



**External ex-post Evaluation:  
Promoting Integrity in International  
Recruitment and Migrant Skill  
Development in Jamaica**

*JM10P0001/LM.0333*

Final Report

March 2023

Evaluation consultant:  
Patricia Goldschmid



## ***Table of Contents***

Executive Summary .....	3
List of acronyms .....	6
1. Introduction .....	7
2. Context and purpose of the evaluation .....	7
3. Findings .....	12
4. Conclusions and recommendations .....	35
Lessons identified .....	36
Annex one: Evaluation Inception Report and Terms of Reference .....	38
Annex two: List of persons interviewed .....	52
Annex three: List of documents / publications consulted .....	53
Annex four: Scoring matrix for Fund projects .....	54

## Executive Summary

This report is an ex-post evaluation of the project (JM10P0001/LM.0333) *Promoting Integrity in International Recruitment and Migrant Skill Development in Jamaica*. The project was funded by the International Organisation for Migration's (IOM) Development Fund ("the Fund"). The ex-post evaluation was commissioned by the Fund and was carried out by Patricia Goldschmid, of the Owl RE research and evaluation consultancy in Geneva, from October 2022 to March 2023.

The purpose of this evaluation was to assess the relevance and coherence of the projects for the stakeholders and beneficiaries, the effectiveness and efficiency of project management and implementation, the expected impact, how well cross-cutting themes of human rights and gender were mainstreamed in the projects, and how sustainable the desired effects were or could be. The evaluation was carried out through a desk review, a visit to Benin, an online survey and key informant interviews with 11 project stakeholders.

### Findings

**Project design - 4 – Very Good:** The results matrix was developed with a logical design with one objective, one outcome and two outputs. The objective was clear with a realistically achievable goal. The results matrix was also adapted following recommendations from the PPR conducted in 2018.

**Relevance - 5 – Excellent:** The project was aligned with national priorities and strategies, as well as government policies. It was developed following an initiative by the Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MLSS) to review Jamaica's primary legislation<sup>1</sup> used to monitor employment which had not been revised since its enactment in 1957. It was aligned with the country's National Development Plan (NDP), Jamaica's International Migration and Development (IMD) policy, as well as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Global Compact for Migration (GCM). Gender and human rights were an integral part of the project.

**Coherence - 3 – Good:** The project built on the links established through a previous project supported by the Fund in 2011, which supported the establishment of a sustainable multi-stakeholders' coordination process. It was also complementary to IOM's Global Mainstreaming Migration (MM) into National Development Strategies Project, developed by the Global Migration Group (GMG), and funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation between 2011 and 2018.

**Effectiveness - 3 – Good:** The project was mostly successful in achieving its objective to contribute to the protection of Jamaican migrant workers by promoting ethical recruitment in key labour migration corridors from Jamaica, particularly to Canada and the United States of America (USA). While the Pre-Departure Orientation (PDO) curriculum was revised, the legislation was still in the process of being reviewed at the time of this evaluation. Positive factors included the government's willingness to participate in the project, the momentum created through previous projects, a positive collaboration with some consultancies, while

---

<sup>1</sup> Employment Agencies Regulation Act (Act 43 of 1956).

negative factors included some challenges in communication with and receiving information from government, changes in staff at both MLSS and IOM, limitations in financial and human resources, Internet connectivity issues and internal Information Technology (IT) problems.

**Efficiency and cost-effectiveness - 3 – Good:** The project resources available were enough to carry out all the activities and the project could not have been implemented with fewer resources. Overall, the project management was noted as exerting a high level of professionalism and positive relationships, which has been recognized by all the stakeholders interviewed and evoked in the Project Performance Review (PPR). The project incurred several delays largely linked to challenges with the government response, as well as the COVID-19 pandemic, which started towards the end of the project.

**Impact - 2 – Adequate:** The most important contribution was that the outputs generated raised awareness about ethical labour migration both within Jamaica, as well as the Caribbean region and the receiving countries Canada and the USA. The short-term changes of raising awareness and contributing to better understanding about labour migration could be largely attributed to the project's activities. The longer-term results can also be linked to the project and the continued efforts by IOM in Jamaica to ensure that the government remains committed to the priorities and recommendations identified in the project.

**Sustainability - 2 – Adequate:** The fact that the project was based on a specific request from the government was thought to be a positive basis for its long-term sustainability as well as and that the project results were based on a baseline assessment. Nevertheless, the project was missing an official handover as well as institutionalized buy-in from the government for the implementation of the results.

## Conclusions and recommendations

The project was able to achieve its objective through the publication of three publications and the organisation of several workshops to allow the GOJ and other stakeholders including the broader Caribbean region to enhance knowledge and access tools to improve ethical recruitment standards and practices in labour migration. The project did incur several challenges including significant delays in the collaboration with the GOJ, as well as the COVID-19 pandemic, which emerged towards the end of the project and meant that approaches needed to be adjusted.

Following are conclusions and recommendations drawn from the detailed findings presented in the previous sections:

### A. Project Design

While the project design was based on an initial assessment that identified gaps, which were addressed in the outputs, it did not address substantially sustainability in its design. The project design did not integrate measures to ensure continuity such as a post-project strategy, a plan of action, or ensure that enough resources were available for the continuation of the project's benefits. Government support was strong in the project but as the project progressed responses were received with significant delays. These may have been avoided with a stronger buy-in from government and clear guidelines from IOM at the onset.

**Recommendation (priority level: 2 - medium):**

For similar future projects of this nature:

- Include government stakeholders early in the project development phase to ensure buy-in and establish clear tasks and guidelines.
- Support stakeholders in defining and securing resource allocation for the continuation of the project.
- Ensure that processes are institutionalised by integrating them into a strategy with a clear plan of action and a timeline that delineates steps for the government after the project end.

**B. Project management**

As mentioned above, significant delays were incurred due to delayed responses on outputs and IOM was not able to influence the process sufficiently.

**Recommendation (priority level: 2 - medium):**

- For future similar projects, require monitoring reports from stakeholders to ensure that timelines are respected and maintained. Maintain a close working relationship with the government counterpart and ensure that a monitoring mechanism is established with regular updates provided by all relevant stakeholders to ensure timely delivery of outputs.

**C. Sustainability**

While there was some follow-up after the end of the project, there was no official handover or clear plan of action for a continued implementation of the project outputs.

**Recommendation (priority level 1- high):**

- For future similar projects, ensure that an official handover is conducted and secure a commitment to a post-project plan of action and an implementation strategy.
- To ensure the benefits of this project continue, IOM Jamaica should consider developing new project(s) to support the government in the implementation of recommendations from the project's three reports in the field of labour migration and ethical recruitment.

**D. Beneficiaries**

While the project considered migrant workers in its inception and a project consultant did interview a limited number of migrants, more could have been done to clearly establish mechanisms to reach these populations and develop outputs according to their needs.

**Recommendation: (priority level: 1- high):**

- Ensure that enough focus is placed on affected populations in the design and assessment processes to allow for strategies to best reach migrants, mitigate obstacles, and allow for a representative sample to be integrated into the project.

## List of acronyms

CS	Civil Society
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EARA	Employment Agencies Regulation Act
The Fund	IOM Development Fund
GCM	Global Compact for Migration
GMG	Global Migration Group
GOJ	Government of Jamaica
HEART/NSTA	Human Employment and Resource Training /National Service Training Agency
HOO	Head of Office
ICT	Information Communication Technology
IMD	International Migration and Development Policy
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
IRIS	International Recruitment Integrity System
IT	Information Technology
MM	Mainstreaming Migration
MLSS	Ministry of Labour and Social Security
NWGIMD	National Working Group on International Migration and Development
NCE	No-Cost Extension
NDP	National Development Plan
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PDO	Pre Departure Orientation
PIOJ	Planning Institute of Jamaica
PM	Project Manager
POA	Program of Action
PPR	Project Performance Review
RM	Results Matrix
SC	Steering Committee
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Train of Trainers
UN	United Nations
USA	United States of America

## 1. Introduction

<b>Project for Ex-Post Evaluation</b>	LM.0333
<b>Duration of the Project</b>	01/12/2017 – 31/12/2020
<b>Budget (USD)</b>	USD 100,000
<b>Donor</b>	IOM Development Fund (the Fund)
<b>Countries covered</b>	Jamaica
<b>Evaluation</b>	External Independent Evaluation
<b>Evaluation Team</b>	Owl RE Research and Evaluation
<b>Evaluation Period</b>	October 2022-March 2023

The following report is an ex-post evaluation of the project (JM10P0001/LM.0333) *Promoting Integrity in International Recruitment and Migrant Skill Development in Jamaica* of the International Organization of Migration (IOM) and funded by the IOM Development Fund (“the Fund”).

