmation.

While each implementing partner contributed to the project's success through their respective experience and networks, Plan encountered challenges in managing its implementing partners. USDOL financial and administrative reporting and documentation requirements proved very challenging for both organizations. Future projects might consider alternative arrangements, partnering with NGOs on particular interventions, rather than establishing a formal sub-agreement arrangement, if agency capacities are in doubt.

Overall, project implementation followed the workplan deliverables, and the project took effective actions to adjust and maintain operations in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, some implementation delays were experienced due to the requirements of ILAB processes, such as the approval of the project extension. Plan secured the services of highly experienced technical consultants to assist in capacity building and production of knowledge products, but the project could have been more proactive in expediting USDOL publication requirements and launching the products via seminars and innovative channels.

SAFE Seas developed and applied a thorough M&E plan, compliant with ILAB standards, and well used in each country to regularly monitor progress against targets and deliverables. The overall structure of the results framework could have elevated increased awareness and remediation access to a higher level of the logical framework to permit better assessment of changes in each area. Additional measures could have included a change in awareness among government officers and private sectors related to awareness raising interventions. While the project teams per country adjusted indicator targets during the life of the project as deemed appropriate, there was a reluctance to adjust the CMEP results framework or the indicators themselves.

5.4 SUSTAINABILITY

As the project approaches is conclusion, the Philippines and Indonesia teams have put in place specific sustainability strategies for the continuity of many of the project's outcomes, and exit consultations are underway or planned with the stakeholders in the Philippines and Indonesia.

While the project cannot ensure sustainability of its results, the country teams have worked steadily with their partners to support institutionalized structures to carry the safe fishing agenda forward, establish national action plans for fisher protection, as well as to find new hosts for the community-based reporting and advocacy services in Indonesia.

In Indonesia, the NAP 2021-2024 for Protection of Seafarers and Fishers, especially if endorsed by the President, assures a pathway for sustained national action through government funding. The backing of the CMMIA for the NAP provides optimism for its eventual approval. The North Sulawesi piloting of multi-disciplinary labor inspection tools and procedures in Bitung port demonstrated a more coordinated approach with the potential for national adoption and replication. The fisher centers in Bitung and Central Java have fulfilled most sustainability requirements in terms of their operational practices. In Bitung, a managing host for the Center is assured through the YCMI foundation, while in Tegal discussions are underway to identify a host institution.

In the Philippines, collaboration for advocacy on fishers' labor protection was anchored in existing national institutions, promoting the sustainability of the safe fishing platform. At the provincial and municipal level, several local government ordinances that would give an ongoing legal basis and funding to inter-agency planning on fisher protection are in place or undergoing local government hearings. The inclusion of a fishers' labor protection framework in the new draft Philippines National Strategic Plan against Trafficking in Persons (2023-2027) provides a strong basis for continued action, provided the key agencies commit to turning the plans into action.

Regarding improved implementation of Philippine regulations governing commercial fishing labor, the project has enabled wider understanding of the legal and regulatory frameworks among duty bearers, but broad acceptance of DOLE regulation DO 156-16 remains to be achieved, involving private sector and fisher representative groups, since there is still considerable resistance to its implementation.

The development of coordinated sea-based inspections of vessels is a work in progress in the project sites of Palawan and General Santos, with pilot systems for inter-agency approaches developed and evident commitment of the labor and marine authorities to coordinate their efforts to detect forced labor and other violations. As noted earlier, a Joint Memorandum Circular issued at national level would help to institutionalize and expand the approach.

Local advocacy networks for fishers' awareness of their rights through barangay councils and FARMCs appears sustainable given the commitment of fishers' rights champions, but longer-term advocacy is needed to change longstanding traditions in recruitment and payment practices. The sustainable outcomes in strengthened reporting avenues for fishers to date are improved resources for service providers in the form of referral directories and better capacity of helpdesk officers of the DSWD and barangay FARMCs to receive and respond to grievances.

5.5 OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY RATINGS

The evaluation provides ratings for the level of achievement of each of the project outcomes and potential for sustainability in Indonesia and the Philippines based on the evaluation findings.

ACHIEVEMENT

The achievement of each of the project's objectives and outcomes in Indonesia and the Philippines is rated according to the following scale:

- **High:** met or exceeded most targets for the period evaluated, with mostly positive feedback from key stakeholders and participants.
- **Above moderate:** met or exceeded most targets for the period evaluated, **but** with mostly neutral or negative feedback from key stakeholders and participants.
- **Moderate:** missed most targets for the period evaluated, **but** with mostly positive feedback from key stakeholders and participants.
- **Low:** missed most targets for the period evaluated, with mostly neutral or negative feedback from key stakeholders and participants.

INDONESIA

Outcome	Rating
Outcome 1: Improved enforcement to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels	High
SO 1.1 Regulatory and policy framework to combat labor exploitation in fishing improved (abbreviated)	High
SO 1.2 Quality of labor-inclusive inspections on fishing vessels procedures and implementation improved	Above moderate
Outcome 2: Decreased indicators of labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels	Above moderate
SO 2.1 Awareness of communities, government and private sector increased	Above moderate
SO 2.2 Ability of fish workers/families to report exploitative working conditions improved	High
SO 2.3 Improved access to remedies of FL/TIP and /or exploitative working conditions	High

PHILIPPINES

Outcome	Rating
Outcome 1: Improved enforcement to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels	**Above moderate**
SO 1.1 Regulatory and policy framework to combat labor exploitation in fishing improved (abbreviated)	Above moderate
SO 1.2 Quality of labor-inclusive inspections on fishing vessels procedures and implementation improved	High

Outcome 2: Decreased indicators of labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels	**Above moderate**
SO 2.1 Awareness of communities, government and private sector increased	High
SO 2.2 Ability of fish workers/families to report exploitative working conditions improved	Above moderate
SO 2.3 Improved access to remedies of FL/TIP and /or exploitative working conditions	Moderate

SUSTAINABILITY

The evaluation provides ratings of the likelihood that the benefits of the project will continue after donor funding ends. These ratings are provided per country and for each of the project's outcomes. The rating scale comprises a four-point scale (low, moderate, above moderate, high):

- **High:** strong likelihood that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and the necessary resources[40] are in place to ensure sustainability;
- **Above moderate:** above average likelihood that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and the necessary resources are identified but not yet committed;
- **Moderate:** some likelihood that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and some of the necessary resources are identified;
- **Low:** weak likelihood that that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and the necessary resources are not identified.

INDONESIA

Outcome	Rating
Outcome 1: Improved enforcement to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels	Above moderate
SO 1.1 Regulatory and policy framework to combat labor exploitation in fishing improved (abbreviated)	Above moderate
SO 1.2 Quality of labor-inclusive inspections on fishing vessels procedures and implementation improved	High
Outcome 2: Decreased indicators of labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels	Above moderate
SO 2.1 Awareness of communities, government and private sector increased	Above moderate
SO 2.2 Ability of fish workers/families to report exploitative working conditions improved	High
SO 2.3 Improved access to remedies of FL/TIP and /or exploitative working conditions	High

[40] Resources can include financial resources (i.e. non-donor replacement resources), as well as organization capacity, institutional linkages, motivation and ownership, and political will, among others.

PHILIPPINES

Outcome	Rating
Outcome 1: Improved enforcement to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels	Above moderate
SO 1.1 Regulatory and policy framework to combat labor exploitation in fishing improved (abbreviated)	Above moderate
SO 1.2 Quality of labor-inclusive inspections on fishing vessels procedures and implementation improved	High
Outcome 2: Decreased indicators of labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels	Above moderate
SO 2.1 Awareness of communities, government and private sector increased	Above moderate
SO 2.2 Ability of fish workers/families to report exploitative working conditions improved	Moderate
SO 2.3 Improved access to remedies of FL/TIP and exploitative working conditions	Moderate

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are directed to Plan for implementation prior to the SAFE Seas closeout; to Plan, ILAB, and other international agencies engaged in promoting labor rights in fishing and to ILAB on project management considerations.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO PLAN FOR SAFE SEAS CLOSEOUT

1. Document and share the SAFE Seas Indonesia fisher center model with stakeholders in Indonesia. Prior to project closure, Plan should fully document the SAFE Seas fisher centers, presenting the ideal model for replication or expansion, the potential institutional home/s, operational costs, and standard operating procedures.
2. Consolidate the SAFE Seas Philippines roadmap for fisher grievance reporting and referral. Prior to project end, SAFE Seas Philippines should consolidate recommendations for further development of fisher grievance reporting services and disseminate them to the relevant national stakeholders.
3. Disseminate the labor supply chain mapping studies and Indonesia gender study to national and regional actors. The supply chain studies conducted by SAFE Seas in Indonesia and the Philippines represent valuable knowledge products for strategizing ongoing efforts by governments, UN agencies, NGOs, donors, and the private sector. Prior to project closure, or as soon as practicable, both countries should launch and disseminate the supply chain mapping studies to national and international actors. The forthcoming study on gender roles in the sector in Indonesia should also be disseminated once approved by USDOL.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO PLAN, ILAB, AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS

4. Future interventions in fisher labor rights protection in these and other countries in the region should limit the project thematic and geographic scope relative to the scale of the project resources, choosing specific areas of focus, and building on the good practices and lessons of SAFE Seas.
5. Future interventions by Plan International addressing the needs of fishing communities in the region should continue to leverage Plan's expertise in community development and gender-focused interventions. This may include promoting access to alternative livelihoods in impoverished fishing communities as recommended by community members, leaders, and women, alongside the expansion of community-level fisher support services.
6. Continue support to Indonesia and the Philippines to institutionalize multi-agency labor inspection of fishing vessels.
    - Both Philippines and Indonesia warrant further technical assistance to consolidate, expand, and institutionalize multi-agency inspection procedures. In Indonesia, ongoing action needs to be closely coordinated with government plans and donor-funded efforts, especially those delivered through the ILO's current projects in the region.
    - Ongoing and future project designs should aim toward the eventual establishment of nationally endorsed standard operating procedures for multi-disciplinary labor inspection of commercial fishing vessels.
    - Strengthen enforcement frameworks and their application to encompass the smaller scale vessels as well as commercial scale vessels in the Philippines and Indonesia.
    - Engagement and capacity of inspection authorities could be strengthened by donor government capacity building and through learning missions to other countries with highly developed fishing crew labor enforcement practices.

7. Continue support in the Philippines and Indonesia for local services for fishers to report grievances and access remedies. Services and systems for fishers to report grievances and access remediation require ongoing development, institutionalization, and replication, in close coordination with efforts supported by different donors.

8. Strengthen private sector advocacy strategies in the design of future interventions in the Philippines and Indonesia. Future programs should devote efforts to working with private sector associations and industry leaders in each country - vessel owners, operators, and recruitment agencies, differentiating strategies for the domestic and migrant private sector actors. Such efforts can be informed by SAFE Seas' labor supply chain mapping studies.

9. Strengthen advocacy for fisher labor standards along fish product supply chains. Sustained improvements to labor practices in the fishing industry in the region require pressure on producers and buyers along the supply chain, including consumer advocacy and cooperation with international buyers in transit countries and markets globally, including the US, EU, Japan, and Taiwan.

10. Address Indonesian migrant fisher labor issues through strengthened CSO networks and bilateral agreements between fishing worker transit and destination countries. Prevention and detection of fisher exploitation in foreign flag vessels should be pursued through CSO networks between sending and destination countries for migrant fishers and support for bilateral agreements on enforcement, in cooperation among donor-funded projects.

11. Address fishers labor exploitation within the broad perspective of labor standards and rights. Interventions on labor protection in the fishing sector in Indonesia, Philippines, and other fish producing countries require differentiated strategies addressing the continuum of fisher labor issues, including occupational safety and health breaches, wage theft and unfair payment systems as well as conditions amounting to FL and trafficking. These interventions should work with key agencies – ministries of labor, labor unions, private sector associations, marine authorities, and criminal justice authorities.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO ILAB FOR CMEP DEVELOPMENT AND OVERSIGHT

12. Future ILAB intervention designs on labor protection in fishing should ensure a clear logical structure and in general ensure that grantees are aware of the opportunity to review and adjust various elements of the CMEP, including the hierarchy of results framework sub-outcomes, outputs, and performance indicators during the course of a project.

ANNEX A. PROJECT PERFORMANCE INDICATOR RESULTS AS OF APRIL 2022

The tables below present the performance monitoring results reported as of the most recent TPR reporting in April 2022. The evaluator provides qualitative updates for the period April to September 2022 where available from the stakeholder interviews, in the last column, subject to confirmation by SAFE Seas October 2022 TPR. The results at the outcome level for Outcome 1 are presented separately as a milestone indicator system was applied for this outcome.

TABLE A-1. OUTCOME 1: IMPROVED ENFORCEMENT TO COMBAT LABOR EXPLOITATION INCLUDING FL/TIP ON FISHING VESSELS

Indicator	Target/ Actual	Country	Apr 2021	Oct 2021	Apr 2022	Oct 2022	SAFE Seas Narrative Reporting (Evaluator comment on the reported result)
OTC 1: Improved enforcement to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels (C1)	Target	All countries	Milestone 3 (October 2020 - September 2021): The related government stakeholders receive improved labor inspection procedures or tools which have labor exploitation indicators including FL/TIP				
	Actual						The PHL SAFE Seas team is a step ahead of IDN SAFE Seas in implementing joint inspection. Satisfactory progress was made by both countries.
	Target	Indonesia	1 inspection procedure and/or tool that have labor indicators including FL/TIP drafted	1 inspection procedure and/or tool that have labor indicators including FL/TIP finalized or received by IDN Key Government Stakeholders	Multidisciplinary Inspections Training to be done for Inspectors		IDN SAFE Seas has successfully conducted the training on Multidisciplinary Inspection for inspectors in North Sulawesi. inspectors from Central Java also attended. The multidisciplinary inspection at Central Java will be conducted in May/June 2022. *Evaluator note: This did not occur as planned.*
	Actual		Achieved	Achieved	Achieved		

	Target	Philippines	1 inspection procedure and/or tool that have labor indicators including FL/TIP drafted	1 inspection procedure and/or tool that have labor indicators including FL/TIP finalized or received by PHL Key Government Stakeholders	Multidisciplinary Inspections Training to be done for Inspectors		To be completed in the next reporting period.
	Actual		Not achieved	Not achieved	No Report		

TABLE A-12. PERFORMANCE INDICATOR RESULTS FOR OUTCOMES AND SUB-OUTCOMES (EXCEPT FOR OTC1)

Indicator	Country	Target/ actual	April 2022	Final Value (End of Project)	SAFE Seas narrative Reporting (Evaluator comment on the reported result)
Outcome 1: Improved enforcement to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels					
Sub Outcome 1.1 Regulatory and policy framework to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels improved					
SO1.1a # of policies, regulations or implementation guidelines created and disseminated with SAFE Seas project assistance (Indicator counts **the local, regional, and national levels,** cumulative, semi-annual)	IDN	Target	2	2	As noted at midterm, the target reflects difficulties the project has had in creating guidelines the GOI is willing to approve.
		Actual	2	2	One result reported in Oct 2020 refers to SAFE Seas assistance to the MMAF on drafting a letter regarding the prevention of COVID19 as a part of fisher protection. The Ministry released and circulated letter in May 2020. *Evaluator: It is not clear what the second result reported refers to – it could be the North Sulawesi provincial Governor's decree approving the SFA in March 2020, also reported under SO1.1b.* The National Action Plan on Protection of Seafarers and Fishers is not counted yet as it has not been fully approved by Presidential order.