This ex-post evaluation was commissioned by the Fund and was carried out by Patricia Goldschmid, of the Owl RE research and evaluation consultancy in Geneva, from October 2022 to March 2023. The evaluation focused on the six main OECD-DAC<sup>2</sup> evaluation criteria: the relevance and coherence of the project for the stakeholders and beneficiaries, the effectiveness and efficiency of project management and implementation, the expected impact, how well cross-cutting themes of human rights and gender were mainstreamed in the project, and how sustainable the desired effects were or could be.

## 2. Context and purpose of the evaluation

Large sections of the Caribbean population seek employment opportunities in Canada and USA, but, increasingly also, within the region. Labour migration is facilitated through informal and regular channels, personal contacts, as well as unregistered agencies. Irregular migration is caused not only by lack of information about regular migration channels, but often by the inability to access those channels, and remains a challenge in the region. While providing valuable and needed labour support, countries of origin sometimes struggle to apply regulations to guide international recruitment practices, with the result that private employment agencies and other contractors or sub-contractors frequently operate without registration and control.

Recognizing the importance of recruitment in the labour migration process, the IOM created the International Recruitment Integrity System (IRIS), a global multi-stakeholder initiative designed to promote ethical recruitment and support the transformation of the international recruitment industry. IOM’s IRIS operates through a comprehensive programmatic framework that works with governments, the international community, the private sector and civil society (CS) to establish ethical recruitment as the norm in cross-border labour migration.

The IOM project “Promoting Integrity in International Recruitment and Migrant Skill Development in Jamaica” was implemented in partnership with the Government of Jamaica

---

<sup>2</sup> Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee; ‘DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance’: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

(GOJ). Its objective was to contribute to the protection of Jamaican migrant workers and promote the development and circulation of their skills through the fostering of multi-stakeholder partnerships among key labour migration stakeholders in Jamaica.

The Results Matrix (RM) is reproduced below to illustrate the intervention logic foreseen for the project:

**OBJECTIVE:** Contribute to the protection of Jamaican migrant workers by promoting ethical recruitment in key labour migration corridors from Jamaica

**OUTCOME 1:** The Government of Jamaica and other key stakeholders improve integrity of international recruitment

**OUTPUT 1.1.:** The Government of Jamaica and other main stakeholders have available information on key gaps and challenges in ensuring ethical international recruitment of workers from Jamaica

**OUTPUT 1.2.:** The Government of Jamaica has gained knowledge through the acquisition of a revised pre-departure orientation curriculum

**ACTIVITIES:**

- 1.1.1. Identify a consultant and develop the detailed methodology for reviewing existing legislation and policy documents;
- 1.1.2. Conduct a desk review of existing national legislation and policy documents;
- 1.1.3. Conduct key informant interviews with representatives of the Jamaican government, recruitment industry representatives, and other stakeholders;
- 1.1.4. Produce an analytical report with recommendations embedded in the IRIS standard as a benchmark of good practice;
- 1.1.5. Identify a consultant and develop a detailed methodology for mapping labour supply chains and recruitment processes;
- 1.1.6. Conduct key informant interviews on recruitment practices for selected skilled and low-skilled migration occupations, skill validation, circulation and retention;
- 1.1.7. Evaluate a pilot sample of private labour recruiters against the IRIS standard;
- 1.1.8. Produce an analytical report identifying key challenges in international recruitment from Jamaica and proposing pathways to address them;
- 1.1.9. Produce and disseminate a project publication comprising the findings and recommendations of the project validated during the national workshop; disseminate electronically and in print to a broad range of national and regional government and non-state actors.

**ACTIVITIES:**

- 1.2.1. Identify consultant to review the current pre-departure orientation content delivered to Jamaican workers participating in government-led recruitment programmes and propose recommendations to the Government of Jamaica on content and modalities for delivery;
- 1.2.2. Government of Jamaica is consulted during the curriculum development process and receives a copy of the final validated document;
- 1.2.3. Present and validate the recommendations with the Government;
- 1.2.4. Organize a capacity-building workshop focused on ethical recruitment practices with focus on IRIS to be conducted virtually for 40 stakeholders in the Caribbean (representatives from Government, private sector, international organizations and academia) over a 3-day period;
- 1.2.5. Share and validate the findings of the project and its recommendations to improve the integrity of international recruitment from Jamaica and promote skills circulation;
- 1.2.6. Gauge the interest and readiness of the Government to take further steps towards improving the integrity of international recruitment from Jamaica and promote skills circulation;
- 1.2.7. Share project results as well as best practices (via email) with key stakeholders in the Caribbean; that is with CARICOM and the OECS, as well as with Governments and other stakeholders.



## **2.1. Evaluation background, scope and purpose**

The purpose of conducting this ex-post evaluation is to assess the relevance of the project to its stakeholders and beneficiaries, coherence, the effectiveness and efficiency of project management and implementation, the expected impact, how well were cross-cutting themes of human rights and gender mainstreamed in the project, and if the desired effects are sustainable, and/or have the prospects of sustainability, (following the six DAC evaluation criteria<sup>3</sup>).

The evaluation aims to promote transparency and accountability which will, in turn, assist the Fund in its decision-making and to better equip staff to make judgments about the project and to improve effectiveness where possible and with regard to future project funding. Concerning the expected use of findings, the ex-post evaluation aims to also identify lessons learned, good practices, and provide a learning opportunity for the Fund and its implementing partners with regard to the project formulation process. The findings will also help make evidence-based strategic decisions in relation to specific projects, while also demonstrating the Fund's on-going commitment to results-based management.

The primary objectives of the evaluation are to:

- (a) Assess the relevance of the project's intended results;
- (b) Assess the relevance of the Theory of Change (ToC) (if used) and design of the results matrix and the extent to which the objective, outcomes and outputs are well formulated; the indicators were SMART and baseline and targets appropriate;
- (c) Assess the coherence of the project with IOM's activities and other interventions in the sector;
- (d) Assess the extent to which the needs of stakeholders and beneficiaries were taken into account during project design and if the project is aligned with national priorities and strategies, government policies and global commitments;
- (e) Assess the effectiveness of the project in reaching their stated objectives and results, as well as in addressing cross-cutting issues such as gender, human-rights based approach;
- (f) Assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of project implementation, along with regular progress monitoring of project resources and if the costs were proportional to the results achieved;
- (g) Assess the impact prospects and outcomes to determine the entire range of effects of the project (or potential effects) and assess the extent to which the project have been successful in producing expected change;
- (h) Assess the sustainability of the project's results and benefits (or measures taken to guarantee it) or prospects for sustainability, and if these benefits generated by the project still continued once external support ceased;
- (i) Assess how effectively issues of gender equality and human rights protection were mainstreamed in the process of project design and during project implementation;
- (j) Identify lessons learned and best practices in order to make recommendations for future similar projects and help the Fund in its decision-making about future project funding.

---

<sup>3</sup> Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance Committee, 'Evaluation of development programmes, DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance', web page, OECD. See <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>.

These objectives are operationalised in a series of evaluation questions and indicators (see section 3.3 below).

The findings, recommendations and lessons learned from this evaluation are to be used by IOM Jamaica, the IOM Regional Office in Costa Rica, and all IOM units implementing Fund projects and the Fund, as described in the following table.

**Table 1: Evaluation Intended Uses and Users**

Intended Users	Intended Uses
IOM Jamaica IOM Regional office (RO): San Jose, Costa Rica Government of Jamaica (GOJ)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To improve identification of country's needs and alignment of IOM's interventions with national, regional and global development agenda.</li> <li>- To improve identification of and alignment of IOM's interventions with national, regional, and global development and migration agenda.</li> <li>- To improve efficiency and effectiveness of future project implementation.</li> <li>- To demonstrate accountability of project implementation and use of resources.</li> <li>- To identify specific follow-up actions/initiatives and project development ideas.</li> <li>- To document lessons learned and best practices.</li> </ul>
All IOM units implementing Fund projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To improve efficiency and effectiveness of current and future projects funded by the Fund.</li> </ul>
The Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To assess value for money.</li> <li>- To use the findings and conclusions in consideration of future project funding approval.</li> </ul>

The evaluation covered the full project period from 1 December 2017 to 31 December 2020. Partners and stakeholders interviewed were chosen based on the extent of their involvement in the project and their availability for consultation. They were identified in collaboration with the IOM project manager (PM). The Terms of Reference (ToR)/Inception Report can be found in annex 1). The list of interviewees is available in annex 2. The main documents consulted are listed in annex 3.

The evaluation focused on the following six main evaluation criteria, based on the OECD/DAC guidelines: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. Gender and human rights were also mainstreamed where pertinent. In response to the evaluation purpose and scope, the evaluation focused on 21 out of the 25 evaluation questions found in the evaluation matrix (as outlined in the Inception Report in annex 1). Responses to cross-cutting questions were integrated across the findings.

## **2.2. Approach and methodology**

The evaluator used a participatory and mixed methods approach, involving and consulting with the relevant stakeholders as much as possible and integrating this approach into the methodology as feasible. Data was collected from a number of different sources in order to cross validate evaluation findings.

## Data sources and collection

Three data collection methods were employed to ensure reliability of data:

- 1) Desk review of available data and documents (see annex 3);
- 2) Key informant interviews: interviews were conducted with IOM and stakeholders involved in the project.
- 3) A visit to Jamaica for interviews and discussion with project stakeholders.

## Data sampling

A sample of 11 stakeholders involved in the project were interviewed both on-site in Jamaica and remotely. The stakeholders included:

- 3 IOM staff
- 5 government officials
- 3 consultants

(See annex 2 for the complete list of persons interviewed).

## Data Analysis

Quantitative and qualitative approaches were used to analyse findings from the document review and interviews. This approach was also used to assess the achievements of the results matrix and accompanying project documentation. Triangulation (reviewing two or more sources of data) was used to corroborate findings and to substantiate findings and to underline any weaknesses in the evidence. For each evaluation criteria a rating was determined based on the following scale: For each evaluation criteria, in addition to the project design, a rating was determined based on the following scale:

**Table 2: Rating scale**

<b>1 - Poor</b>	<b>2 - Adequate</b>	<b>3 - Good</b>	<b>4 - Very Good</b>	<b>5 - Excellent</b>
-----------------	---------------------	-----------------	----------------------	----------------------

The ratings for each criterion and project design are guided by a Scoring Matrix (see annex four).

## Limitations and proposed mitigation strategies

In total, four limitations and challenges were identified for the evaluation and detailed in the Inception Report. The following table describes these limitations and how they were addressed.

**Table 3: Limitations and challenges**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Limitation</b>	<b>How these limitations were addressed</b>
1	The context of COVID-19: The timing of the evaluation during the COVID-19 pandemic response and recovery could possibly impact on the availability of IOM	Early and close involvement of the PM ensured that meetings were organised timely and the on-site visit was scheduled to ensure maximum availability of stakeholders (in

	staff and project stakeholders/beneficiaries, and/or extend the time it will take to respond to the evaluation request and provide inputs.	Jamaica). Additional interviews were also conducted remotely where stakeholders were not available on site. The field visit was not impeded by any COVID-19 resurgence.
2	General problem of insufficient data or insufficient representative data collected, owing to poor response rate from interviewees. Due to the fact that the government changed at the beginning of 2022 and the fact that consular work is carried out on a short-term basis, many of the stakeholders involved in the project are no longer available.	The interviewee response rate was good. Triangulation with other data gathering tools from different sources was used to address any data gaps.
3	Objective feedback: interviewees may be reticent to reveal the factors that motivate them or any problems they are experiencing or being transparent about their motivation or about internal processes.	This did not transpire. All discussions were conducted on a one-to-one basis in confidentiality without the presence of IOM staff. Sources were anonymized and interviews were transparent, appeared objective, and open in their responses.
4	General bias in the application of causality analysis.	This did not pose a major limitation to the findings as a general consensus was found on the majority of findings.

### 3. Findings

The project was successful in reaching its objective to contribute to the protection of Jamaican migrant workers by promoting ethical recruitment in key labour migration corridors from Jamaica, particularly to Canada and the USA. It was well aligned with national priorities and strategies. It incurred a number of challenges which led to delays; however, it was able to deliver the outputs that were confirmed of value to the GOJ. While only few concrete actions followed the project close, GOJ officials interviewed confirmed that efforts continued to implement recommendations from the reports submitted.

**Table 4: Summary evaluation findings per criteria**

<b>Evaluation criteria and rating</b>	<b>Explanation</b>	<b>Supporting evidence</b>
<b>Project Design – 4 - Very Good</b>	The results matrix was developed with a logical design with one objective, one outcome and two outputs. The objective was clear with a realistically achievable goal. The results matrix was also adapted following recommendations from the PPR conducted in 2018. It was well aligned with government priorities.	Document review
<b>Relevance – 5 - Excellent</b>	The project was aligned with national priorities and strategies, as well as government policies. It was developed following an initiative by the	Interviews Document review

	<p>MLSS to review Jamaica’s primary legislation<sup>4</sup> used to monitor employment which had not been revised since its enactment in 1957. The projects primarily considered the MLSS and PIOJ as its direct beneficiaries. Migrant workers’ needs were also specifically considered through the integration of the IRIS<sup>5</sup> into the project. Gender and human rights were an integral part of the project.</p>	
<p><b>Coherence – 3</b> <b>- Good</b></p>	<p>The project built on the links established through a previous project supported by the Fund in 2011, which supported the establishment of a sustainable multi-stakeholders’ coordination process. The project was also complementary to IOM’s Global MM into National Development Strategies Project, developed by the GMG, and funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation between 2011 and 2018. It also looked to other IOM missions in terms of providing examples for the government on labour migration. During the project’s lifespan, there were no comparable external interventions identified that addressed labour migration in Jamaica.</p>	<p>Interviews Document review External documents</p>
<p><b>Effectiveness – 3</b> <b>- Good</b></p>	<p>The project was mostly successful in achieving its objective to contribute to the protection of Jamaican migrant workers by promoting ethical recruitment in key labour migration corridors from Jamaica, particularly to Canada and the USA. The project collaborated most closely with the MLSS and PIOJ, the main implementing partners involved in the process from the onset. A steering committee, chaired by the MLSS, monitored the implementation of the project and included representatives from the National Working Group on International Migration and Development (NWGIMD) subcommittee on human rights, social protection, labour mobility and family, as well as the PIOJ and IOM. The project also involved two consultants, one of which also connected directly with migrant beneficiaries in the process to research their experiences and assess needs. Nevertheless, some challenges were also identified with the main one linked to delays in the reaction of the MLSS attributable to the availability of overseas liaison officers and overseas farm operators,</p>	<p>Interviews Project documentation Document review</p>

<sup>4</sup> Employment Agencies Regulation Act (Act 43 of 1956).

<sup>5</sup> IRIS is a global multi-stakeholder initiative that supports governments, civil society, the private sector and recruiters to establish ethical recruitment as a norm in cross-border labour migration. <https://iris.iom.int/what-iris>

	which resulted in significant delays in the project.	
<b>Efficiency and cost effectiveness - 3 - Good</b>	The project resources available were enough to carry out all the activities and the project could not have been implemented with fewer resources. Overall, the project management was noted as exerting a high level of professionalism and positive relationships, which has been recognized by all the stakeholders interviewed and also evoked in the PPR. It incurred a number of delays largely linked to challenges with the government response, as well as the COVID-19 pandemic, which started towards the end of the project.	Interviews Document review Budget documents and reports
<b>Impact – 2 - Adequate</b>	The project resulted in some short and long-term positive changes. The most important contribution was that the outputs generated raised awareness about ethical labour migration both within Jamaica, as well as the Caribbean region and the receiving countries Canada and the USA. Stakeholders involved in the project all reported an increased learning and better understanding of the issues involved. Nevertheless, while the GOJ reported consulting the recommendations, a stronger impact was missing with few concrete changes noted at the time of the evaluation.	Interviewees Document review
<b>Sustainability – 2 - Adequate</b>	Some measures were taken to guarantee sustainability. The fact that it was based on a specific request from the government was thought to be a positive basis for their long-term sustainability as well as the fact that the project results were based on a baseline assessment. Project activities were specifically prioritised in the implementation plan developed for Jamaica’s International Migration and Development Policy and were meant to help the GOJ achieve SDGs. However, the project was missing an official handover as well as institutionalized buy-in from the government for the implementation of the results.	Interviewees Document review

### Relevance – 5 –Excellent

The project was aligned with national priorities and strategies, as well as government policies. It was developed following an initiative by the MLSS to review Jamaica’s primary legislation<sup>6</sup> used to monitor employment which had not been revised since its enactment in 1957. The project activities were also aligned with the country’s NDP, Jamaica’s IMD policy, as well as

---

<sup>6</sup> Employment Agencies Regulation Act (Act 43 of 1956).

the SDGs and GCM. The projects primarily considered the MLSS and the PIOJ as its direct beneficiaries. Migrant workers' needs were also specifically considered through the integration of the IRIS<sup>7</sup> into the project in that it protects migrants by establishing ethical recruitment as a norm in cross-border labour migration.

### **1. Is the project aligned with national priorities and strategies, government policies and global commitments?**

**Finding:** The project was aligned with national priorities and strategies, as well as government policies. It was developed following an initiative by the MLSS to review Jamaica's primary legislation used to monitor employment which was not revised since its enactment in 1957. It included an initial assessment, which identified a need for a revamping of the legislation. The project's activities were also aligned with the country's NDP, with Jamaica's IMD policy, as well as the SDGs and GCM.