Indicator	Country	Target/ actual	April 2022	Final Value (End of Project)	SAFE Seas narrative Reporting (Evaluator comment on the reported result)
	PHL	Target (revised)	2	2	
		Actual	1	1	The reported number "1" refers to the provincial ordinance in Sarangani Province, which was enacted in 2021. During this reporting period, the project worked on the provision related to the creation of the sea-based taskforce that would be an addendum to the approved ordinance. At the local level, proposed FL/TIP ordinances in Puerto Princesa city as well as in Taytay municipality in Palawan province are already at the stage of public hearing prior to its official issuance as a local policy. In General Santos city, activation of the local anti-trafficking task force through a legislative amendment is ongoing while in Sarangani province with reference to the enacted provincial ordinance for FL/TIP, the project is continuously collaborating with relevant stakeholders for the inclusion of the creation of sea based task force in the enacted ordinance. Upcoming May 2022 Elections are affecting the Legislation of the said proposed local policies *Evaluator: The previous TPR reporting (October 2021), noted: DO 156-16 does not reflect the perspective of BFAR, and given continuing dissent about the executive order, policy amendments at national level are not foreseen within the life of the project.*
SO1.1 (b) Number of regional and local regulatory frameworks on exploitative labor conditions on fishing	IDN	Target	2	2	*Evaluator: It is not clear which two regulatory frameworks are counted toward the result.*
		Actual	2	2	The project target has been achieved.

Indicator	Country	Target/ actual	April 2022	Final Value (End of Project)	SAFE Seas narrative Reporting (Evaluator comment on the reported result)
vessels aligned with national framework (Aligned means that regulations and polices are consistent between subnational level and national government)					The Governor in North Sulawesi signed a decree to establish SFA working group in March 2020, including the role of SFA working group members and implementation policy of SFA. The signed decree was shared with SAFE Seas by the SFA North Sulawesi in April 2020.
	PHL	Target	3	3	*The same results are provided for SO1.1 (a) and SO1.1 (b)*
		Actual	3	3	Philippines site-specific results: * In Sarangani Province – regarding the enacted provincial ordinance for FL/TIP, the project is collaborating with relevant stakeholders for the inclusion of the creation of a sea-based task force in the enacted ordinance; in General Santos city, the local legislative body is in the process of reactivating the local task force for anti-trafficking to include fishing vessels on its scope * In Palawan Province - two proposed policies in the form of local ordinances are already at the stage of public hearing in the two project sites in the province Notations: Upcoming May 2022 Elections are affecting the Legislation of the said proposed local policies
Output 1.1.1 Final draft of improved regulations and policy briefs submitted to government					
OTP 1.1.1 (a) # of advisory groups established to drive the process of policy and regulation revisions at all levels of government (in PHL affiliated with the FARMC)	IDN	Target	10	10	
		Actual	10	10	Project target achieved. Represents the number of SFA groups established at national and sub-national level.
	PHL	Target	21	21	
		Actual	21	21	Philippines Site specific Activities:

Indicator	Country	Target/ actual	April 2022	Final Value (End of Project)	SAFE Seas narrative Reporting (Evaluator comment on the reported result)
					In addition to the recognized legal entities which served as advisory groups of the project, city/municipal level FARMCs in General Santos City, Sarangani and Palawan provinces were tapped by the project to help in matters related to policy legislation for the fishing sector.
OTP 1.1.1 (b) # of reports and policy briefs produced by the SAFE Seas project to inform decision making on FL/TIP by government policy makers	IDN	Target	3	3	
		Actual	5	5	Exceeded target number of policy briefs/reports.
	PHL	Target	3	3	
		Actual	2	2	Target not achieved.
Sub-outcome 1.2 Quality of labor inclusive inspections on fishing vessels (procedures and implementation) improved					
SO 1.2 Number of joint monitoring inspections conducted by members of interagency working groups	IDN	Target	2	2	**Target achieved in the Oct 22 reporting period.** *As reported in October 2020 reporting, IDN SAFE Seas facilitated a trial joint fishing vessel monitoring inspection in North Sulawesi in September 2020. The planned trial inspection did not take place in Jakarta port due to COVID-19 restrictions.* As of April 2022 reporting, The IDN SAFE Seas will facilitate the joint inspection on fishing vessels at North Sulawesi in June 2022 as follow-up to the Multidisciplinary Inspection training.
		Actual	1	1	
	PHL	Target	1	1	**Target achieved.** While the Project has already achieved this indicator, it is continuously collaborating with the stakeholders to strengthen FL/TIP referral and reporting systems for the fishing sector. During the October 2020 reporting period, SAFE Seas conducted one joint inspection in Taytay municipality in Palawan, involving various stakeholders. This activity was
		Actual	2 (Cumulative)	2	

Indicator	Country	Target/ actual	April 2022	Final Value (End of Project)	SAFE Seas narrative Reporting (Bvaluator comment on the reported result)
					also used to test the joint inspections checklist produced by the assigned sub-group.
Output 1.2.1 Inspection mechanism among related key government agencies is improved					
OTP 1.2.1 # of recommendations produced by SSP to improve labor inspection mechanisms that are agreed upon by the key government agencies	IDN	Target	9	9	Exceeded project target.
		Actual	10	10	*According to the narrative report, recommendations produced by SAFE Seas have been agreed by the Director and Deputy Director at the MOM ministry level.*
	PHL	Target	3	3	*Exceeded project target for number of recommendations agreed but it is not clear at what level. There is no nationally agreed plan for labor inclusive vessel inspections*.
		Actual	10	10	
Output 1.2.2 Roadmap for establishing fishing vessel labor-inclusive IA inspections working unit <u>disseminated</u> among relevant stakeholders					
OTP 1.2.2 Number of stakeholders that have <u>implemented</u> the roadmap	IDN	Target	2	2	*Evaluator: The indicator "implemented the roadmap" is a higher level than receiving the roadmap. No evidence available that the specific roadmap provided in the SAFE Seas policy brief is under implementation in September 2022.*
		Actual	0	1	The IDN SAFE Seas has the roadmap of multidisciplinary inspection for labor protection on domestic and foreign fishing vessels. The targets here indicate regions - Central Java and North Sulawesi.
	PHL	Target	2	2	
		Actual	3	3	LGUs demonstrated this with the ongoing legislations that included the lens of FL/TIP in fishing vessels
Output 1.2.3 Fishing vessel and labor inspectors trained on incorporating labor exploitation into inspections					
	IDN	Target	20	20	

Indicator	Country	Target/ actual	April 2022	Final Value (End of Project)	SAFE Seas narrative Reporting (Evaluator comment on the reported result)
OTP 1.2.3 (a) # of inspectors who completed training on FL/TIP in inspections of fishing vessels		Actual	26	26	Target achieved. The IDN SAFE Seas Multi-disciplinary Inspection training in North Sulawesi was conducted online.
	PHL	Target	20	20	
		Actual	0	0	TOT for multi-disciplinary inspections has been done in a manner that the full cycle of addressing FL/TIP has been covered - Protection, Prevention and Prosecution. Training was confirmed by 60 stakeholders, which included field law enforcers, certified social workers and prosecutors. *Evaluator: As the training was completed in April, the numbers will be included in the next reporting period.*
OTP 1.2.3 (b) Percentage of inspectors who report an increase in skills and knowledge after receiving training from the SAFE Seas project	IDN	Target	85%	85%	
		Actual	96.2%	96.2%	IDN SAFE Seas post-test results shows that 25 of the 26 participants experienced an increased understanding about labor inspection in fishing vessel. While in narrative evaluation some participants appreciated the values of the training and expected that the joint inspection can be further strengthened.
	PHL	Target	85%	85%	
		Actual	0%	0%	As the training was completed in April, the results will be included in the next reporting period.

Indicator	Country	Target/ actual	April 2022	Final Value (End of Project)	SAFE Seas narrative Reporting (Evaluator comment on the reported result)
Outcome 2 Decreased indicators of labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels					
OTC 2 (a) Percent of fish workers who understand the meaning of FL/TIP	IDN	Target	60%	70%	
		Actual		Not available	The final survey, conducted in August 2022, will be reported in October 2022 TPR. Report notes that the baseline values for both countries have been reconsidered following a second survey March 2021. The first survey was conducted in April 2020. Indonesia result from March 2021 survey: 55%. *Evaluator: No information available as to why the survey was repeated in 2021.*
	PHL	Target	60%	70%	
		Actual		Not available	Survey conducted August 2022. Will be reported in Oct 2022 TPR. Baseline value based on October 2020 survey, reported in April 2021: 40.8%
OTC 2 (b) Number of fish workers who reported seeking FL/TIP services or referrals after receiving SAFE Seas campaign information	IDN	Target	15	31	Family members seeking services for fish workers are also counted. *Evaluator: Targets different to those reported in 2020.*
		Actual	69	69	During the reporting period there were 207 fishers seeking FL/TIP services to complain and request support for referrals
	PHL	Target	20	50	
		Actual	0	38	In 2020, OND Hesed assisted the repatriation of 33 fishers whose wives reported their husbands' detention in Indonesia for illegal entry in Indonesian waters.

Indicator	Country	Target/ actual	April 2022	Final Value (End of Project)	SAFE Seas narrative Reporting (Evaluator comment on the reported result)
					April 2022 reporting: Though more than 20 Filipino fish workers have been supported by the FL/TIP services by ATF group last March 2022 through the AOS Center of OND Hesed, the information was (only) relayed to SAFE Seas by April. Data will be included in the next reporting period as soon as more detailed information is received by AOS.
Sub-Outcome 2.1 Improved understanding among government, private sector, local communities, and fish workers of acceptable work conditions in the fishing industry					
SO 2.1 # of government agencies with policies/ordinances adopted to prevent FL/TIP in the fishing industry	IDN	Target	1	1	*Evaluator: Interim evaluation noted that high level policy adoption should be reflected under Outcome 1 rather than Outcome 2.*
		Actual	1	1	Project target achieved. MOM regulation on labor in fishing enacted
	PHL	Target	0	6	PHL: 6 Agencies - DOJ- IACAT, DOLE, BFAR, PPA, PCG, PNP-MG expected to adopt policies/ordinances to prevent FL/TIP in the fishing industry.
		Actual	-	4	This is a continuing collaborative activity with the concerned LGUs in Palawan Province; Legislation would continue after the May 2022 local and national elections *Evaluator: Differing interpretation of the number of government agencies adopting polices, and at what level of government.*
Output 2.1.1 Improved private sector support of government policies					
	IDN	Target	10	10	

Indicator	Country	Target/ actual	April 2022	Final Value (End of Project)	SAFE Seas narrative Reporting (Evaluator comment on the reported result)
OTP 2.1.1 (a) Number of private sector fish companies/boat owners that sponsor FL/TIP trainings for their fish workers		Actual	-	4	The project has not achieved the target due to COVID-19 outbreak in Indonesia and mobility restriction policy by the government. IDN SAFE Seas plans to achieve the remaining targets.
	PHL	Target	5	10	
		Actual	-	26	The project target has been achieved *Evaluator: October 2020 report:* *Puerto Princesa, Palawan - Project engagement for advocacy purposes included 13 boat owners* *General Santos City - Continuous collaboration with SOCCSKSARGEN Federation of Fishing and Allied Industries, Inc. (SFFAII) for possible engagements with boat owners/fish workers for training purposes. SFFAII declined to agree on training activities for fish workers due to the pandemic.*
OTP 2.1.1 (b) Number of workplaces (land or sea-based) that display materials on indicator of FL/TIP and contact information in public view	IDN	Target	20	20	
		Actual	21	21	**Achieved target.** SAFE Seas has posted materials at fishing workplaces in Tegal and Bitung.
	PHL	Target	20	20	
		Actual	24 *(carried over from previous period)*	24	**Exceeded target**. The project is maintaining its presence in those areas/workplaces which have been posted with materials on indicators of FL/TIP and reporting contact
Output 2.1.2 MAST initiative introduced in Indonesia and the Philippines					
	IDN	Target	45	45	

Indicator	Country	Target/ actual	April 2022	Final Value (End of Project)	SAFE Seas narrative Reporting (Evaluator comment on the reported result)
OTP 2.1.2 # stakeholders that attend presentations on the MAST approach		Actual	53	53	In 2020, activity delayed due to COVID-19 restrictions. IDN SAFE Seas conducted the workshop on orientation of MAST to the participants from Central Java. It was attended by 11 fishery companies and four institutions stakeholders.
	PHL	Target	-	20	
			0	0	PHL SAFE Seas will not continue to reach MAST event target.
Output 2.1.3 Increased understanding of labor exploitation including FL/TIP among fish workers and community members					
OTP 2.1.3 Number of communities with early detection plans in place and operational	IDN	Target	2	2	
		Actual	-	2	Project target achieved.
	PHL	Target	2	3	
		Actual	2	2	This is an ongoing process with the stakeholders to refine/strengthen existing referral and reporting systems in the project sites in Palawan province, Sarangani province and General Santos City. **Oct 2020 report**: Capacity building for referral and reporting systems during the reporting period only covered the relevant duty bearers and not the community. **FL/TIP community-based protection mechanisms will be introduced in the next 6 months**
Sub-Outcome 2.2 Ability of fish workers and their families to report exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels improved					
SO 2.2 Number of cases reported through project supported services (help desk, hotlines)	IDN	Target	30	30	The IDN SAFE Seas achieved this indicator earlier and better than expected. During this reporting period, Fishers Centers in Tegal, Central Java and Bitung, North Sulawesi received in total 12 cases from fish workers on Indonesian-flagged fishing vessels.
		Actual	76 (Cumulative)	76	

Indicator	Country	Target/ actual	April 2022	Final Value (End of Project)	SAFE Seas narrative Reporting (Evaluator comment on the reported result)
	PHL	Target	12	12	None to report in the period.
		Actual		38 *(value carried over – not final value)*	*Though 20 Filipino fishworkers have been rescued by ATF group last March (2022) through the AOS Center of OND Hesed, information was relayed to SAFE Seas by April. Data would be included in the next reporting period as soon as specific details would be secured from AOS *Evaluator: In Oct 2020 reporting, through OND Hesed's existing reporting referral center (Apostleship of the Seas) the project assisted the repatriation of 33 fishers whose wives reported their husbands' detention in Indonesia for illegal entry in Indonesian waters*
Output 2.2.1 Reporting mechanisms (using appropriate technology) strengthened					
2.2.1 (a) # of reporting mechanisms created with project support	IDN	Target	3	3	
		Actual	6	6	Project target achieved. *Evaluator: Not clear what the number '6' refers to. It may represent three mechanisms associated with the Bitung Fisher Center in North Sulawesi and three associated with the Central Java fisher center: the telephone hotline, the physical helpdesk and the network of cadres.*
	PHL	Target	3	3	
		Actual	-	4	This is an on-going process with the stakeholders to refine/strengthen existing referral and reporting systems in the project sites in Palawan province, Sarangani province and General Santos City.

Indicator	Country	Target/ actual	April 2022	Final Value (End of Project)	SAFE Seas narrative Reporting (Evaluator comment on the reported result)
					Evaluator: In 2020, project-initiated learning event webinar on the establishment of Anti-TIP help desks, existing reporting and referral Anti-TIP systems
2.2.1 (b) # of hotline/helpdesk staff trained	IDN	Target	10	10	Note: Training conducted online in 2020 due to COVID 19.
		Actual	10	10	Project target has been achieved
	PHL	Target	5	10	
		Actual	-	44	44 hotline/help desk staff in Palawan province were part of the capacity training facilitated by the Project. Technical inputs were provided by a legal person from the Inter-Agency Council Against Trafficking (IACAT)
Sub-outcome 2.3 Improved access to remedies of TIP/FL and/or exploitative working conditions					
SO 2.3 # of service delivery guidelines formulated by multi-stakeholders working group for FL/TIP victims	IDN	Target	1	1	**Project target achieved.**
		Actual	1	1	Fishers' centers completed two guidelines: Instructions on how to refer a case of FL/TIP in the referral system, second how to handle a grievance.
	PHL	Target	1	1	This is an ongoing process with the stakeholders to refine/strengthen existing referral and reporting systems in the project sites in Palawan province, Sarangani province and General Santos City.
		Actual	0	0	*Evaluator: The development of service delivery guidelines was underway in General Santos, Sarangani Province and Palawan Province in September 2022.*
Output 2.3.1 Strengthened referral networks and mechanisms fishing vessel workers, especially for FL/TIP victims					
OTP 2.3.1 (a) No. of trainings provided to CSOs, CBOs/monitoring groups	IDN	Target	0	2	The project targets have been achieved
		Actual	2	2	
	PHL	Target	2	2	The project targets have been achieved

Indicator	Country	Target/ actual	April 2022	Final Value (End of Project)	SAFE Seas narrative Reporting (Evaluator comment on the reported result)
		Actual	3	3	
OTP 2.3.1 (b) Number of MOUs/agreements signed among service providers to coordinate referrals to FL/TIP victims	IDN	Target	3	3	
		Actual	0	2	IDN SAFE Seas in this period report have no signed MOUs to report. *Evaluator: SAFE Seas signed MOUs previously with the Environment Justice Foundation in Central Java and North Sulawesi, and with YCMI Foundation in North Sulawesi.*
	PHL	Target	4	4	
		Actual	0	0	No progress reported on coordination of referrals of FL.TIP victims
Output 2.3.2 Updated referral network directory for fish workers on fishing vessels, especially for FL/TIP					
OTP 2.3.2 (# of) District referral network directories created and widely disseminated* in project districts Means posted on the DFW website.	IDN	Target	2	3	
		Actual	3	3	Target Achieved. SAFE Seas has created a network directory and disseminated in project districts. The network directories refer to the national referral network, North Sulawesi referral network and Central Java referral network.
	PHL	Target	3	3	Not achieved.
		Actual	0		This is an on-going process with the stakeholders to refine/strengthen existing referral and reporting systems in the project sites in Palawan province, Sarangani province and General Santos City. *Evaluator: Completed in September 2022*

ANNEX B. SAFE SEAS RESPONSE TO INTERIM EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Source: Grantee completed USDOL DERT tracking of response to evaluation recommendations. 2022 Update.

Note: Elements of the recommendations not accepted by the Grantee are italicized and marked in blue.

#	Recommendation	Grantee Response and action on recommendations	Final Evaluation Comment
	Project wide/Both Countries		
1	**Submit a proposal to USDOL to extend the project duration by 12 months.** The evaluation team proposes providing an extension of 12 months to enable delayed activities to be implemented and existing interventions to reach a sustainable status.	**Accepted.** Proposal submitted and approved by USDOL in 2021.	The total time for preparation of the Grant extension and cost modification submission and approval was lengthy. Plan US submitted the proposal on May 28, 2021, and approval was granted end of October 2021. This had some apparent impacts on retention of staff and hiring of new staff.
2	**Improve sustainability and exit planning in each country.** The project should create specific sustainability and phase-out plans per country, with sustainability targets. The sustainability plan should identify exit plan priorities in case an extension is granted, and in case it is not granted.	**Accepted.** **IDN:** 1. Capitalize previous achievements and focus on assisting Safe Fishing Alliance (SFA) in promoting prevention of FL/TIP to be included in the National Action Plan (NAP). While at the provincial level, the team will focus on assisting SFA/government to develop local regulation on protection of fish workers on the fishing vessel (this will continue during the extended project period) 2. Indonesia will continue to work with SFA and promote joint inspection through regular working group meetings. This is also to maintain the interest of the SFA members to continue promoting joint inspections as one of the issues in the policy discussion within their respective ministries/departments 3. Fishers' center: • Buy-in from Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries can be completed once the grant extension gets approved. The capacity building on handling the reporting based on Standard Operational Procedure (SOP) would be then conducted. • Alternative: hand over to the local government, such as Tegalsari Fishing Port (PPP Tegalsari) or to CBO (SAKTI in North Sulawesi/PILAKP in Central Java), or will be taken over by Destructive Fishing Watch (DFW) • Until the end of the original project year, the team will make an effort to identify where fisher centers' reports go into. 4. Early detection mechanism at the village-level: advocate Head of Villages to set aside budget to support the Cadre of fisher protection at the village-level. **PHL:** 1. This will be done through a consultative workshop with the partners, especially the members of the IACATs. As to the legal basis for the local SFAs, the project is continuing consultations with the committees on legal matters municipal/city level and lobby to anchor on the existing structure of IACAT as per suggestions of focal persons from relevant	The grantee updated the Sustainability Plan in response to the recommendation, as attached to the October 2021 TPR. The updated plan provides more specific action plans towards sustainability and exit. The grantee did not take up the suggestion for sustainability targets, or the suggestion for exit priorities in the case that an extension was not granted.

#	Recommendation	Grantee Response and action on recommendations	Final Evaluation Comment
		agencies. During a meeting with the Puerto Princesa City legal matters committee, the project did not receive from the authorities a nod to move forward to legalize the SFA. The committee members suggested to use the existing structure of IACAT instead which will also ensure sustainability of the project initiative. Legalizing SFA will entail administrative deliberation hurdles with very lean chances. 2. Documentation on the evaluation of the existing reporting mechanism reflective of the needs of fishers. 3. SS team will continue to work with DOJ-IACAT's effort to cater to fishing communities - Barangay reporting system 4. The committee members also added to push through with a sea-based task force (Philippine Coast Guard, MARINA, Social Welfare Department, Bureau of Customs, Dep't of Foreign Affairs, Fishery Bureau, Philippine Maritime Police, Philippine Ports Authority, etc.). 5. The legal committees in the cities of Puerto Princesa and General Santos suggested that consultation need to be conducted to amend the ordinance for the possibility to create the sea-based task force. 6. For sustainability, the team will capitalize on the existing efforts to incorporate in the municipal/city ordinances the provisions to address FL/TIP in the fishing sector which will include the functions of the 3 sub-groups. In General Santos and Sarangani, the efforts to elaborate on the details of the approved IRR of the PIACAT-VAWC on the seaports/sea-based section will be very strategic in terms of sustaining the initiatives as per the suggestion of Prosecutor Lastimosa during a special meeting with OND team last December (this will also be discussed with the inter-agency during a special meeting).	
3	**CMEP adjustments**. The evaluation suggests several adjustments to the CMEP system. Specifically: • *Add an output under SO 1.1 for creating or strengthening multi-stakeholder advisor groups, with an indicator incorporating the presence of a time-based workplan for the advisory group.* • *Add a regional-level output and indicators.* • Ensure that Annex A reporting includes a qualitative explanation of the quantitative achievement per indicator. • *As part of the evaluation of effects on rights awareness among fishers and fishers' family members, conduct a qualitative outcomes study via interviews with a small sample of fishers, fishers' wives, and village representatives to document the changes in awareness to complement the final awareness survey.*	**Partially accepted**, **excluding the points in blue** 1. No CMEP change is planned until after the project extension gets granted. 2. Qualitative explanations for indicator results will be added to the TPR comment sections going forward. 3. SAFE Seas project won't be able to conduct a qualitative outcome study at this point of the project but will carry it out during the extended period. This will be carried out with fishers, fishers' wives and community members to assess changes in awareness of FL/TIP on fishing vessels.	The recommendation for addition of a qualitative explanation of the quantitative results in TPR Annex was accepted; however, it has not been consistently applied based on review of the April 2022 TPR Annex A. The project did not offer a viewpoint in response to the suggested changes to the CMEP, and no changes were made. Evaluation interviews with SAFE Seas interview with M&E staff conveyed the perception that changes to the CMEP were either not permitted by ILAB or were very difficult to change.
4	**Enhance gender responsiveness in project activities, ensuring that the project responds to the needs of female family members and female fishers in Indonesia and the Philippines**. In both countries SAFE Seas should: • Include women's role in fishing in advocacy materials • Direct awareness and education on labor rights to women family members as well as male fishers and train	**Partially Accepted**, **excluding point in blue.** IDN: 1. Through early detection mechanisms, the team can enhance gender responsiveness: • Empowering women to be facilitators • Strengthening women's participation in the village level for planning, budgeting and implementation using Plan's gender marker tool.	The Grantee made extensive efforts to address the gender responsiveness in both Indonesia and the Philippines

#	Recommendation	Grantee Response and action on recommendations	Final Evaluation Comment
	women as peer advocates • Improve counselling and remediation services for families as well as victims of FL/TIP • *Integrate economic security in fishing community forums*.	2. Provide IEC Materials to enhance gender responsiveness: • Make sure that messages are written through gender lenses • Increase women's participation in determining and testing messages • Include marginalized groups, including people with disability PHL: 1. Create a dissemination plan for the gender study, and craft gender-responsive messages from the study. Identify the best channels using the results of the awareness survey. 2. The project has already drafted a Gender Integration Strategy and identified approaches and interventions to make the project gender-inclusive 3. As part of our learning plan, the participation of women as FL/TIP champions (in Palawan SFAs and Sarangani and Gensan Communities as Community Facilitators) will be documented. Both countries: SAFE Seas project will ensure that the referrals made through the fishers' centers includes counseling and remediation services for fishers' families and victims of FL/TIP. Economic security is beyond the scope of this project.	
5	**Strengthen regional sharing of lessons learned and promising practices in the SEA region**. SAFE Seas should develop and disseminate knowledge products to capitalize on the project's cross-country structure. Relevant stakeholders include the *Southeast Asia Ship to Shore Rights* Project.	**Partially accepted.** Regional activity is outside of the project scope. However, we plan to continue partnership with Ship to Shore Rights project initiative in Indonesia and the Philippines to share good practices from these two countries identified in the Mid-Term Evaluation.	Although regional activity is outside of the project logical framework, (through sub-outcomes/outputs), the evaluation recommended that a regional or cross-country outcome be added to the logical framework (Recommendation 3). While the PD has participated in multiple regional events sponsored by projects such as ILO's Ship to Shore Rights project, and knowledge products are available on the Plan and ILAB websites, the evaluation found that dissemination strategies to regional audiences or at country via SAFE Seas-hosted seminars and launches have not been fully optimized.
	Indonesia		
6	**Enhance coordination between YPII and DFW**. To strengthen the coordination and collaboration between YPII and DFW, the partners should discuss the lines of task division and task cooperation and establish more clarity on the division of tasks.	**Partially accepted.** 1. Continue the bi-weekly coordination meeting 2. Continue assisting DFW in improving the quality of their project narrative and financial report 3. Supporting DFW in their engagement with the community through the provision of technical experts 4. The subagreement with DFW is until September 30, 2021, and these points are only applicable until then.	Plan increased the supervision of DFW, but different understandings of the areas of responsibility persisted, as well as issues with quality of reporting and transparency. DAFE Seas decided to discontinue the DFW contract during the final project year.
7	**Prioritize areas for continued support to the NAP of the National Team**. Work with the National Team to prioritize what support it needs from the SAFE Seas Project in the remaining project period to advance the NAP.	**Accepted** 1. To advocate NAP to be legally binding through Presidential Regulation 2. To encourage the **National Team to support the NAP** at the national and sub-national levels through media online and offline, workshops, etc.	No evidence to suggest that this was taken up. Support to the National team has been less marked during 2022 in particular.