The project was aligned with national priorities and strategies, as well as government policies as it focused on improving the Employment Agencies Regulation Act (EARA), Jamaica's primary legislation used to monitor employment which was not revised since its enactment in 1957<sup>8</sup> (with the exception of a slight amendment in 2010). The project was developed following an initiative by the MLSS to review the legislation<sup>9</sup>. The initiative was instigated by a series of newspaper articles and social media post about abuses happening in Canada with families of a deceased migrant on the labour migration programme claiming mistreatment with the process of their treatment and the repatriation of the deceased which highlighted the need for the legislation review.

The project sought to examine current legislation looking at labour recruitments to see how that was facilitating labour mobility and to see what gaps there may have been and to review PDO for migrants who were going to work abroad (in Canada and the USA).

The activities were also aligned with the country's NDP Vision 2030, and with Jamaica's IMD policy, which was passed in Parliament as a White Paper in June 2017<sup>10</sup>, as well as the SDGs, specifically SDG 8.5<sup>11</sup> 8.8<sup>12</sup> and 10.7<sup>13</sup> and in line with the GCM.

---

<sup>7</sup> IRIS is a global multi-stakeholder initiative that supports governments, civil society, the private sector and recruiters to establish ethical recruitment as a norm in cross-border labour migration. <https://iris.iom.int/what-iris>

<sup>8</sup> The legislation governs the recruitment and placement of persons in employment both locally and overseas and monitored the operations of employment agencies in Jamaica including registering employment agencies, receiving, and investigating complaints and ensuring that the operators of the agencies observe the provisions of the Act.

<sup>9</sup> The review of international treaties and conventions was being undertaken with a view to ensuring that the new legislation was in keeping with international standards. These included the Maritime Labour Convention (MLC 2006) and the International Recruitment Integrity System. Other reviews included Jamaica's Employment Agencies Regulations Act and its supporting regulations to determine gaps in the legislation and legislation for other jurisdictions that dealt with recruitment and placement services. The approaches of the latter might provide some guidance.

<sup>10</sup> Framework for mainstreaming international migration in the planning processes of relevant institutions concerned with enhancing the development and well-being of Jamaicans at home and abroad.

<sup>11</sup> SDG Target 8.5: *by 2030 achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value.*

<sup>12</sup> SDG Target 8.8: *protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments of all workers, including migrant workers, particularly women migrants, and those in precarious employment.*

<sup>13</sup> SDG Target 10.7: *Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies, is the most explicit migration-related target of the 2030 Agenda.*

**2. To what extent were the needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders taken into account during project design?**

**Finding:** The project’s direct beneficiaries were the MLSS and the PIOJ with indirect beneficiaries being the Jamaican migrant workers. The project primarily considered direct beneficiaries. The migrant workers’ needs were also considered through the integration of IRIS into the project.

The project’s direct beneficiaries were the MLSS and the PIOJ and indirect beneficiaries were Jamaican migrant workers. The project strongly considered all beneficiaries in the design, as it was directly linked to the needs identified by the government entities. The fact that the project also focused on the protection of Jamaican migrant workers by promoting ethical recruitment through the integration of IRIS indicated a consideration of the needs of migrant workers as a beneficiary.

However, while the project assessment also included some direct discussions with beneficiaries, their involvement in the project was limited. According to stakeholder interviews, this could have been enhanced if a greater focus had been placed on their integration in the project design, identifying strategies to best access these populations and identified potential access issues in advance.

**3. Was the project designed with a logical connection between its objective, outcomes, outputs and indicators based on a solid rationale/needs assessment?**

**Finding:** The results matrix was developed with a logical design with one objective, one outcome and two outputs. The objective was clear with a realistically achievable goal. The results matrix was also adapted following recommendations from the PPR conducted in 2018. It was well aligned with government priorities in terms of a longer-term strategy through Jamaica’s IMD policy, Vision 2030 as well as aligning with broader goals through the SDG Agenda 2030.

The results matrix was developed with a logical design with one objective, one outcome and two outputs. The objective was clear with a realistically achievable goal. The results matrix was also adapted following recommendations from the PPR conducted in 2018. It was well aligned with government priorities in terms of a longer-term strategy through Jamaica’s IMD policy, Vision 2030 as well as aligning with broader goals through the SDG Agenda 2030 as mentioned above.

**Table 5: Evaluation Assessment of the Project Results Matrix Vertical Logic**

<b>Vertical Logic</b>	<b>Analysis and suggested alternatives</b>
<p><b>Objective:</b> <i>Contribute to the protection of Jamaican migrant workers by promoting ethical recruitment in key labour migration corridors from Jamaica.</i></p> <p><b>Indicator:</b></p>	<p>The objective was appropriate for the project.</p>



<p>a) Percentage of migrants who have sought services from the certified private labour recruiters and are satisfied with the process</p> <p>b) Percentage of migrants who have sought services from the Government of Jamaica and are satisfied with the process.</p> <p>c) The percentage increase of labour recruiters who practice ethical and fair recruitment practices (government certified recruiters in Jamaica).</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> a) 0; b) 0; c) 0</p> <p><b>Target:</b></p> <p>a) At least 50% of both male and female migrants who sought services from the Government are satisfied</p> <p>b) At least 50% of both male and female migrants who sought services from certified private labour recruiters are satisfied</p> <p>c) At least 10%</p> <p><b>Assumptions:</b> N/A</p>	<p>The indicators and targets were adapted following the PPR recommendations.</p> <p>Indicator c) requires an assessment of ethical and fair recruitment; however, it is lacking criteria to measure or a standard / certification to measure against such as the IRIS for example. It is also still missing a baseline despite the recommendation from the PPR.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 1:</b> The Government of Jamaica and other key stakeholders improve integrity of international recruitment</p> <p><b>Indicators:</b></p> <p>a) Number of project recommendations implemented considered by the Government.</p> <p>b) Number of labour recruiters and/or employers from Jamaica expressing interest in IRIS certification and/or capacity-building to improve own practices by project's completion.</p> <p>c) Improved pre-departure orientation for Jamaican workers delivered in line with the proposed curriculum and modalities.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> a) 0; b) 0; c) No</p> <p><b>Target:</b></p> <p>a) To be established during the implementation when the recommendations are developed but minimum 1.</p> <p>b) Minimum 1.</p> <p>c) Yes</p> <p><b>Assumptions:</b> Resources and political support are in place to support implementation of project recommendations.</p>	<p>The outcome was adapted following the PPR recommendations and is appropriate.</p> <p>Indicator a) refers to the consideration of recommendations by the government, however, it does not measure the actual implementation of the recommendations. This was also identified in the PPR but not modified in the matrix.</p> <p>Similarly, the assumption related to the outcome was identified as too generic by the PPR and challenging in terms of understanding the specific conditions necessary for the outcome to contribute to the achievement of the objective.</p>

<p><b>Output 1.1.:</b> The Government of Jamaica and other main stakeholders have available information on key gaps and challenges in ensuring ethical international recruitment of workers from Jamaica.</p> <p><b>Indicator:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Existing recruitment regulation in Jamaica assessed and areas for improvement identified.</li> <li>b) Labour supply chains along key migration corridors from Jamaica and in key occupations mapped, including gender-differentiated assessment of current recruitment practices.</li> <li>c) Recruitment processes along key migration corridors from Jamaica and in key occupations mapped, including gender-differentiated assessment of current recruitment practices</li> <li>d) Number of key stakeholders that received publication of the findings and recommendations on addressing key gaps and challenges, including ensuring protection for both female and male migrant workers.</li> </ul> <p><b>Baseline:</b> a) no; b) no; c) no; d) 0</p> <p><b>Target:</b> a) yes; b) yes; c) yes; d) At least 40 stakeholders nationally and regionally will receive either a print or electronic copy.</p> <p><b>Assumption:</b> Relevant stakeholders willing and available to contribute to the project activities. Improving the integrity of international recruitment remains the Government’s priority throughout project implementation.</p>	<p>The output was adapted following the PPR recommendations. The output could, however, still be more tangible by describing the type of information that is available to the GOJ, such a document or other resource with identified gaps.</p> <p>Indicator a) included three different items (recruitment regulation, monitoring mechanisms, and areas for improvement). This was already identified in the PPR and should have been adapted into three separate indicators.</p> <p>As also indicated in the PPR, the assumption may be too generic and could have made reference to the consultant or the capacity of the beneficiary for example.</p>
<p><b>Output 1.2.:</b> The Government of Jamaica has gained knowledge through the acquisition of a revised pre-departure orientation curriculum.</p> <p><b>Indicator:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Recommendations for an improved curriculum for pre-departure orientation for Jamaican workers is available to and validated by the Government of Jamaica.</li> <li>b) Percentage of final workshop participants who report improved understanding of key issues pertaining to improving integrity of international recruitment from Jamaica, disaggregated by gender.</li> <li>c) Project experiences presented by the Government of Jamaica to other governments at the regional level</li> <li>d) A proposal for modalities for delivery of the pre-departure orientation for Jamaican workers is available to and validated by the Government of Jamaica.</li> </ul>	<p>The output formulation was adapted according to the PPR recommendations.</p> <p>Indicator c) should mention “the number of events presented by the GOJ” to be aligned with the proposed target as identified in the PPR.</p>

<p><b>Baseline:</b> a) No; b) 0; c) 0; d) No</p> <p><b>Target:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Yes, recommendations available and validated. The GOJ has gained knowledge through the acquisition of a revised PDO curriculum</li> <li>b) At least 85%</li> <li>c) At least 1 event where project experiences are presented</li> <li>d) Yes</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions:</b> Stakeholder interest and participation remain high throughout the project; Relevant stakeholders, in particular private recruitment agencies, willing and available to contribute to the project activities; Improving the integrity of international recruitment remains the Government's priority throughout project implementation.</p>	<p>The assumption is also considered very broad as per the PPR and could be more directly linked to this output.</p>
--	--

**4. To what extent do the expected outcome and outputs remain valid and pertinent as originally intended in terms of direct beneficiary needs?**

**Finding:** The main outcome and two outputs remain valid and pertinent as they focus on the continued improvement of international recruitment with a focus on ethical recruitment in key labour migration corridors from Jamaica for the protection of Jamaican migrant workers.

The objective of the project was to contribute to the protection of Jamaican migrant workers by promoting ethical recruitment in key labour migration corridors from Jamaica. The outcomes and output remain pertinent to date as Jamaican migrants continue to work abroad in both Canada and the USA and cases of exploitation are still prevalent globally. For example, an article published in the news outlet Al-Jazeera in 2019 highlighted a group of Jamaican farmworkers who had sent a letter to the Jamaican President denouncing their treatment working on farms in a region of Canada, comparing it to “systematic slavery”<sup>14</sup>.

**5. How adequately were human rights and gender equality taken into consideration during the project design and implementation?**

**Finding:** Gender and human rights were an integral part of the project. The IOM PM was noted as having ensured that both cross-cutting themes formed an essential part of all discussions, research, and publications. Gender, in particular, was mainstreamed as a key component of both the legislative review and the pre-departure orientation curriculum. Given that the project also integrated IRIS, which aims to ensure that the rights of labour migrants are upheld, demonstrates the importance of human rights in the project. Both this evaluation and the PPR noted that migrant rights were a main topic raised during interviews and identified as a key priority.

<sup>14</sup> Al-Jazeera; 1 Sep 2022; *Jamaica sending team to Canada to probe work conditions on farm*; <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2022/9/1/jamaica-sending-team-to-canada-to-probe-work-conditions-on-farms>

Gender and human rights were an integral part of the project. The IOM PM was noted as having ensured that both cross-cutting themes formed an essential part of all discussions, research, and publications. Gender was mainstreamed as a key component of both the legislative review and the pre-departure orientation curriculum. This was an improvement which resulted from the PPR, which had identified that gender was not fully mainstreamed in the project proposal. A chapter examining the specific challenges linked to gender and labour migration was included in the Assessment of the Existing Recruitment Regulatory and Monitoring Mechanisms, a project deliverable of output 1.1.

Given that the project also integrated IRIS, which aims to ensure that the rights of labour migrants are upheld, demonstrates the importance of human rights in the project. Issues of human rights were reported as a fundamental part of the “Introduction to IRIS” training convened for private recruitment companies, as well as the workshop held to share project results and strengthen capacity.

Both this evaluation and the PPR noted that migrant rights were a main topic raised during interviews and identified as a key priority by the beneficiaries. The project included an effort to enhance the PDO to contribute to increased awareness of their rights and reducing their exposure to vulnerabilities and abuses. The consultant working on the pre-departure curriculum also conducted specific interviews with a group of migrants to adapt the curriculum according to their needs and expectations. Both this evaluation and the PPR noted that migrant rights were a main topic raised during interviews and identified as a key priority.

## **6. Is the project in line with IOM/Fund priorities and criteria?**

**Finding:** The project was found to be aligned with the Fund’s priorities and supported six points identified in IOM’s current strategic focus. It also supported three principles and one objective in IOM’s Migration Governance Framework as well as two objectives. As reported in the PPR, the project also responded to the Fund’s eligibility criteria<sup>15</sup>, particularly in terms of supporting the development of improved migration services on a regional level through enhanced infrastructure and capacity-building and it was aligned with the IOM Regional Strategy for Central and North America and the Caribbean 2014-2016.

The project was found to support six points identified in IOM’s current strategic focus<sup>16</sup>, notably:

- 1: To provide secure, reliable, flexible and cost-effective services for persons who require international migration assistance.
- 2: To enhance the humane and orderly management of migration and the effective respect for the human rights of migrants in accordance with international law.
- 3: To offer expert advice, research, technical cooperation and operational assistance to States, intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations, and other stakeholders, in order to build national capacities and facilitate international, regional and bilateral cooperation on migration matters.

---

<sup>15</sup> IOM/Fund eligibility criteria: <https://developmentfund.iom.int/eligibility-criteria>

<sup>16</sup> IOM mission and strategic focus: [https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/about-iom/iom\\_strategic\\_focus\\_en.pdf](https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/about-iom/iom_strategic_focus_en.pdf)

- 5. To support States, migrants and communities in addressing the challenges of irregular migration, including through research and analysis into root causes, sharing information and spreading best practices, as well as facilitating development-focused solutions.
- 11. To assist States in the development and delivery of programmes, studies, and technical expertise on combating migrant smuggling and trafficking in persons, in particular women and children, in a manner consistent with international law.
- 12. To support the efforts of States in the area of labour migration, in particular short-term movements, and other types of circular migration.

The project supported IOM's Migration Governance Framework (MIGOF)<sup>17</sup> principles through Principle 1: Adherence to international standards and fulfilment of migrant's rights, 2) Migration and related policies are best formulated using evidence and whole-of-government approaches, and 3) Engagement with partners to address migration and related issues, as well as objectives 1) Advance the socioeconomic well-being of migrants and society and 3) Migration should take place in a safe, orderly, and dignified manner.

As reported in the PPR, it also responded to the Fund's eligibility criteria, particularly in terms of supporting the development of improved migration services on a regional level through enhanced infrastructure and capacity-building and was aligned with the IOM Regional Strategy for Central and North America and the Caribbean 2014-2016<sup>18</sup>.

### Coherence – 3 – Good

The project built on the links established through a previous project supported by the Fund in 2011<sup>19</sup>, which paved the way for the establishment of a sustainable multi-stakeholders' coordination process. The project was also complementary to IOM's Global MM into National Development Strategies Project, developed by the GMG, and funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation between 2011 and 2018<sup>20</sup>. It also looked to other IOM mission in terms of providing examples for the government on labour migration. During the project's lifespan, there were no comparable external interventions identified that addressed labour migration in Jamaica.

#### 7. To what extent is this project compatible with other IOM activities?

**Finding:** The project built on the links established through a previous project supported by the Fund in 2011, which paved the way for the establishment of a sustainable multi-stakeholders' coordination process. The project was also complementary to IOM's global MM into National Development Strategies Project, developed by the GMG, and funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation between 2011 and 2018. It also looked

<sup>17</sup> Migration Governance Framework: [https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/about-iom/migof\\_brochure\\_a4\\_en.pdf](https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/about-iom/migof_brochure_a4_en.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> In particular with the following strategic working areas (as confirmed in the PPR): 1) enhancing protection of the most vulnerable migrants; 2) strengthening governments' migration management capacities; and, 3) helping governments to improve their migration policy.

<sup>19</sup> (CE.0130) National Policy and Plan of Action on International Migration and Development – Jamaica.

<sup>20</sup> The objective of the programme was to enable eight target governments (including Bangladesh, Ecuador, Jamaica, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Morocco, Serbia and Tunisia) to better govern migration to increase the human development outcomes and mitigate the risks for migrants, their families and communities at origin and destination. It involved a large focus on knowledge sharing, capacity building, setting up institutional working groups and coordination mechanisms and more.

to other IOM missions in terms of providing examples for the government on labour migration, such as the Philippines example on how to become recruiters as well as workers.

The project built on the links established through a previous project supported by the Fund in 2011<sup>21</sup>, which supported the establishment of a Labour Mobility Sub-Committee, including a wide range of national stakeholders, including the MLSS, the PIOJ, the Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as well as Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), and others. This was said to have created a momentum and supporting a sustainable multi-stakeholder coordination process also noted in the PPR. The committee continued to meet even during this project to discuss issues related to labour mobility and development and was reported as helping the project with a network of stakeholders and partnerships, which were able to provide inputs into the documents developed.

The project was also complementary to IOM's Global MM into National Development Strategies Project, developed by the GMG, of which IOM is a founding member, and funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation through UNDP between 2011 and 2018.