#	Recommendation	Grantee Response and action on recommendations	Final Evaluation Comment
8	**Step up efforts toward consolidating the SFA in Central Java**. The project should intensify local government ownership and support of the provincial forum by providing fishing vessel worker FL/TIP data to the governor and key government offices, as well as sharing experience from North Sulawesi.	**Accepted.** Work with local government bodies to strengthen SFA Central Java by engaging Maritime Affairs and Fisheries Service office (including fishing port Tegalsari) which has already shown its support for the project. We will maintain this network.	No response to the specific suggestions. Little progress in establishing an active SFA in Central Java according to final evaluation key informants.
9	**Consolidate the fisher centers' operations procedure and initiate the transition to long-term institutional managers.** Consolidate the fishers' centers' operations procedure. To support the effective operation and sustainability of the two centers, the project should prioritize the documentation of report receiving guidelines, follow-up processes, and case referral mechanisms. *Secondly, establish the handover transition process to the eventual managers, including the option of DFW serving as a bridge or center manager. If an extension of time is permitted, provide on-the-job training for incoming center staff.*	**Partially accepted, excluding point in blue** Finalize the SOP for the Fishers Center and advocate for government endorsement to use the SOP (it has already gotten a good response and support from the **government stakeholders** which provide services to fisher victims of FL/TIP on Fishing Vessel). The blue part can only be implemented once the extension gets granted. Update:	Grantee update states that SOPs have been completed in Bitung. Transition to new institutional managers identified in Bitung, not confirmed in Tegal.
10	**Enhance private sector advocacy.** To the extent that the project duration permits, intensify supply chain advocacy, working with selected fishing companies and buyers as models and advocates, linked with regional advocacy. **Subject to further discussion with MMAF on its Human Rights Certification initiative for businesses, SAFE Seas should continue to support this initiative with fishing companies in Bitung as a good practice.**	**Not accepted.** Indonesia will focus on private sector advocacy once the extension gets granted.	*The supply chain study completed in April 2022 progressed the understanding of avenues for private sector interventions, but no evidence of enhanced advocacy work which substantively fell beyond project scope and timeframe. *No further project action was evident on support for the MMAF Human Rights Certification Initiative for Business
11	**Enhance fisher labor rights awareness and education.** Focus on strengthening awareness raising among fishers, their families, and communities through the **Community Based Early Detection Mechanism**. Secondly, engage vocational institutions in local SFA working groups and support them with learning materials on acceptable working conditions useable for formal and non-formal education for fishers after the project ends.	**Accepted** Indonesia will continue providing information on the prevention of FL/TIP to CBOs/NGOs working in the same issues, private Sectors/Companies relevant to FL/TIP, Government (SFAs) and village government in the targeted areas on prevention of FL/TIP through meetings and the distribution of communication materials. Developing a learning module with Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries may be completed during the extended period. **Update:** There is FL/TIP materials developed for fish worker training, already discussed with vocational school as well as training for labor sponsored by its industry	Action is in line with the recommendation. The response does not mention which vocational school is interested in integrating fish worker training and the location.
	Philippines		
12	**Address the staffing shortfall and workload** by recruiting additional officers to support fieldwork in General Santos, Sarangani and Palawan. • *OND should either recruit two additional staff to support fieldwork in Sarangani and General Santos, or second two staff from Plan Philippines. Alternatively, narrow the geographic scope of the implementation in Sarangani.* • Plan should provide additional support to field staff in Palawan, either through providing graduate interns from	**Partially accepted, excluding the points in blue.** OND proposes to have a full-time finance staff and additional field support staff. With the budget realignment for the extension, the budget for additional staff have been included. The hire and the training is planned to be done once the extension gets granted.	OND Hesed's contract was not extended. Under Plan's continuing management, the staff number remained the same during the extension period. Additional M&E officer posted in Palawan. Staff numbers remained the same in GenSan/Sarangani

#	Recommendation	Grantee Response and action on recommendations	Final Evaluation Comment
	relevant university departments, or by providing onsite administrative support staff. • *OND and Plan should ensure that new staff members receive sufficient technical coaching and support.*		
13	**Prioritize and strengthen the national SFA strategy.** In consultation with the TWG leadership, SAFE Seas should determine whether the thematic working groups are feasible; and consider alternative structures. To gain more traction at the national level, the team should strengthen the linkages with civil society labor protection advocates and also enhance linkages between the national SFA and the subnational SFA agendas, highlighting progress of the subnational efforts.	**Accepted**. The project will hold a meeting with the TWG policies for amendment should this be amenable to them. We initially aim(ed) for the DOLE Department Order 156 (standard procedure for fair labor practices on fishing vessels) to be amended but given the complexities in its provisions, the project proposes to **change indicators to number of consultations**. We had a meeting with DOLE and they informed they were not open to having another consultation with fishing industry and other government agencies at this stage. They welcome the idea that individual consultations with relevant government agencies be conducted (and with fishing alliances) to gather inputs to support the amendment or revision of DO 156.	The response did not comment directly on the question of the thematic subgroups in the TWG. The project support to the national TWG in IACAT remained, and the TWGs continued.
14	**Enhance private sector engagement.** SAFE Seas should pursue a wider range of strategies to engage private sector support, including supply chain advocacy, celebrity advocacy, and human rights certification of businesses as being introduced in Indonesia.	**Not accepted.** Philippines will focus on private sector engagement once the grant gets extended.	The evaluation did not identify evidence of SAFE Seas' enhanced private sector engagement following the project grant extension.
15	**Strengthen training of trainers on FL/TIP for FARMC to continue fisher advocacy.** The FARMC groups at the community level demonstrate would benefit from a systematic TOT approach for the leaders to ensure that community education activities continue.	**Partially accepted.** OND team is continuing the engagement of the FARMCs as this is also what the local government authorities suggested. For the project sites in Palawan, the team plans to carry this out as well as this is very vital in terms of sustaining initiatives and especially the output to set up detection mechanisms at the community level and for the fishers' center. For Plan Philippines, this is now included **as part of the extension**. The activation and strengthening of the FARMCs is essential for the creation of early detection mechanisms at the barangay level. **The FARMCs are the regulatory and recommendatory bodies for issues regarding fisheries concerns.**	Partially in line with recommendation, other than the TOT element to ensure sustainability of FARMC capacity.
16	**Consult with local SFAs and communities on the preferred model for grievance and reporting services.** The project and its partners should consult with communities and fisher representatives on the preferred channels in different locations (large ports versus municipal fishing), rather than replicating the Indonesia model in the Philippines.	**Partially accepted.** Both Plan and OND team fully agree on this, and in fact, this is already initiated as of last year. This effort will continue until the end of the project; however, evaluating the existing system to have more proper reporting for fishers will be done when the extension is granted.	Consideration of a fisher center model that is independent of existing barangay or helpdesk structures is ongoing through a feasibility study
17	**Data collection and case tracking of FL/TIP in fishing.** To make more factual data available for policy advocacy, as well as to track the nature and extent of grievance cases, support the DOJ/IACAT to integrate fisher TIP/FL cases within the digital case management and tracking system for overseas Filipino workers. The digital case management system should be linked to the **web-based**	**Not accepted.** Philippines won't be able to address this at this point, but with the project extension, will work on below items: Consultations with the Department of Justice-Inter Agency Committee Against Trafficking (DOJ/IACAT). The project has not collaborated yet with POEA, but POEA is a member of the IACAT. We will meet with	The Labour Supply Chain Mapping is a positive step towards assessing the proportion of Philippines fishers engaged in domestic and international fishing, although it is not related to the collection of data on grievances among migrant workers mentioned in the recommendation. Unfortunately, the timing of the study, underway in

#	Recommendation	Grantee Response and action on recommendations	Final Evaluation Comment
	fishing portal under development, with access rules established for public and confidential information.	concerned authorized agencies to collect and discuss the information that can be accessed and allowed to be shared. The labor supply chain study will also be expanded to include the Philippines in order to understand better the recruitment and placement of fishers for both domestic and international jobs. This has been included to the budget realignment for the project extension.	August-September 2022, did not permit contribution to action during the project life. The evaluation did not hear further updates regarding discussion on data collection and case tracking of FL/TIP in fishing, or the web-based fishing portal with the Department of Justice and the Philippine Overseas Employment Authority. No additional information was obtained on the development of the web-based fishing portal.

Additional SAFE Seas notes included in updated response to Recommendation 4: Gender responsiveness

High cases of violence against women and children in Tegal led to the formation of some small groups at sub-district and village level to help prevent and manage cases that arise, such as labelled violence, marginalization, and double burden. It is critical for local government at village level to strengthen the organization and to understand the management practices.

To support the local government in increasing people's awareness on how to handle violence cases, the IDN SAFE Seas Project and the Women Empowerment, Child Protection, Population Control, and Family Planning Office of Tegal (DP3AP2KB) conducted a workshop in Kedungkelor village that targeted three sub-districts, Warureja, Suradandi, and Kramat. This activity involved 35 participants, consisting of 15 females and 20 males.

The IDN SAFE Seas Project organized a capacity building workshop for selected cadres, including women in Tegal, Brebes, and Pemalang in June 2022. This activity aims to (1) increase cadres' understanding on the importance of Sea Work Agreement (PKL) for fishing workers, (2) strengthen coordination between cadres, villages, and related local government agencies, (3) and develop action plan in order to reduce risks of fishing vessel crew from exploitation at sea. As many as 45 participants from Kramat village, Bongkok village, and Munjung Agung village were involved in this activity.

Low literacy skills remain a challenge for fishing workers in SAFE Seas-assisted five villages. Many cases that were considered fraud happened because fishing workers are not able to read. Although many people in Central Java have smartphone devices, the majority have not been able to use them as a tool to search for important information and manage online documents. To help cadres increasing society's awareness on fishing vessel workers, IDN SAFE Seas plans to produce IEC materials that will be disseminated through WhatsApp or Facebook for easier access.

ANNEX C. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Project Operation and Reporting Documents

- ILAB FOA-2017-04
- Project Proposal, 2017.
- Cooperative Agreement
- Project modifications Including Modification No. 3 providing for the Cost Extension. Dated 31 August 2021.
- Sub-grantee Agreements
- Project Document. Revised version October 11, 2019.
- TPRs and Status Reports submitted from the project start (April 2018) until April 2022 (latest available TPR).
- Performance Monitoring Plan Data, Annex A of Technical Progress Reports
- Work plans submitted with the TPRs
- Correspondence related to TPRs
- SAFE Seas Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, December 18, 2018
- Realigned Project Budget, October 29, 2020
- USDOL. 2021. Interim Performance Evaluation. Safeguarding and Addressing Fishers' Exploitation at Sea. IMPAQ International, March 2021.

Project Research and Technical Products

- Plan US/SAFE Seas. April 2022. **Labor Supply Chain Mapping, Indonesian and Foreign Vessels Crewed by Indonesian Fishers. Indonesia.** Authors: Jeremia Humolong Prasetya, Mina Chiang, Birgitte Krogh-Poulsen, Humanity Research Consultancy.
- Plan US/SAFE Seas. July 2022**. Multidisciplinary Inspection on Fishing Vessels. Training Manual Indonesia.** Katrina Nakamura, Policy Incubator and George Martin Sirait.
- Plan US/SAFE Seas. July 2022. **Multidisciplinary Inspection on Fishing Vessels. Training the Trainers Manual, Philippines.** Katrina Nakamura, Policy Incubator and Angel Ysik.
- SAFE Seas. May 2021. **Policy Brief: Indonesia**. (Multidisciplinary Inspection). Katrina Nakamura, Policy Incubator.
- SAFE Seas. May 2021. **Policy Brief: Philippines.** (Multidisciplinary Inspection). Katrina Nakamura, Policy Incubator.
- Plan International. **Forced Labor and Trafficking in Persons among Fish Workers in Indonesia and the Philippines. Pre-Situational Analysis.** The SAFE Seas Project. July 12, 2019.
- Plan US/Rapid Asia. 2020. **Effects of Forced Labor and Trafficking in Persons on Female Relatives of Male Fishers**. October 2020.
- **SAFE Seas. Regional Stakeholder Mapping**.

Background Reports Referenced

- Congress of the Philippines. Republic Act No. 11862. Expanded Anti-Trafficking Act of 2022. 26 July, 2021.

- Government of Indonesia. National Action Plan on Seafarers and Fishers. 2020.
- Greenpeace. September 2022. Reference to new law in Indonesia. https://www.greenpeace.org/international/press-release/54408/indonesian-migrant-fishers-victory-regulation-protection-rights/
- ILO. (2013), Caught at Sea: Forced Labor and Trafficking in Fisheries.
- ILO. Work in Fishing Convention 2007 (No. 188)
- ILO. Country Office for Indonesia and Timor Leste. Update on activities in Indonesia. https://www.ilo.org/jakarta/whatwedo/eventsandmeetings/WCMS_840361/lang--en/index.htm Accessed 28 September 2022.
- ILO. Alliance 8.7 Accelerator Lab. Multi-donor Programme. Indonesia component.
- International Maritime Organization (IMO). International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Fishing Vessels Personnel (STW-F)
- IMO. International Maritime Organization. International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) Amended 1988.