It was also reported as looking to other IOM missions in terms of providing examples for the government on labour migration with the Philippines example on how to become recruiters as well as workers cited. A visit was organised to the IOM mission in the Philippines as they had system looking at protecting migrant workers. Government officials confirmed having been able to benefit from best practices.

#### **8. To what extent is this project compatible with other interventions in this field?**

**Finding:** During the project's lifespan, there were no comparable external interventions identified that addressed labour migration in Jamaica.

During the project's lifespan, there were no comparable external interventions identified that addressed labour migration in Jamaica.

#### **Effectiveness – 3 - Good**

The project was mostly successful in achieving its objective to contribute to the protection of Jamaican migrant workers by promoting ethical recruitment in key labour migration corridors from Jamaica, particularly to Canada and the USA. While the PDO curriculum was revised, the legislation was still in the process of being reviewed at the time of this evaluation. The project collaborated most closely with the MLSS and PIOJ, the main implementing partners involved in the process from the onset. A steering committee, chaired by the MLSS, monitored the implementation of the project and included representatives from the NWGIMD subcommittee on human rights, social protection, labour mobility and family, as well as the PIOJ and IOM. It was reported as a valuable contribution to the project as it created a link to the essential government entities of the project and provided feedback on the products developed. It was also seen as contributing to the longer-term value as it continued on beyond

---

<sup>21</sup> (CE.0130) National Policy and Plan of Action on International Migration and Development – Jamaica.

the end of project (further developed in sustainability). The project also involved two consultants, who produced the three project reports. Some challenges were also linked to a delayed reaction on the part of the MLSS attributable to the availability of overseas liaison officers and overseas farm operators, which resulted in significant delays in the project. Positive internal factors that influenced the results of the project included the government's willingness to participate in the project, the momentum created through previous projects, a positive collaboration with some consultancies. Negative internal and external factors included some challenges in communication with and receiving information from government, changes in staff at both MLSS and IOM, limitations in financial and human resources, Internet connectivity issues and internal IT problems.

**9. Have the project's outputs and outcomes been achieved in accordance with the stated plans and results matrix?**

**Finding:** The project was mostly successful in achieving its objective to contribute to the protection of Jamaican migrant workers by promoting ethical recruitment in key labour migration corridors from Jamaica, particularly to Canada and the USA. Both outputs were strongly linked to the capacity of the consultants to deliver high-quality products and on the government's capacity to provide, in a timely manner, inputs and the documentation needed by the consultants to finalize their work. Significant delays were incurred due to both internal and external impediments further described below.

The project was mostly successful in achieving its objective to contribute to the protection of Jamaican migrant workers by promoting ethical recruitment in key labour migration corridors from Jamaica, particularly to Canada and the USA. The outputs were strongly linked to the capacity of the consultants to deliver high-quality products and on the government's capacity to provide, in a timely manner, inputs and the documentation needed by the consultants to finalize their work. Significant delays were incurred with the achievement of the outputs due to delayed responses by the MLSS, difficulties in collaboration with some consultants, as well as the COVID-19 pandemic, which began towards the end of the project. These are further described below. At the time of this evaluation, the legislation was still in the process of being reviewed and recommendations had been implemented to a limited extent.

The following table summarizes the main points:

**Table 6: Assessment and Analysis of the Results Matrix**

<b>Results Matrix element</b>	<b>Level of achievement</b>	<b>Analysis</b>
<b>Objective:</b> Contribute to the protection of Jamaican migrant workers by promoting ethical recruitment in key labour migration corridors from Jamaica.	<b>Mostly achieved</b>	According to stakeholders interviewed the project successful in raising awareness about ethical recruitment in key labour migration corridors from Jamaica among key government and private sector stakeholders. However, the project placed limited emphasis on the awareness of migrant beneficiaries and the indicators linked to this objective were not measured.

<p><b>Outcome 1:</b> The Government of Jamaica and other key stakeholders improve integrity of international recruitment.</p>	<p><b>Partially achieved</b></p>	<p>The outcome was partially achieved as at the time of this evaluation, the government had only started to implement the recommendations of both reports. Two recommendations were reported as having been implemented: 1) the Human Employment and Resource Training /National Service Training Agency Trust (HEART/NSTA Trust) developed training modules for participants in short-term labour migration programmes; 2) the MLSS had developed videos aimed at building the capacity of migrant’s workers on various topics. Efforts were also under way to implement a third recommendation to revise the EARA, which governs private recruitment agencies, however this was reported as challenging due to limitations in human resources within the MLSS. Similarly, interest was shown in the IRIS certification by four agency representatives, with two submitting relevant documentation to become IRIS certified to date.</p>
<p><b>Output 1.1:</b> The Government of Jamaica and other main stakeholders have available information on key gaps and challenges in ensuring ethical international recruitment of workers from Jamaica.</p>	<p><b>Achieved</b></p>	<p>An assessment and mapping were completed, each with a series of recommendations for improvement. The two reports completed in 2019: 1) An Assessment of the Existing Recruitment Regulatory and Monitoring Mechanisms<sup>22</sup>; 2) Mapping Labour Supply Chains for Government and Private Sector Programme<sup>23</sup>. The reports were recognised as valuable in interviews conducted, however some discrepancies were noted in terms of the effectiveness of the consultants and the value of their reports (further developed below). According to the project narrative final report, over 100 stakeholders in Jamaica and the Caribbean received a copy of the publications either in print or electronically.</p>
<p><b>Output 1.1. Activities</b></p>	<p><b>Achieved</b></p>	<p>All activities were reported as achieved.</p>
<p><b>Output 1.2:</b> The Government of Jamaica has gained knowledge through the acquisition of a revised pre-departure orientation curriculum.</p>	<p><b>Partially Achieved</b></p>	<p>Recommendations for an improved PDO curriculum for Jamaican workers were included in a report completed in 2019 titled “An Assessment of the Government of Jamaica’s Pre-Departure Orientation Curriculum for Short-term Circular Migration</p>

<sup>22</sup> Dr. Walters, Shinique; *Circular Labour Migration in Jamaica: An Assessment of the Existing Recruitment Regulatory and Monitoring Mechanisms*; International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2019

<sup>23</sup> Dr. Walters, Shinique; *Circular Labour Migration In Jamaica: Mapping the Labour Supply Chains for Government and Private Sector Programmes*, International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2019



		<p>Programme <sup>24</sup> . Information from this publication was shared with stakeholders in Jamaica as well as other governments at the regional level at 2 events <sup>25</sup> : The report submitted was noted as valuable by stakeholders who recognized the positive contribution of the consultant.</p> <p>While the GOJ confirmed gained knowledge through the acquisition of a revised PDO curriculum, no further survey data was available to measure the level of knowledge acquired by participants in the workshops. According to the narrative final report, 90% of final workshop participants in December 2019 report improved understanding of key issues pertaining to improving integrity of international recruitment from Jamaica. Nevertheless, no gender disaggregation was available.</p>
<b>Output 1.2. Activities</b>	<b>Achieved</b>	All activities were reported as achieved.

**10. Was the collaboration and coordination with partners (including project implementing partners) and stakeholders effective, and to what extent were the target beneficiaries involved in the processes?**

**Finding:** The project collaborated most closely with the MLSS and PIOJ, the main implementing partners involved in the process from the onset. A steering committee was formed to monitor the implementation of the project. The project also involved three consultants, one of which also connected directly with migrant beneficiaries in the process to research their experiences and assess needs. Nevertheless, some challenges were also identified with the main one being a delayed reaction on the part of the MLSS, which resulted in significant delays in the project.

The project collaborated most closely with the MLSS and PIOJ, the main implementing partners involved in the process from the onset. The MLSS had a significant input in the planning phase and was also involved in developing the concept note. As also noted in the PPR, the implementing partners contributed to the project by providing inputs to the documents as well as training and were closely involved in the recruitment of consultants with positive coordination and collaboration reported by stakeholders and the PPR on the selection of the consultants. Concept note done with IOM and project proposal. The collaboration with the private sector (recruiting agencies) was also reported as effective.

---

<sup>24</sup> Morgan, Janet Faith; *An Assessment of the Government of Jamaica's Pre-Departure Orientation Curriculum for Short-term Circular Migration Programmes*; IOM 2019  
<sup>25</sup> the GOJ Labour Market Forum in September 2019, which included representatives from other Caribbean governments, as well as CARICOM and OECS officials; and an event held virtually in October 2020 allowing government representatives to share their experience and knowledge with a wider audience.

A SC monitored the implementation of the project linked to the National Working Group on NWGIMD. It was chaired by the MLSS and included representatives from the NWGIMD subcommittee on human rights, social protection, labour mobility and family, as well as the PIOJ and IOM. It was reported as a valuable contribution to the project as it created a link to the essential government entities of the project and provided feedback on the products developed. Members met regularly to review project deliverables, discuss challenges and possible solutions and to provide guidance to the consultant. The committee convened in September 2018 to review the first deliverables (the inception report for the pre-departure orientation consultancy and the legislative review consultancy) received from the two consultants, as well as to formally introduce the project to key government stakeholders.

The project also involved two consultants, who produced the project assessments. According to interviews, the consultants varied in terms of effectiveness with one consultant, responsible for the PDO assessment report, more able to interact with stakeholders including migrant beneficiaries and accepting recommendations, while the other, responsible for the legislative review report, was seen as encountering difficulties in incorporating suggestions from counterparts. Products were rated as valuable with slightly better reviews given to the PDO assessment report.

A significant challenge was incurred by the project due to delays in the collaboration with the MLSS, which resulted in significant delays in the project. This was explained by stakeholders as largely resulting from limitations in human resources (further described in below).

#### **11. What major internal and external factors influenced (positively or negatively) the achievement of the project's objectives and how were they been managed?**

**Finding:** Positive internal factors that influenced the results of the project included the government's willingness to participate in the project, the momentum created through previous projects, a positive collaboration with some consultancies. No specific positive external factors were identified. Negative internal and external factors included some challenges in communication with and receiving information from government, changes in staff at both MLSS and IOM, limitations in financial and human resources, Internet connectivity issues and internal IT problems (PRIMA).

The following **positive** factors which influenced the results of the project were identified:

##### **Internal:**

- The government's willingness to participate, collaborate in consultations and workshops that were needed was identified as valuable to the project.
- The fact that the steering committee was directly linked to the ongoing NWGIMD was noted as a positive as it provided a direct link to the relevant government entities, as well as contributing to continuity (further developed in sustainability).
- Positive momentum was generated through the previous Fund project in terms of strong established working relationships between the PM, the Head of Office (HOO), government stakeholders and private institutes.

- Positive collaboration with pre-departure report consultant was noted as a facilitating factor with efforts to integrate field perspective from migrants and recruiters positively supported the project in identifying needs and priorities.
- The timing of timing of the data collection for the PDO assessment was during the recruitment process which meant that the consultant was able to attend an actual PDO.

**External:**

- No specific external factors were identified as positively influencing the result of the project.

The following **negative** factors which influenced the results of the project were identified:

**Internal:**

- Difficulty in obtaining information from some government agencies and other stakeholders, including scheduling problems with no shows, incomplete questionnaires and unanswered surveys (by overseas employers for example), uncontrolled focused group discussions (e.g. too many participants), unavailability of stakeholders (US workers and female stakeholders for example).
- Changes within the MLSS resulted in delays at the start of the project and consultants were recruited simultaneously to offset delays. This led to a problem in timing of the two main outputs (recruitment and regulatory studies) and was considered a problem as the mapping of the labour supply chain was meant to run before and feed into the assessment of the PDO.
- Delays in reaction on the part of the MLSS attributable to the availability of overseas liaison officers and overseas farm operators, which resulted in significant delays in the project.
- Communication problems and other challenges were identified in the collaboration with some consultancies making the process cumbersome.
- Problems of limited human resources in the MLSS which was an obstacle in the review of documents and the follow up.
- Insufficient funds available in the project for hiring consultants with the appropriate level of knowledge and expertise required according to stakeholders.
- Internet connectivity issues and challenges with the PRIMA platform impacted revisions and report submission. Attempts to access the platform from home by the PM failed and IOMs IT service was also unable to provide the needed support.

**External:**

- The COVID-19 pandemic generated challenges such as delays in implementation due to restrictions on travel and face-to-face meetings, border closures in Canada and USA which led to hotel workers in the USA being sent home for example.
- Challenges were encountered in getting representative samples of migrant workers due to the broad geographical coverage of their locations. Instead, the project consulted with those who were came in for orientation in the capital (Kingston).

### Efficiency and Cost Effectiveness – 3 – Good

The project resources available were enough to carry out all the activities and the project could not have been implemented with fewer resources. Overall, the project management was noted

as exerting a high level of professionalism and positive relationships, which has been recognized by all the stakeholders interviewed and also evoked in the PPR. The project incurred a number of delays largely linked to challenges with the government response, as well as the COVID-19 pandemic, which started towards the end of the project. The project demonstrated regular monitoring of project progress throughout the timeframe, with interim and final reports, both narrative and financial inclusive of all relevant and key annex documentation uploaded to PRIMA.

## **12. How cost-effective was the project? Could the activities have been implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results?**

**Finding:** The project resources available were enough to carry out all the activities and could not have been implemented with fewer resources. Some respondents felt that additional resources may have contributed stronger results and contributed to longer term sustainability.

The project resources available were enough to carry out all the activities and the project could not have been implemented with fewer resources. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, several delays linked to the government response as well as the COVID-19 pandemic meant that a number of activities could not be carried out.

Some respondents felt that additional resources may have contributed stronger results and contributed to longer term sustainability. For example, more resources may have allowed the project to hire more specialized and higher qualified consultants or made more efforts to reach out to a broader range of migrant beneficiaries and recruiters according to feedback from stakeholders.

## **13. How efficient was the overall management of the project?**

**Finding:** Overall, the project management was noted by the PPR as exerting a high level of professionalism. The project incurred a number of delays largely linked to challenges with the government response, as well as the COVID-19 pandemic, which started towards the end of the project. Challenges began prior to the launch of the project due to scheduling issues and conflicting priorities with the government, as well as staff changes within the government and IOM.

Overall, the project management was noted by the PPR as exerting a high level of professionalism, hard work and collegial relationship, which has been recognized by all the stakeholders interviewed.

The project incurred a number of delays largely linked to challenges with the government response, as well as the COVID-19 pandemic, which started towards the end of the project. According to the PPR the challenges with the government already started prior to the launch of the project in December 2017 due to scheduling issues and conflicting priorities with the government, followed by changes in staff both within the government and at IOM. The IOM PM left in 2019 and the CoM took over the management of the project as a result. Once activities began (six months after the project's start date) further delays were seen with activities of both outputs 1.1 and 1.2, also noted in the PPR.

Efforts were made by IOM to off-set the delays with the project management drafting key documents and lists of contacts which were shared with the relevant stakeholders once identified, as also noted in the PPR: *“They also took this opportunity to revise the workplan and develop a Results Monitoring Framework. Finally, regarding IOM internal staffing issue, other staff members were called upon to provide assistance, which was contingent upon their availability due to other work commitments.”*

**14. Were project resources monitored regularly and managed in a transparent and accountable manner to guarantee efficient implementation of activities? Did the project require a no-cost or costed extension?**

**Finding:** The project demonstrated regular monitoring of project progress throughout the timeframe, with interim and final reports, both narrative and financial inclusive of all relevant and key annex documentation uploaded to PRIMA. A PPR was conducted by the Fund in December 2018. The project required four revisions and two no-cost extensions due to the significant delays in relation to the completion of activities and related outputs as described above.

The project demonstrated regular monitoring of project progress throughout the timeframe, with interim and final reports, both narrative and financial inclusive of all relevant and key annex documentation uploaded to PRIMA.

A PPR was conducted by the Fund in December 2018, with a visit to Kingston (Jamaica) from 3 to 6 December 2018.

The project required four revisions due to the significant delays in relation to the completion of activities and related outputs as described above. The first revision included a seven-month no-cost extension (NCE) which was submitted in March and approved in July 2019 to allow for completion of activities. It included a budget revision but did not change any total line figures. It also included a revision of the results matrix based on the recommendations from the PPR. The second revision was submitted in January 2020 and approved in February to be able to complete and disseminate project publications as well as hosting a lessons learnt event with stakeholders in Jamaica as well as the Caribbean region. It included a NCE of three months. The third revision was requested in response to the COVID-19 pandemic which resulted in closed borders and other measures that would prevent the project from implementing the last activities. It included a six-month NCE submitted in March 2020 and approved in May. The fourth revision, which was submitted in October 2020 and approved in January 2021 was also linked to the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in changes to budget lines as certain activities such as meetings which could no longer be held in person.

**Budget analysis:** The project was allocated USD 100'000 (including USD 3'969 for the evaluation) . According to the final financial report, the total budget used totalled USD 95'257 (equalling a 99% disbursement rate).

The project was financially monitored by the resource management unit in IOM Kingston, which made sure that the expenses were charged to their respective budget lines.

**Table 7: Comparison between the planned budget and the actual budget spent (USD)**

Expenditure item	Proposed budget	Actual expenditure	Change indicated in documentation?
Staff	17'394	17'394	-
Office	12'602	12'602	-
Output 1.1.	23'660	23'587	Y
Output 1.2.	42'376	41'675	Y
Evaluation	3'969		Y
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100'000</b>	<b>95'257</b>	The total proposed budget actually adds up to USD 100'001 and the actual expenditure is USD 95'258.

**15. Were the costs proportionate to the results achieved?**

**Finding:** The project budget of \$100,000 was sufficient to carry out the project activities. Some budget lines were adjusted due to delays incurred as described above.