ANNEX D. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

Interview Common Introduction and Consent Script

- Introduction of the **evaluation team members**: Ruth Bowen, Ellah Delerio (the Philippines), Clara Ajisuksmo (Indonesia)
- The SAFE Seas project will end on 30 November 2022. The US DOL has commissioned American Institutes for Research to conduct an independent final evaluation of the SAFE Seas project implemented by Plan.
- The purpose of this interview is to discuss your organization's activities related to the SAFE Seas project and your opinions regarding the perceived outcomes, successful strategies, challenges, and sustainability prospects. This interview/focus group discussion will last approximately 60 minutes. With your permission, we will audio record the discussion to assist with our notetaking. **No one outside the evaluation team will have access to this recording.**
- Please feel free to speak openly about your experiences and perspectives regarding this project. Your participation in this interview is voluntary. If, at any time, you wish to discontinue participation, you may do so.
- The information gathered through these interviews will be reported in an aggregate manner, highlighting findings on the project's results and specific SAFE Seas activities and not from particular individuals. **You will not be identified by name or position in the evaluation report.**

Plan and Implementing Partner Staff

Plan US National Office Staff (Current and former)

Name of interviewee:

Position:

Name of Interviewer:

Date of interview:

- **Present introduction and consent script**

Questions

1. What is your role in the management of SAFE Seas? (elaborate on management and technical support)
2. When did you take up your position/role in the project? When did you leave?
3. What were the objectives for the cost-extension period? Are all the activities planned on track to be delivered?
4. How was the situation of fishers impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and how did the project respond?
5. Did the design logic continue to be relevant throughout? Any key adjustments, especially since the interim evaluation, if any? (Are the supply chain studies new additions?)
6. How did SAFE Seas respond to the recommendations of the interim evaluation?
7. What are the key achievements per country?
8. What factors influenced progress and achievements per country?
9. How effective were the staffing arrangements? Was the budget sufficient?
10. How effective were partnerships and coordination with partners?
11. How were gender issues addressed?
12. Monitoring and evaluation: Please provide an explanation of the most recent performance reporting in TPR Annex A. Please explain the columns related to time elapsed and achievements. How was the M&E system applied in practice to inform the project direction? (*M&E manager/project manager)*
13. What are the sustainability strategies; which results are likely to be sustained?
14. Any lessons and good practices arising from SAFE Seas for future projects on fishers' rights in the countries?
15. Any recommendations for future project strategies?

Project Director, National Coordinators, M&E Staff

Name of interviewee:

Position/title:

Name of Interviewer:

Date of interview:

- Present common introduction and consent

Questions

Interviewee Background

1. How long have you been involved in the SAFE Seas project and in what capacity?

General Status – for orientation call (10 minutes)

2. Overview of project status - key activities since the interim evaluation, which key interim evaluation recommendations were adopted? Which not adopted?
3. Summary of current staffing and partnerships (when did partner contracts close?)

Relevance and Coherence (10 minutes)

4. Looking back over the project life, did the project design logic prove to be appropriate to address the problems of FL and TIP on fishing vessels in the two countries? Were any important issues not addressed in the design? Were any important adjustments made to fit changing context?
5. How well did the project strategies fit with the regulatory context and programs in each country? Any developments in the context that significantly affected the relevance of strategies? If so, how did SAFE Seas respond?
6. How did the COVID-19 outbreak affect the situation of fishers per country and did the project introduce any specific responses?
7. Has the project established synergies with other donor-funded interventions? If so, how have they supported project outcomes?

Effectiveness (15 minutes)

8. Implementation progress: Over the life of the project, to what extent did the activities proceed as planned and scheduled? Any significant implementation challenges? Including the challenge of the **COVID-19 outbreak**. How did the SAFE Seas teams respond? How has the project extension been utilised?
9. Progress toward outcomes

- What are the prominent results would you highlight in each country? Per policy and regulatory outcome and community level outcomes/remediation services?

(Prompts re: Inter-agency coordination mechanisms - national and sub-national, regulatory and policy achievements, multi-disciplinary inspection, awareness, and access to remedy)

- Where are the gaps? What planned results are not fully achieved?

10. What factors helped the achievement of the results, and what hindered achievements?

Consider: Internal, organizational factors, external factors. To your knowledge, are the fishing communities satisfied with the implemented project activities? How did the project team/Plan respond to the obstacles/challenges?

11. Effectiveness of policy and regulatory interventions? (If not covered under Q9)
12. Effectiveness of community level interventions (if not covered under Q9.)
    a. How did fisher communities respond?
    b. What plans are in place for sustaining the fisher centres?
    c. Did communities have realistic expectations about the project's contribution?
13. How has the project addressing gender issues related to addressing fisher exploitation?

Management Effectiveness and Efficiency (15 minutes)

14. Were you satisfied with the staffing level of the project? **in each country and overall**? Could you comment on the staff capacities? Any challenges related to staff turnover?
15. Were financial resources sufficient to achieve project outcomes, how was the cost-addition utilised? Were there any efficiency strategies in the use of financial resources?
16. How was implementation coordinated with the implementing partners, and how well did it work? *(IND: DFW; PHIL: ONED)*
17. How effective was the management structure, coordination, and reporting? (including with the Plan US National Office)?
18. **Monitoring and Evaluation**. Are you satisfied with the CMEP structure and indicators as a means of tracking progress and informing management decisions? Can you explain any changes made to the indicators/targets? Do you have any examples of how the M&E data informed decision making?
19. Did you experience any challenges in setting up and using the CMEP?

Sustainability (10 minutes)

20. What strategies has SAFE Seas put in place towards sustainability of the achievements? Is there an exit strategy in place?
21. What results are likely to be sustained? Which are less likely to continue? (national level, local level, implementing partner capacity)
22. What factors might influence the sustainability of results? *(e.g.financial, institutional).*

Lessons and Recommendations (5 minutes)

23. What lessons learned, and good practices can be drawn from SAFE Seas' experience?
24. Recommendations for future development projects to address fisher rights?

Plan Country Officers (Plan International Philippines, Yayasan Plan Indonesia International)

Name of interviewee:

Position:

Name of Interviewer:

Date of interview:

Gender:

- **Common introduction and consent**

Questions:

1. What is your position title?
2. How long have you been in this position and what role do you play in supporting SAFE Seas implementation?

Coherence

3. How does the SAFE Seas Project fit within the Country program?

Effectiveness

4. What is your perspective on the project's overall progress towards its objectives?

5. What have been the main challenges? What factors have facilitated or limited progress?

6. How was progress affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, and what adjustments were made to respond to the pandemic?

Efficiency

7. How is financial reporting and budgeting managed?

8. Is the SAFE Seas expenditure rate proceeding according to plan?

Looking forward: Lessons, good practices, sustainability

9. What plans are in place to sustain the achievements of the project?

10. What lessons can be drawn from the implementation of SAFE Seas?

11. Do you have any comments regarding future directions for similar projects?

Communications and Advocacy Officers

Name of interviewee:

Position:

Name of Interviewer:

Date of interview:

Gender:

- **Common introduction**

Do you have any questions for us before we begin?

Interviewee background (5 minutes)

1. What is your title?
2. How long have you been involved in the SAFE Seas project and in what capacity?

Relevance (10 minutes)

3. From your perspective, what messages are important for the different project target groups? (national stakeholders, provincial office bearers, communities, private sector)

Effectiveness (30 minutes)

4. What are the key communications strategies?
5. What adjustments were made to respond to the COVID-19 outbreak?
6. What communications and advocacy activities have been undertaken?
7. What strategies worked best? Which ones not so well – challenges??
8. *(If not mentioned earlier)* Are there any communications and advocacy activities specifically related to addressing gender issues?

Management Effectiveness and Efficiency (5 minutes)

9. How do you coordinate with other project staff and partners?
10. How would you rate the project management structure and effectiveness?

Looking forward (15 mins)

11. How are communications being used in the sustainability strategy?

12. What innovative communications strategies were used that could be documented/shared for future projects?
13. Recommendations for future projects addressing similar issues?

Project Field Staff (Plan, former partner field officers)

Name of interviewee:

Position:

Gender:

Name of Interviewer:

Date of interview:

Common Introduction

Interviewee Background (5 minutes)

1. What is your title?
2. How long have you been involved in SAFE Seas and in what capacity?

Relevance and Coherence (10 minutes)

3. In your view are the designed project strategies and activities relevant to address the problems of FL and TIP on fishing vessels at the provincial/district/community levels? Are any key issues not addressed in the design?
4. How well does the project fit with the local context and programs? Have there been developments in the context since the project started that have affected the relevance of strategies? If so, how has the project responded?
    - How successful have the project's efforts been to engage with government-led and other stakeholder efforts to eliminate forced labor and TIP in the Philippines/Indonesia?

Effectiveness (15 minutes)

5. Did the activities proceed as originally planned/scheduled? Please explain any obstacles or challenges in implementation and how you have addressed them.
6. How was implementation adjusted to respond to COVID-19?
7. Progress toward outcomes:
    - <u>Outcome 1.</u> What are the key results for improvements in the government efforts to tackle FL/TIP in the project sites? *(Prompt: new regulations, improved labor inspection?)*
    - <u>Outcome 2.</u> What are the key results achieved in promoting understanding of acceptable working conditions among stakeholders, reporting mechanisms for fish workers, and access to remedies?
8. What factors have helped the achievement of specific activities and results, and what has made it difficult, considering internal factors and external factors?
9. Is the implementation of some activities more successful than others? If so, which ones? Why?
10. Are the fishing communities satisfied with the implemented project activities?

Explore the effectiveness of the fisher centre in Indonesia, case reporting mechanisms in the Philippines.

    a. Have the fisher communities responded positively to the project's activities? What could have been improved?
    b. Did the target community have realistic expectations about the project activities?

11. *(If not mentioned earlier)* How do the project activities address gender issues related to fishing worker exploitation?

Management Effectiveness and Efficiency (15 minutes)

12. How does the team coordinate, plan and report results? *(Prompt: communication between field staff and national level)*
13. Are you satisfied with the CMEP indicators as a means of tracking progress? What about as a means of informing decision making?
14. What is the system for collecting CMEP data and have you encountered any challenges in collecting and reporting CMEP indicator data?
15. Are financial resources sufficient and have you been able to achieve any efficiencies in the use of financial resources?

Looking forward (15 minutes)

16. What plans for sustaining the results are in place in your location? Do you see encouraging signs of sustainability? What are the risks to sustainability?
17. What innovations, lessons learned, and good practices can be documented from the project experience?
18. Any recommendations for future projects addressing fishers' rights and protection?

Project Stakeholders

National Government and Safe Fishing Alliance/Inter-Agency Team Members

Name of interviewee:

Position:

Gender:

Name of Interviewer:

Date of interview:

Common introduction and consent (5 minutes)

Interviewee Background (5 minutes)

1. What is your title?
2. Please tell us about your department/organization and role in protecting fishers rights?
3. Have you been involved in the SAFE Seas project and in what capacity?

Relevance and Coherence (10 minutes)

4. Are you familiar with the SAFE Seas project of Plan Philippines/Yayasan Plan International Indonesia and its objectives?
5. What motivated you/your agency to participate in the SAFE Seas project/Safe Fishing Alliance? **Prompt:** Are you aware of problems of exploitative conditions among fishery workers or forced labor and situations that amount to trafficking in persons?
6. To what extent do the strategies of this project meet the needs and interests of the Government and your department in particular? **Prompt**: Do the strategies coordinate with the government's efforts? Are any key issues not addressed in the project strategies? What types of fishing does the project address in Philippines/Indonesia?
7. What issue arose for fishers under Covid-19 and how did the project respond?
8. Do you think the project selected appropriate implementation sites? (given limited donor resources)

Looking back (15 minutes)

9. **Progress and achievements**: What have been the key contributions of the Project together with its partners, nationally and sub-nationally? For example, towards:

- Establishing or supporting inter-agency mechanisms for addressing the issues at national and sub-national level.
    - Improvements in the regulatory environment.
    - improvements in labor-inclusive inspection quality.
    - Understanding of acceptable working conditions among multiple stakeholders, ability of fish workers to report abuses, and their access to remedies?
    - Addressing gender issues in protecting fisher labour rights?
    - Effectiveness of research and knowledge products?

10. What factors assisted the project and its partners to achieve intended results, and what factors made it difficult? *(Prompt: Internal/organizational factors/external factors)* Taking each of the key outcomes in turn:

a) regulatory and policy framework to combat labor exploitation on fishing vessels and the quality of labor-inclusive inspections on fishing vessels?

b) understanding among government, private sector, local communities, and fish workers of acceptable work conditions in the fishing industry?

c) ability to fish workers and their families to report exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels? Access of fishery workers to remedies of FL/TIP or exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels?

11. To your knowledge, is the implementation of some activities **more successful** than others? If so, which ones? Why? What are the challenges? How has the Covid 19 pandemic affected the project progress/ fishers' situation?

12. Does the project and its partners address any gender issues related to the labor exploitation of fishing workers? If so, how?

Management Effectiveness and Efficiency (15 minutes)

13. Can you comment on the quality of the communication and coordination carried out by the project team of Plan Philippines/Yayasan Plan International Indonesia with its government partners?

14. Do you have any comments on the technical quality of the SAFE Seas technical support or other aspects of the project's resources – human and financial?

Looking forward (15 minutes)

15. What has SAFE Seas and its partners done toward sustaining improvements in fishing worker protection (regarding regulations, inspection mechanisms, awareness, reporting and access to remedies beyond the project duration)? **Prompt:** What role will the government/your department have in ensuring sustainability of the outcomes?

16. What plans are in place through the Safe Fishing Alliance to help make long-lasting improvements in the regulatory environment and awareness among the key stakeholder groups – i.e. in regulatory improvements, coordinating mechanisms, inspection practices, awareness and services?

17. What innovations, lessons learned, and good practices have you observed from your collaboration with SAFE Seas?

18. Do you have any recommendations for the SAFE Seas project to help improve its effectiveness or impacts going forward?

19. Is there anything that I did not ask about that you would like to share with me, or do you have any additional thoughts about what we have discussed today?

Sub-national Government and Network Members: KII or FGD

This category includes provincial/municipal inspectorate, coast guard, polytechnic institutions, fisher unions, and legal service agencies. Adjust as appropriate

Name of interviewee:

Position:

Gender:

Name of Interviewer:

Date of interview:

Interviewee Background (5 minutes)

1. What is your title?
2. Brief background on role of the agency/agencies
3. How long have you been involved in the SAFE Seas project and in what capacity?

Relevance and Coherence (10 minutes)

4. Are you familiar with the SAFE Seas project of (Plan Philippines/Yayasan Plan International Indonesia/Destructive Fishing Watch/ONED) and its objectives?
5. What was your motivation for participating in the project? (Are you aware of problems of exploitative conditions among fishery workers or forced labor and situations that amount to trafficking in persons in this province/municipality? What labor rights problems do fishers face?)
6. What are the gender issues in fish worker protection?
7. What labour protection issues arose with the **COVID-19 outbreak**, and did the project respond appropriately?
8. To what extent did the strategies of this project meet the needs and interests of your agency? **Prompt**: Do the strategies coordinate with your agency's efforts? Are any other important issues not addressed in the project strategies?

Effectiveness (15 minutes)

9. **Progress and achievements**: What are the main contributions of the Project together with its partners? For example, towards improvement in the regulatory environment, labor inspection mechanisms, coordination of efforts, raising awareness among multiple agencies, improving ability of fishers to report abuses and to access remediation services. **Consider national or sub-national level contributions.**
10. What factors supported Plan and its local partners to achieve its intended results?
11. What were the challenges to achieving the intended results? *(Prompt: Internal/organizational factors/external factors) Taking each outcome in turn:*
    a) regulatory and policy framework to combat labor exploitation on fishing vessels and the quality of labor-inclusive inspections on fishing vessels?
    b) understanding among government, private sector, local communities, and fish workers of acceptable work conditions in the fishing industry?
    c) ability to fish workers and their families to report exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels? d) access of fishery workers to remedies of FL/TIP or exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels?

12. To your knowledge, was the implementation of some activities **more successful** than others? If so, which ones? Why?

Management Effectiveness and Efficiency (15 minutes)

13. Can you comment on the quality of the communication and coordination carried out by the project team?
14. Any comments on the technical quality of the SAFE Seas technical support or other aspects of the project's resources – human and financial?

Looking forward (15 minutes)

15. What strategies are in place or planned towards sustaining improvements in fisher's protection? (in relevant regulations, inspection mechanisms, awareness, reporting and access to remedies beyond the project duration? **Prompt**: What is your role in ensuring that the outcomes will be sustained?
16. What changes are likely to remain after the project ends in November 2022? i.e. in regulatory improvements, coordinating mechanisms, inspection practices, awareness and services?
17. What innovations, lessons learned, and good practices have you observed from your collaboration with SAFE Seas?
18. Do you have any recommendations for future efforts by the national authorities of future development assistance projects concerning fisher labour protection?

FGD: Legal and Other Support Service Agencies

Introduction (30 minutes)

1. FGD participants introduce themselves – name, agency, and their position
2. Background of the agencies present – what services do you provide and what are some of the problems fishers face in this locality?
3. How is your agency collaborating with SAFE Seas? What is your motivation to participate?
4. What has been achieved? What has aided the progress?
5. What are some of the challenges faced by the project and its partners in addressing fishers' access to remediation services?

Sustainability (15 minutes)

6. What strategies are in place towards sustaining improvements in fishing worker regulations, inspection mechanisms, awareness, reporting and access to remedies beyond the project duration? **Prompt:** What is your role in ensuring that the outcomes will be sustained?
7. What more can be done under this project to help make long-lasting improvements in the SFA's (and project's) outcome areas – i.e. in regulatory improvements, coordinating mechanisms, inspection practices, awareness and services?

Recommendations and conclusion (15 minutes)

8. What innovations, lessons learned, and good practices have you observed from your collaboration with SAFE Seas so far?
9. Do you have any recommendations for the SAFE Seas project to help improve its effectiveness or impacts going forward?
10. Is there anything that I did not ask about that you would like to share with me, or do you have any additional thoughts about what we have discussed today?

FGD: Fishing Communities

- *Adjust as appropriate for Philippines and Indonesia*
- *Record names, positions of participants, gender composition*

Interviewee Background (5 minutes)

1. What kind of fishing are you/your community involved in now or in the past?
2. How long have you been involved in the SAFE Seas project and in what activities/capacity?

Relevance and Coherence (10 minutes)

3. Are you familiar with the SAFE Seas project of (Plan Philippines/Yayasan Plan International Indonesia/Destructive Fishing Watch/OND Hesed) and its objectives? If yes, what does the project do here in (location)?
4. What are some of the problems fish workers face in this province/municipality? **Probe:** What problems do fishers face in their working conditions, hours of work, payment? Are you aware of exploitative conditions among fishery workers? What about forced labor (explain with examples) and situations that amount to trafficking in persons? What are some of the reasons fish workers are involved in these types of exploitative conditions? What needs to be done to improve and protect fishers' working rights?
5. Do the strategies of this project meet your needs and interests as a fisher/fishing family? Please explain why the activities are relevant or not. **Prompt**: Are any other important issues not addressed in the project strategies?

Effectiveness (15 minutes)

6. What do you understand about the rights of fishing workers and acceptable work? How did you gain this understanding?
7. Considering the project's activities so far, what do you observe as the major contributions of the Project/(Plan/OND/DFW), in your community, province?
8. What steps do fishers and family members take to protect themselves or report exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels? How about women family members? Have your practices changed since this project came here?
9. What factors are helping the project and its partners to achieve its intended results?
10. What were the challenges for this project to helping to bring improvements in fishers' working conditions and preventing exploitation?
11. What activities do you like most about this project? Why?

Management and Efficiency (15 minutes)

12. Can you comment on the quality of the communication and coordination carried out by the project team?

Looking forward (15 minutes)

13. What important changes do you expect to see remain after this project ends? (impact and sustainability)
14. What more can be done to help make long-lasting improvements for fishers in this community or nationally. *Probe: regulatory improvements, inspection practices, awareness among different parties, reporting mechanisms and access to services?*
15. Do you have any recommendations for future projects? Recommendations for SAFE Seas before the project ends?

Fishing Companies

- Common introduction

Interviewee Background (5 minutes)

1. What is your title?
2. Can you provide an overview of your company's business?
3. How long have you been involved in the SAFE Seas project and in what capacity? Are you aware of the objectives of SAFE Seas project?

Relevance and Coherence (10 minutes)

4. What issues/problems of exploitative conditions among fishers or forced labor are you aware of in Indonesia/Philippines/ specific ports/regions?
5. To what extent did the project strategies meet the needs and interests of the fishing companies? **Prompt**: Are any key issues not addressed in the project strategies?
6. Can you comment on the quality of the communication and coordination carried out by the project team of Plan Philippines/Yayasan Plan International Indonesia with its private sector/government partners?

Effectiveness and Efficiency (10 minutes)

7. What results has SAFE Seas and its partners achieved – Prompt re regulatory environment and coordination, coverage, labor inspection mechanisms, awareness, services etc.
8. What have been the main challenges for the project in your view?

Looking forward (15 minutes)

9. Lessons and good practices from the experience of SAFE Seas?
10. What strategies are the SAFE Seas partners using to promote sustained improvements in fisher protection?
11. What improvements do you expect to see remain after the external support stops? What does your agency plan to carry forward?
12. Do you have any recommendations for future projects? What strategies are needed?

ANNEX E. EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is an office within the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL). ILAB's mission is to promote a fair global playing field for workers in the United States and around the world by enforcing trade commitments, strengthening labor standards, and combating international child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

OCFT works to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking around the world through international research, policy engagement, technical cooperation, and awareness-raising. Since OCFT's technical cooperation program began in 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated funds annually to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects in more than 90 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL support sustained efforts that address child labor and forced labor's underlying causes, including poverty and lack of access to education.

The USDOL, through its Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), has contracted with American Institutes for Research (AIR) to conduct the final performance evaluation of the Safeguarding against and Addressing Fishers' Exploitation at Sea (SAFE Seas) project. The present terms of reference (TOR) pertain to the final performance evaluation of the SAFE Seas project.

This evaluation approach will be in accordance with DOL's Evaluation Policy[41]. OCFT is committed to using the most rigorous methods applicable for this qualitative performance evaluation and to learning from the evaluation results. The evaluation will be conducted by an independent third party and in an ethical manner and safeguard the dignity, rights, safety and privacy of participants. The quality standards underlying this evaluation are: Relevance, Coherence (to the extent possible), Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact (to the extent possible), and Sustainability.[42] In conducting this evaluation, the evaluator will strive to uphold the American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles for Evaluators.[43] OCFT will make the evaluation report available and accessible on its website.

PROJECT CONTEXT

As noted by OCFT, forced labor and labor abuses in the fishing industries of Southeast Asian nations are well documented and have come to the forefront of international attention. In December 2018, representatives of government, employer, worker, and civil society organizations from eight Southeast Asian countries, including Indonesia and the Philippines, established the Southeast Asian Forum to End Trafficking in Persons and Forced Labour of Fishers (SEA Forum for Fishers) to

[41] For more information on DOL's Evaluation Policy, please visit https://www.dol.gov/asp/evaluation/evaluationpolicy.htm

[42] From Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use by the Organization for Economic Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) Network on Development Evaluation. DOL determined these criteria are in accordance with the OMB Guidance M-20-12. For more information, please visit: https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf

[43] For more information on the American Evaluation Association's Guiding Principles, please visit: https://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51

harmonize and strengthen efforts to end forced labor and labor trafficking in the region's fishing industries. Indonesia and the Philippines are signatories to numerous conventions addressing maritime labor rights and forced labor more broadly, including the Forced Labour Convention, Seafarers' Identity Documents Convention, and the Maritime Labour Convention, but greater efforts are required to tackle the widespread labor abuses in the industry.

In December 2017, ILAB awarded a $5 million, four-year cooperative agreement (CA) to Plan International USA (Plan) with a project objective to "combat forced labor and human trafficking on fishing vessels in Indonesia and the Philippines." ILAB has since approved the extension of the project duration until 30 November 2022, as well as an additional $500,000. SAFE Seas intends to contribute to the reduction of forced labour and trafficking in persons on fishing vessels nationally and in selected districts in Indonesia[44] and the Philippines.[45]

AIR has been contracted to conduct the final performance evaluation of this project, including Plan's overall methodology, interventions and results through both qualitative and quantitative studies to synthesize lessons learned and make recommendations for future projects. AIR will prepare and conduct this evaluation, analyze the results, and synthesize the findings into reports as outlined in the contract with ILAB from July 2022 to February 2023.

The fieldwork for Safe-Seas will commence on or about August 29, 2022 and last for about three weeks. Evaluation fieldwork will take place in Indonesia, the Philippines, and remotely if needed. For Indonesia, potential evaluation sites include Jakarta, Central Java Province, and North Sulawesi. For the Philippines, potential evaluation sites include Manila, General Santos, Palawan, and Sarangani. The final selection of stakeholders to be interviewed will be made by the lead evaluator in collaboration with USDOL and the grantee. All efforts will be made to ensure that the lead evaluator interviews a representative sample of stakeholders during the fieldwork phase to gain a wholistic understanding of the successes and challenges of the project. Fieldwork will be conducted in accordance with the methodology requirements set out in Section 4: Evaluation Methodology and Timeline provided by ILAB below.

PROJECT SPECIFIC INFORMATION – FILLED IN BY CONTRACTOR

Plan's approach is delivered through two outcomes: Outcome 1: Improved enforcement to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels; and Outcome 2: Decreased indicators of labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels, each with respective sub-outcomes and outputs, as detailed in the table below:

Outcome 1: Improved enforcement to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels
Sub-Outcome 1.1: Regulatory and policy framework to combat labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels improved
Output 1.1.1 Final draft of improved regulations and policy briefs submitted to government
Sub-Outcome 1.2: Quality of labor-inclusive inspections on fishing vessels procedures and implementation improved
Output 1.2.1 Inspection mechanism among related key government agencies is improved

[44] Working at national level in Jakarta, in Pemalang district and Tegal area in Central Jave province, and Bitung district in North Sulawesi province.

[45] Working at national level in Manila, and in Puerto Princesa and Taytay, Palawan; General Santos City, Glan and Kiamba – Sarangani.

Output 1.2.2 Roadmap for establishing fishing vessel labor-inclusive inter-agency inspections working unit disseminated among relevant stakeholders
Output 1.2.3 Fishing vessels and labor inspectors trained on incorporating labor exploitation including FL/TIP into inspections
Outcome 2: Decreased indicators of labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels
Sub-Outcome 2.1 Improved understanding among government, private sector, local communities and fish workers of acceptable work conditions in the fishing industry
Output 2.1.1: Improved private sector support of government policies related to labor and labor exploitation including FL/TIP in the fishing industry
Output 2.1.2 MAST Initiative is introduced in Indonesia and the Philippines
Output 2.1.3: Increased understanding of labor exploitation including FL/TIP on fishing vessels among fish workers and community members
Sub-Outcome 2.2: Ability of fish workers and their families to report exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels improved
Output 2.2.1: Reporting mechanisms using appropriate technology created/ strengthened
Sub-Outcome 2.3 Improved access to remedies of FL/TIP and/or exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels
Output 2.3.1: Strengthened networks and referral mechanisms for fish workers on fishing vessels, especially for FL/TIP victims
Output 2.3.2: Updated referral network directory for fish workers on fishing vessels, especially for FL/TIP victims

Below are a few examples of key interventions reported. AIR plans to assess the effectiveness of activities related to the above outlined Outcomes, including but not limited to the following:

Indonesia:

- Development and support of the adoption of a National Action Plan for the Protection of Seafarers and Fishery Vessel Personnel (2021-2024) led by the Coordinating Ministry for Maritime Affairs and Investment.
- Establishment of a multi-agency Safe Fishing Alliance at the national level and two at the provincial level in North Sulawesi and Central Java.
- Establishment an operation of two local fisher centers to provide information and reporting mechanisms for fishers and their family members.

Philippines:

- Establishment of national fishing alliance and three working groups, as well as two state level alliances.
- Facilitation of partnerships with government agencies to coordinate policies and regulations on fishers' working conditions.
- Multi-agency inspection of a fishing vessel in Tay Tay and pre-test of an inspection checklist to use in future fishing vessel inspections.
- Publication of a research study on the "Effects of Forced Labor and Trafficking in Persons on Female Relatives of Male Fishers."

After the mid-term evaluation, Plan conduced further activities that will be evaluated by AIR, including development of multi-disciplinary inspection manuals and trainings in each country.

An independent interim evaluation was conducted during 2020 and concluded in March 2021 (originally scheduled for March 2020, the data collection was postponed to October 2020 due to the

outbreak of COVID-19). The present evaluation will include a focus on the project's progress since the interim evaluation and the response to its recommendations.

2. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

EVALUATION PURPOSE

The purpose of final performance evaluations covered under this contract includes, but may not be limited to, the following:

- Assessing if the project has achieved its objectives and outcomes, identifying the challenges encountered in doing so, and analyzing the driving factors for these challenges;
- Assessing the intended and unintended effects of the project;
- Assessing lessons learned and emerging practices from the project (e.g., strategies and models of intervention) and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future projects in the focus country(ies) and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors; and
- Assessing which outcomes or outputs can be deemed sustainable.

INTENDED USERS

The evaluation will provide OCFT, the grantee, other project stakeholders, and stakeholders working to combat child labor more broadly, an assessment of the project's performance, its effects on project participants, and an understanding of the factors driving the project results. The evaluation results, conclusions and recommendations will serve to inform any project adjustments that may need to be made, and to inform stakeholders in the design and implementation of subsequent phases or future child labor elimination projects as appropriate. The evaluation report will be published on the USDOL website, so the report should be written as a standalone document, providing the necessary background information for readers who are unfamiliar with the details of the project.

3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Following discussions with ILAB and Plan, the evaluation team developed key questions for this evaluation in accordance with the OECD-DAC criteria: Relevance and validity, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Sustainability.[46] As a final performance evaluation, due attention will be given to the grantee's response to the recommendations of the interim performance evaluation. Given the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic, mid-way in the project's implementation in January 2020, the final evaluation will consider the impact of the pandemic on the project's implementation and results, including the adaptations SAFE Seas made in its delivery.

Relevance and Design Validity

1. To what degree is the project design, theory of change and intervention logic appropriate and adequate to combat forced labor and human trafficking on fishing vessels in Indonesia and the Philippines?

[46] The OECD Development Assistance Committee evaluation criteria were revised in December 2019. https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf

2. To what extent are the project strategies relevant to the specific needs of project participants, communities, and other stakeholders?

Coherence

3. To what extent has the project established links and coordinated with government-led efforts to eliminate FL and TIP and with other donor-funded interventions?

Effectiveness and Efficiency

4. To what extent is the project making progress towards its primary objective and planned outcomes? What are the key results achieved so far, specifically regarding improving the:
   a) regulatory and policy framework to combat labor exploitation on fishing vessels and the quality of labor-inclusive inspections on fishing vessels?
   b) understanding among government, private sector, local communities, and fish workers of acceptable work conditions in the fishing industry?
   c) ability to fish workers and their families to report exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels?
   d) access of fishery workers to remedies of FL/TIP or exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels?
5. What are the key internal or external factors that limit or facilitate the achievement of project outcomes?
6. How effective and efficient are the project's intervention and management strategies? What are the key strengths and weaknesses in project implementation and management? What areas need improvement?
7. To what extent were the midterm evaluation's recommendations adopted by the project management?
8. Does the project's Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP) provide a valid means to monitor project progress and achievements; and to what extent has the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system been effectively used by the project to inform management decision making?
9. To what extent has gender mainstreaming been addressed by the project? Has the project integrated gender equity as a cross-cutting concern throughout its methodology and all deliverables?
10. How has the COVID-19 pandemic influenced project results and effectiveness, and how has the project adapted to this changing context?

Sustainability

11. To what extent a phase out strategy has been defined and what steps have been taken to ensure sustainability?
12. To what extent are the project's plans for sustainability adapted to the local level, national level, and capacity of implementing partners?

These questions will provide the structure for the evaluation and will be tailored to the specific objectives, expected results, activities and stakeholders of the project. The evaluation team will

identify the data sources it intends to use to answer these questions in the Question Matrix after the logistics call with the ILAB and Plan teams. The Questions Matrix will be added as an Annex to the final version of this report.

4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME

The evaluation methodology will consist of the following activities and approaches:

A. APPROACH

The evaluation approach will be qualitative and participatory in nature, and use project documents including CMEP data to provide quantitative information. Qualitative information will be obtained through field visits, interviews and focus groups as appropriate. Opinions coming from stakeholders and project participants will improve and clarify the use of quantitative analysis. The participatory nature of the evaluation will contribute to the sense of ownership among stakeholders and project participants.

ALL EVALUATIONS SHOULD:

- Identify which interventions are most effective at producing the desired outcomes.
- Identify which outcomes and, where applicable, which outputs have the greatest likelihood of being sustained after donor funding ends.
- Objectively rate the level of achievement of each of the project's major outcomes on a four-point scale (low, moderate, above-moderate, and high).
- As relevant during final evaluations, should assess whether the results from the RDQA were used by the project to formulate and implement measures to strengthen their data management and reporting system and improve data quality.
- Include evaluator activity to review CMEP data with grantee.

To the extent that it is available, quantitative data will be drawn from the CMEP and project reports and incorporated in the analysis. In particular, project monitoring data shall be triangulated with relevant quantitative or qualitative data collected during fieldwork, in order to objectively rate the level of achievement of each of the project's major outcomes on a four-point scale (low, moderate, above-moderate, and high).

The evaluation approach will be independent in terms of the membership of the evaluation team. Project staff and implementing partners will generally only be present in meetings with stakeholders, communities, and beneficiaries to provide introductions. The following additional principles will be applied during the evaluation process:

1. Methods of data collection and stakeholder perspectives will be triangulated for as many as possible of the evaluation questions.
2. Efforts will be made to include parents' and children's voices and beneficiary participation

generally, using child-sensitive approaches to interviewing children following the ILO-IPEC guidelines on research with children on the worst forms of child labor[47] and UNICEF Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children.[48][49]

3. Gender and cultural sensitivity will be integrated in the evaluation approach.

4. Consultations will incorporate a degree of flexibility to maintain a sense of ownership of the stakeholders and beneficiaries, allowing additional questions to be posed that are not included in the TOR, whilst ensuring that key information requirements are met.

5. As far as possible, a consistent approach will be followed in each project site, with adjustments made for the different actors involved, activities conducted, and the progress of implementation in each locality.

B. EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team will consist of:

1. The lead evaluator

2. Junior evaluators as determined under ILAB/OCFT contract award.

3. As appropriate, an interpreter fluent in necessary languages will travel with the evaluator

One member of the project staff may travel with the team to make introductions. This person is not involved in the evaluation process, or interviews.

The lead evaluator will be responsible for developing the methodology in consultation with (Contractor), USDOL, and the project staff; assigning the tasks of the national consultant (as applicable); assigning the tasks of the interpreter for the field work (as applicable); directly conducting interviews and facilitating other data collection processes; analysis of the evaluation material gathered; presenting feedback on the initial results of the evaluation to the national stakeholder meeting and preparing the evaluation report.

The responsibility of the interpreter in each provincial locality is to ensure that the evaluation team is understood by the stakeholders as far as possible, and that the information gathered is relayed accurately to the evaluator. The interpreter should be impartial and independent from the grantee in order to mitigate potential bias.

[47] http://www.ilo.org/ipecinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=3026
[48] https://www.unicef.org/media/reporting-guidelines
[49] This consideration may not directly be applicable to the surveys being conducted by AIR, but AIR will nonetheless hold these considerations in mind act within stringent ethical standards as defined by the US Department of Labor, Plan International, and AIR.

C. DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY

1. DOCUMENT REVIEW

- Pre-field visit preparation includes extensive review of relevant documents
- During fieldwork, documentation will be verified and additional documents may be collected
- The evaluator shall also review the Routine Data Quality Assessment (RDQA) form completed by the grantee. The evaluator shall assess whether results from the RDQA were used by the project to formulate and implement measures to strengthen their data management and reporting system and improve data quality. The evaluator's analysis should be included in the evaluation report.
- The evaluator shall also review key CMEP outcome and OCFT Standard Output indicators with the grantee. This will include reviewing the indicator definitions in the CMEP's Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) and the reported values in the Technical Progress Report (TPR) Annex A to ensure the reporting is accurate and complete.
- Documents may include:
    - CMEP documents and data reported in Annex A of the TPR,
    - Routine Data Quality Assessment (RDQA) form as appropriate
    - Baseline and endline survey reports or pre-situational analyses,
    - Project document and revisions,
    - Project budget and revisions,
    - Financial Reports (FFRs)
    - Cooperative Agreement and project modifications,
    - Technical Progress and Status Reports,
    - Project Results Frameworks and Monitoring Plans,
    - Original work plan and most current revised work plan,
    - Correspondence related to Technical Progress Reports,
    - Management Procedures and Guidelines,
    - Research or other reports undertaken (KAP studies, etc.), and,
    - Project files (including school records) as appropriate.

2. QUESTION MATRIX

Before beginning fieldwork, the evaluator will create a question matrix, which outlines the source of data from where the evaluator plans to collect information for each TOR question. This will help the evaluator make decisions as to how they are going to allocate their time in the field. It will also help the evaluator to ensure that they are exploring all possible avenues for data triangulation and to clearly note where their evaluation results are coming from. The Contractor will share the question matrix with USDOL. The contractor will submit the Question Matrix with sufficient time before the start of fieldwork to receive feedback, based on discussions during the logistics call and the midterm evaluation. The Questions Matrix will be included as an Annex to the final version of the TOR.

3. INTERVIEWS WITH STAKEHOLDERS

Informational interviews will be held with as many project stakeholders as possible. The evaluation team will solicit the opinions of, but not limited to: children, youth, community members in areas where awareness-raising activities occurred, parents of project participants, teachers, government representatives, employers and private-sector actors, legal authorities, union and NGO officials, the action program implementers, and program staff regarding the project's accomplishments, program design, sustainability, and the working relationship between project staff and their partners, where appropriate.

Depending on the circumstances, these meetings will be one-on-one or group interviews. Technically, stakeholders are all those who have an interest in a project, such as implementers, partners, direct and indirect participants, community leaders, donors, and government officials. Thus, it is anticipated that meetings will be held with:

- OCFT staff responsible for this evaluation and project prior to the commencement of the field work
- Implementers at all levels, including child labor monitors involved in assessing whether children have been effectively prevented or withdrawn from child labor situations
- Headquarters, Country Director, Project Managers, and Field Staff of Grantee and Partner Organizations
- Government Ministry Officials and Local Government Officials who have been involved in or are knowledgeable about the project
- Community leaders, members, and volunteers
- School teachers, assistants, school directors, education personnel
- Project participants (children withdrawn and prevented and their parents)
- International NGOs and multilateral agencies working in the area
- Other child protection and/or education organizations, committees and experts in the area
- U.S. Embassy staff members

4. FIELD VISITS

The evaluator will visit a selection of project sites. The final selection of field sites to be visited will be made by the evaluator. Every effort should be made to include some sites where the project experienced successes and others that encountered challenges, as well as a good cross section of sites across targeted CL sectors. During the visits, the evaluator will observe the activities and outputs developed by the project. Focus groups with project participants will be held, and interviews will be conducted with representatives from local governments, NGOs, community leaders and teachers.

5. OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY RATINGS

The evaluator should objectively rate the level of achievement and potential for sustainability of each of the project's outcomes on a four-point scale (low, moderate, above-moderate, and high).

ACHIEVEMENT

"**Achievement**" measures the extent to which a development intervention or project attains its objectives/outcomes, as described in its performance monitoring plan (PMP).

For assessing the achievement of program or project outcomes, the evaluation team should consider the extent to which the objectives/outcomes were achieved and identify the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives/outcomes. ***For interim evaluations***, the evaluation team should also consider the likelihood of the objectives/outcomes being achieved by the end of the project if the critical assumptions hold, as well as the extent the project requires course corrections to bring it back on track. ***For final evaluations***, the evaluation team should consider to what extent the project is likely to meet or exceed its targets by project end.

Project achievement ratings should be determined through triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data. The evaluation team should collect qualitative data from key informant interviews and focus group discussions through a structured data collection process, such as a survey or rapid scorecard. Interviews and focus groups can also provide context for the results reflected in the Data Reporting Form submitted with the Technical Progress Report (TPR). The evaluation team should also analyze quantitative data collected by the project on key performance indicators defined in the Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) and reported on in the TPR Data Reporting Form. The evaluation team should consider the reliability and validity of the performance indicators and the completeness and accuracy of the data collected. The assessment of quantitative data should consider the extent to which the project achieved its targets and whether these targets were sufficiently ambitious and achievable within the period evaluated. The evaluation team should assess each of the project's objective(s) and outcome(s) according to the following scale:

- **High:** met or exceeded most targets for the period evaluated, with mostly positive feedback from key stakeholders and participants.
- **Above-moderate:** met or exceeded most targets for the period evaluated, **but** with mostly neutral or negative feedback from key stakeholders and participants.
- **Moderate:** missed most targets for the period evaluated, **but** with mostly positive feedback from key stakeholders and participants.
- **Low:** missed most targets for the period evaluated, with mostly neutral or negative feedback from key stakeholders and participants.

SUSTAINABILITY

"**Sustainability**" is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. When evaluating the sustainability of a project, it is useful to consider the likelihood that the benefits or effects of a particular output or outcome will continue after donor funding ends. It is also important to consider the extent to which the project takes into account the actors, factors, and institutions that are likely to have the strongest influence over, capacity, and willingness to sustain the desired outcomes and impacts. Indicators of sustainability could include agreements/linkages with local partners, stakeholder engagement in project sustainability planning, and successful handover of project activities or key outputs to local partners before project end, among others.

The project's Sustainability Plan (including the associated indicators) and TPRs (including the attachments) are key (but not the only) sources for determining its rating. The evaluation team should assess each of the project's objective(s) and outcome(s) according to the following scale:

- **High:** strong likelihood that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and the necessary resources[50] are in place to ensure sustainability;
- **Above-moderate:** above average likelihood that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and the necessary resources are identified but not yet committed;
- **Moderate:** some likelihood that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and some of the necessary resources are identified;
- **Low:** weak likelihood that that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and the necessary resources are not identified.

In determining the rating above, the evaluation team should also consider the extent to which sustainability risks were adequately identified and mitigated through the project's risk management and stakeholder engagement activities. ***For final evaluations***, the evaluation team should assess the risk environment and its expected effects on the project outcomes after the project exits and the capacity/motivation/resources/linkages of the local actors/stakeholders to sustain the outcomes produced by the project.

D. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND CONFIDENTIALITY

The evaluation mission will observe utmost confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. To mitigate bias during the data collection process and ensure a maximum freedom of expression of the implementing partners, stakeholders, communities, and project participants, implementing partner staff will generally not be present during interviews. However, implementing partner staff may accompany the evaluator to make introductions whenever necessary, to facilitate the evaluation process, make respondents feel comfortable, and to allow the evaluator to observe the interaction between the implementing partner staff and the interviewees.

E. STAKEHOLDER MEETING

Following the field visits, a stakeholder meeting, will be organized by the project and led by the evaluator to bring together a wide range of stakeholders, including the implementing partners and other interested parties to discuss the evaluation results. The list of participants to be invited will be drafted prior to the evaluator's visit and confirmed in consultation with project staff during fieldwork. ILAB staff may participate in the stakeholder meeting virtually if available. ILAB and project staff may coordinate with relevant US Embassy representatives for their participation, as well.

The meeting will present the major preliminary results and emerging issues, solicit actionable recommendations, discuss project sustainability and obtain clarification or additional information from stakeholders, including those not interviewed earlier. The agenda of the meeting will be determined by the evaluator in consultation with project staff. Some specific questions for stakeholders may be prepared to guide the discussion and possibly a brief written feedback form.

The agenda is expected to include some of the following items:

[50] Resources can include financial resources (i.e. non-donor replacement resources), as well as organization capacity, institutional linkages, motivation and ownership, and political will, among others.

- Presentation by the evaluator of the preliminary main results
- Feedback and questions from stakeholders on the results
- Opportunity for implementing partners not met to present their views on progress and challenges in their locality
- If appropriate, Possible Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) exercise on the project's performance
- Discussion of recommendations to improve the implementation and ensure sustainability. Consideration will be given to the value of distributing a feedback form for participants to nominate their "action priorities" for the remainder of the project.

A debrief call will be held with the evaluator and USDOL after the stakeholder workshop to provide USDOL with preliminary results and solicit feedback as needed.

F. LIMITATIONS

Fieldwork for the evaluation will last two weeks, on average, and the evaluator will not have enough time to visit all project sites. As a result, the evaluator will not be able to take all sites into consideration when formulating their results. All efforts will be made to ensure that the evaluator is visiting a representative sample of sites, including some that have performed well and some that have experienced challenges.

This is not a formal impact assessment. Results for the evaluation will be based on information collected from background documents and in interviews with stakeholders, project staff, and project participants. The accuracy of the evaluation results will be determined by the integrity of information provided to the evaluator from these sources.

Furthermore, the ability of the evaluator to determine efficiency will be limited by the amount of financial data available. A cost-efficiency analysis is not included because it would require impact data which is not available.

G. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Contractor is responsible for accomplishing the following items:

- Providing all evaluation management and logistical support for evaluation deliverables within the timelines specified in the contract and TOR;
- Providing all logistical support for travel associated with the evaluation;
- Providing quality control over all deliverables submitted to ILAB;
- Ensuring the Evaluation Team conducts the evaluation according to the TOR;

The Evaluation Team will conduct the evaluation according to the TOR. The Evaluation Team is responsible for accomplishing the following items:

- Receiving and responding to or incorporating input from the grantees and ILAB on the initial TOR draft;

- Finalizing and submitting the TOR and sharing concurrently with the grantees and ILAB;
- Reviewing project background documents;
- Reviewing the evaluation questions and refining them as necessary;
- Developing and implementing an evaluation methodology, including document review, KIIs and FGDs, and secondary data analysis, to answer the evaluation questions;
- Conducting planning meetings or calls, including developing a field itinerary, as necessary, with ILAB and grantees;
- Deciding the composition of field visit KII and FGD participants to ensure the objectivity of the evaluation;
- Developing an evaluation question matrix for ILAB;
- Presenting preliminary results verbally to project field staff and other stakeholders as determined in consultation with ILAB and grantees;
- Preparing an initial draft of the evaluation report for ILAB and grantee review;
- Incorporating comments from ILAB and the grantee/other stakeholders into the final report, as appropriate.
- Developing a comment matrix addressing the disposition of all of the comments provided;
- Preparing and submitting the final report;

ILAB is responsible for the following items:

- Launching the contract;
- Reviewing the TOR, providing input to the evaluation team as necessary, and agreeing on final draft;
- Providing project background documents to the evaluation team, in collaboration with the grantees;
- Obtaining country clearance from U.S. Embassy in fieldwork country;
- Briefing grantees on the upcoming field visit and working with them to coordinate and prepare for the visit;
- Reviewing and providing comments on the draft evaluation report;
- Approving the final draft of the evaluation report;
- Participating in the pre- and post-trip debriefing and interviews;
- Including the ILAB evaluation contracting officer's representative on all communication with the evaluation team;

The grantee is responsible for the following items:

- Reviewing the TOR, providing input to the evaluation team as necessary, and agreeing on the final draft;
- Providing project background materials to the evaluation team, in collaboration with ILAB;
- Preparing a list of recommended interviewees with feedback on the draft TOR;
- Participating in planning meetings or calls, including developing a field itinerary, as necessary, with ILAB and evaluator;
- Scheduling meetings during the field visit and coordinating all logistical arrangements;
- Helping the evaluation team to identify and arrange for interpreters as needed to facilitate worker interviews;
- Reviewing and providing comments on the draft evaluation reports;
- Organizing, financing, and participating in the stakeholder debriefing meeting;
- Providing in-country ground transportation to meetings and interviews;;

- Including the ILAB program office on all written communication with the evaluation team.

H. TIMETABLE

The tentative timetable is as follows. Actual dates may be adjusted as needs arise and after logistics call with Plan International and ILAB.

Task	Responsible Party	Date
Evaluation launch call	DOL/OCFT	July 1, 2022
Background project documents sent to Contractor	DOL/OCFT	July 11, 2022
TOR Template submitted to Contractor	DOL/OCFT	July 1, 2022
Draft TOR sent to DOL/OCFT and Grantee	Contractor	July 15, 2022
Contractor and Grantee work to develop draft itinerary and stakeholder list (based on guidance from the Lead Evaluator) (Grantee sent Contractor draft on 7/15 for review/further comments)	Contractor and Grantee	Week of Jul 18, 2022
Contractor submits draft itinerary and stakeholder list to DOL	Contractor	Within 10 days of draft itinerary call with grantee
Logistics call - Discuss logistics and field itinerary	Contractor and Grantee (DOL/OCFT as needed)	Week of Jul 25, 2022
Contractor sends minutes from logistics call	Contractor	Within 3 business days of meeting
DOL/OCFT and Grantee provide comments on draft TOR	DOL/OCFT and Grantee	2-3 weeks after submission (by August 5, 2022)
Fieldwork budget submitted to DOL/OCFT (include fieldwork clearance approval forms)	Contractor	August 18, 2022 (or 2 weeks before start of field work)
Fieldwork budget approved by DOL/OCFT	DOL/OCFT	By September 4, 2022 (or start of field work)
Finalize field itinerary and stakeholder list for workshop	DOL/OCFT, Contractor, and Grantee	August 15, 2022
Cable clearance information submitted to DOL/OCFT	Contractor	Within 2 weeks of start of fieldwork
Final TOR submitted to DOL/OCFT for approval	Contractor	August 18, 2022
Question matrix submitted to DOL/OCFT for review	Contractor	Internal draft by August 1, 2022. Submitted with TOR by August 18, 2022
Final approval of TOR by DOL/OCFT	DOL/OCFT	August 29, 2022
Submit finalized TOR to Grantee	Contractor	August 18, 2022
Interview call with DOL/OCFT	Contractor	August 19, 2022 or the week of August 22, depending on DOL availability. DOL staff have been contacted.
Interview call with Grantee HQ staff	Contractor	August 19, 2022, or the week of

Task	Responsible Party	Date
		August 22, depending on Grantee availability. Grantee has been contacted.
Fieldwork	Contractor	September 5, 2022 – September 20, 2022 (traveling on September 4)
1Stakeholder Workshop	Contractor	Within field work timeline – estimated date of September 12, 2022
Post-fieldwork debrief call	Contractor	Week of September 26, 2022
Draft report (2-week review draft) submitted to DOL/OCFT and Grantee	Contractor	October 18, 2022
DOL/OCFT and Grantee/key stakeholder comments due to contractor after full 2-week review	DOL/OCFT and Grantee	November 1, 2022
Revised report in redline submitted to DOL/OCFT and Grantee demonstrating how all comments were addressed either via a comment matrix or other format	Contractor	November 11, 2022
DOL/OCFT and Grantee provides concurrence that comments were addressed	DOL/OCFT and Grantee	November 21, 2022
Final report submitted to DOL/OCFT and Grantee	Contractor	November 29, 2022
Final approval of report by DOL/OCFT	DOL/OCFT	December 13, 2022
Draft infographic/brief document submitted to DOL/OCFT	Contractor	December 23, 2022
DOL/OCFT comments on draft infographic/brief	DOL/OCFT	January 6, 2023
Editing and 508 compliance by contractor	Contractor	January 20, 2023
Final infographic/brief submitted to DOL/OCFT (508 compliant)	Contractor	January 20, 2023
Final approval of infographic/brief by DOL/OCFT (508 compliant)	DOL/OCFT	February 3, 2023
Final edited report submitted to COR (508 compliant)	Contractor	February 3, 2023
Final edited approved report and infographic/brief shared with grantee (508 compliant)	Contractor	February 10, 2023

5. EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

Ten working days following the evaluator's return from fieldwork, a first draft evaluation report will be submitted to the Contractor. The report should have the following structure and content:

1. Table of Contents
2. List of Acronyms
3. Executive Summary (no more than **five pages** providing an overview of the evaluation,

summary of main results/lessons learned/emerging good practices, and key recommendations)

4. Evaluation Objectives
5. Project Description
6. Listing of Evaluation Questions
7. Results
    a. The results section includes the facts, analysis, and supporting evidence. The results section of the evaluation report should address the evaluation questions. It does not have to be in a question-response format, but should be responsive to each evaluation question.
8. Conclusions and Recommendations
    a. Conclusions – interpretation of the facts, including criteria for judgments
    b. Lessons Learned and Emerging Good Practices[51]
    c. Key Recommendations - critical for successfully meeting project objectives and/or judgments on what changes need to be made for sustainability or future programming
9. Annexes –
    a. List of documents reviewed;
    b. Interviews (including list of stakeholder groups; without PII in web version)/meetings/site visits;
    c. Stakeholder workshop agenda and participants;
    d. TOR, Evaluation Methodology and Limitations;
    e. Summary of Recommendations (citing page numbers for evidence in the body of the report, listing out the supporting evidence for each recommendation, and identifying party that the recommendation is directed toward.)

The key recommendations must be **action-oriented and implementable**. The recommendations should be clearly linked to results and directed to a specific party to be implemented. It is preferable for the report to contain no more than 10 recommendations, but other suggestions may be incorporated in the report in other ways.

The total length of the report should be approximately 30 pages for the main report, excluding the executive summary and annexes.

The first draft of the report will be circulated to OCFT and the grantee individually for their review. The evaluator will incorporate comments from OCFT and the grantee/other key stakeholders into the final reports as appropriate, and the evaluator will provide a response, in the form of a comment matrix, as to why any comments might not have been incorporated.

While the substantive content of the results, conclusions, and recommendations of the report shall be determined by the evaluator, the report is subject to final approval by ILAB/OCFT in terms of whether or not the report meets the conditions of the TOR.

[51] An emerging *good practice* is a process, practice, or system highlighted in the evaluation reports as having improved the performance and efficiency of the program in specific areas. They are activities or systems that are recommended to others for use in similar situations. A *lesson learned* documents the experience gained during a program. They may identify a process, practice, or systems to avoid in specific situations

6. EVALUATION DESIGN QUESTION MATRIX

No.	Question	Method
	Relevance and Design Validity	
1	To what degree is the project design, theory of change and intervention logic appropriate and adequate to combat forced labor and human trafficking on fishing vessels in Indonesia and the Philippines?	Document review, KII, FGD
2	To what extent are the project strategies relevant to the specific needs of project participants, communities, and other stakeholders?	Document review, KII, FGD
	Coherence	
3	To what extent has the project established links and coordinated with government-led efforts to eliminate FL and TIP and with other donor-funded interventions?	Document review, KII
	Effectiveness and Efficiency	
4	To what extent is the project making progress towards its primary objective and planned outcomes? What are the key results achieved so far, specifically regarding improving the: d) regulatory and policy framework to combat labor exploitation on fishing vessels and the quality of labor-inclusive inspections on fishing vessels? e) understanding among government, private sector, local communities, and fish workers of acceptable work conditions in the fishing industry? f) ability to fish workers and their families to report exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels? d) access of fishery workers to remedies of FL/TIP or exploitative working conditions on fishing vessels?	Document review, KII, FGD, quantitative analysis
5	What are the key internal or external factors that limit or facilitate the achievement of project outcomes?	Document review, KII, FGD
6	How effective and efficient are the project's intervention and management strategies? What are the key strengths and weaknesses in project implementation and management? What areas need improvement? [52]	Document review, KII, FGD, quantitative analysis
7	To what extent were the midterm evaluation's recommendations adopted by the project management?	Document review, KII with Plan USNO and SAFE Seas team

[52] Note: Interpret the last sub-question as "what areas could have been improved?"

No.	Question	Method
8	Does the project's Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP) provide a valid means to monitor project progress and achievements; and to what extent has the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system been effectively used by the project to inform management decision making?	Document review, KII, quantitative analysis
9	To what extent has gender mainstreaming been addressed by the project? Has the project integrated gender equality as a cross-cutting concern throughout its methodology and all deliverables?	Document review, KII, FGD
10	How has the COVID-19 pandemic influenced project results and effectiveness, and how has the project adapted to this changing context	Document review, KII with SAFE Seas team, implementing partners, beneficiaries
	Sustainability	
11	To what extent a phase out strategy has been defined and what steps have been taken to ensure sustainability?	Document review, KII
12	To what extent are the project's plans for sustainability adapted to the local level, national level, and capacity of implementing partners?	Document review, KII, FGD