The project budget of \$100,000 was sufficient to carry out the project activities. For some of the activities there were challenges in terms of the logistics related to costing. Budget lines were not always sufficient, and some budget adjustments were made to be able to finance adapted activities following the challenges mentioned above.

**Impact – 2 – Adequate**

The project resulted in some short and long-term positive changes. The most important contribution was that the outputs generated raised awareness about ethical labour migration both within Jamaica, as well as the Caribbean region and the receiving countries Canada and the USA. Stakeholders involved in the project all reported an increased learning about and better understanding of the issues involved. Nevertheless, while the GOJ reported consulting the recommendations of project’s reports, a stronger impact was missing with few concrete changes noted at the time of the evaluation. The short-term changes of raising awareness and contributing to better understanding about labour migration could be largely attributed to the project’s activities. The longer-term results can also be linked to the project and the continued efforts by IOM in Jamaica to ensure that the government remains committed to the priorities and recommendations identified in the project.

**16. Which positive/negative and intended /unintended effects/changes are visible (short and long-term) as a result of the project?**

**Finding:** The project resulted in some short and long-term positive changes. Short term changes included the implementation of some recommendations such as improved PDO modules, the production of informative videos shown to migrants at key locations, two formal applications for IRIS certification; responses from ministries in the Caribbean to replicate the PDO; wider dissemination of results through virtual methods, better understanding of virtual tools and adapted working methods at IOM. Longer-term changes included enhanced knowledge and awareness about ethical standards in international labour recruitment, ongoing use of the recommendations produced in the reports, and more awareness and use of IRIS among the GOJ ministries.

The following positive short-term changes were identified:

- The GOJ had a revised PDO curriculum and confirmed that it had started to implement the recommendations of the project's reports such as including topics on health and safety, estate, and financial planning, as well as a focus on sexual harassment.
- The MLSS developed videos for PDO North America (Canada and USA), which were shown at various locations to migrants before they leave the country (medical offices, registration centres, etc.).
- IOM reported having received documentation from two recruitment agencies to formally apply for IRIS certification.
- Different ministries of labour across the Caribbean were reported as having been interested in replicating the PDO programme.
- Virtual implementation of activities resulted in project results being shared with a wider range of stakeholders in the Caribbean as well as provided the opportunity for representatives from Jamaica to learn from a diverse stakeholder group.
- The project allowed for the IOM team to adapt their ways of working and better manage different tools and platforms available for virtual sessions, which has positively impacted the mission's capacity to implement other activities.

The following positive long-term changes were identified:

- The project enhanced the knowledge, awareness, and capacity of the GOJ, public and private recruitment agencies, and other relevant actors to improve the integrity of international recruitment processes.
- The three project reports are still available today and the GOJ reported using them as guidelines and reported a continued effort to implement the reports' recommendations.
- The project brought awareness about the IRIS initiative and government stakeholders were able to see what was done in the Philippines and use this for implementation in Jamaica.

**17. Can those changes /outcomes/ expected impact be attributed to the project's activities? Are there any contribution from external factors?**

**Finding:** The short-term changes of raising awareness and contributing to better understanding about labour migration can be largely attributed to the project's activities. The longer-term results can also be linked to the project and the continued efforts by IOM in Jamaica to ensure that the government remains committed to the priorities and recommendations identified in the project.

The short-term changes of raising awareness and contributing to better understanding about labour migration can be largely attributed to the projects' activities. For example, one stakeholder confirmed that there was no awareness about the IRIS initiative prior to the project. Stakeholders also confirmed that IOM had provided insights and ideas on a labour strategy.

The longer-term results can also be linked to the project and the continued efforts by IOM in Jamaica to ensure that the government remains committed to the priorities and recommendations identified in the project.

IOM was recognized by the GOJ as a valuable actor in the country which *had “always brought global perspective and best practices”* according to one stakeholder.

## Sustainability - 2 – Adequate

Some measures were taken to guarantee sustainability. Given that the project was based on a specific request from the government was thought to be a positive basis for its long-term sustainability as well as the fact that the project results were based on a baseline assessment. Project activities were specifically prioritised in the implementation plan developed for Jamaica’s International Migration and Development Policy and were meant to help the GOJ achieve SDGs. However, the project was missing an official handover as well as institutionalized buy-in from the government for the implementation of the results.

### 18. Did the project take specific measures to guarantee sustainability?

**Finding:** The project did take some measures to guarantee sustainability. It was based on a specific request from the government which was thought to ensure continuity. Project activities were specifically prioritised in the implementation plan developed for Jamaica’s International Migration and Development Policy<sup>26</sup> and outputs were linked to SDGs. In addition, project outputs were distributed both in Jamaica and the Caribbean region. However, the project was missing an official handover as well as institutionalized buy-in from the government for the implementation of the results.

The project did take some measures to guarantee sustainability. Given that it was based on a specific request from the government was thought to be a positive basis for its long-term sustainability as well as the fact that the project results were based on a baseline assessment. In addition, the involvement of the private sector was thought to open new possibilities to mobilize funds to support such activities in the future.

Project activities were specifically prioritised in the implementation plan developed for Jamaica’s International Migration and Development Policy, which was passed by Parliament as a White Paper in June 2017 and was also intended to contribute to its sustainability. In addition, the outputs were meant to support the GOJ in achieving SDGs Goals 8<sup>27</sup> and 10.7<sup>28</sup>, indicating a longer-term commitment.

The project’s three publications were widely distributed and shared with other Caribbean countries which was also acknowledged by stakeholders interviewed as an important step towards contributing to a longer-term impact of the results. The project concluded with a regional workshop where project outputs were shared with CARICOM member states who actively implement circular migration programmes as well as participate in regional and/or sub-regional free movement initiatives.

---

<sup>26</sup>JAMAICA; White Paper; National Policy on International Migration and Development; April 2017; <http://www.japarliament.gov.jm/attachments/article/1796/Revised%20IMD%20Policy%20-%20FINAL%20WHITE%20PAPER.pdf> Accessed December 2022.

<sup>27</sup> Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all.

<sup>28</sup> Facilitate orderly, safe regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies



Nevertheless, the project failed to secure a concrete continuation beyond its close. For example, it was reported that one consultant designed a post-project plan of action for the GOJ, but it was not delivered to the relevant government entities. Similarly, the PPR emphasized the importance of a phase out strategy to provide support to the government after the close of the project and allow it to implement the recommendations, which was also not implemented. The project was missing an official handover as well as institutionalized buy-in from the government for the implementation of the results.

### **19. Have the benefits generated by the project deliverables continued once external support ceased?**

**Finding:** The three publications produced as well as the capacity building has created a momentum within the government to continue with a focus on improving the labour migration process. At the time of this evaluation, however, the government confirmed only starting with the implementation of the reports' recommendations. A challenge evoked by both government representatives as well as IOM, that hampered the progress was the limited human and financial resources within the MLSS legal team. Also, if the project had taken more steps to institutionalize the process within the government, the benefits may have continued more effectively once the support ceased. Nevertheless, several initiatives supporting the continuation of project benefits were confirmed by stakeholders.

The three publications produced as well as the capacity building has created a momentum within the government to continue with a focus on improving the labour migration process. At the time of this evaluation, however, the government confirmed only starting with the implementation of the reports' recommendations. A challenge evoked by both government representatives as well as IOM, that hampered the progress was the limited human and financial resources within the MLSS legal team. Also, if the project had taken more steps to institutionalize the process within the government, the benefits may have continued more effectively once the support ceased. It should be noted that that the new IOM CoM in Jamaica is the former PIOJ programme director, which may contribute to a strong continuation of the link to the GOJ and possible support for the project results.

Several initiatives supporting the continuation of project benefits were confirmed by stakeholders, including:

- The legal department within MLSS reported being in the process of making recommendations to revise legislation that govern private recruitment companies.
- Recommendations produced during project implementation and outlined in the legislative review were being considered for inclusion in the assessment currently being conducted by the MLSS legal department.
- The project reports' recommendations were reported as being used as guidance for policies such as the Programme of Action (POA) for the National Population and Sustainable Development Policy.
- Stakeholders reported a PDO package being developed for private recruiters.
- The MLSS reported having sought assistance from the HEART Trust/NSTA government training agency to develop training modules for participants in short-term labour migration programme modules in line with IOM recommendations.

- Job readiness programmes were being implemented for those preparing to go abroad.
- The GOJ reported that dialogue had started with migrants to understand their needs after the end of the project.
- Continued priority was reported by government stakeholders to improve the recruitment process with a focus on ethical approaches and ongoing consultation of project reports produced.
- The project's PDO report (output 1.2) highlighted gaps in content and provided a set of recommendations for organizing the content. An effort was reported by the GOJ to expand on subjects in the PDO programme according to these recommendations including more guidance on health and safety, estate, and financial planning, as well as a focus on sexual harassment. At the time of the evaluation, the GOJ was planning a workshop with a focus on these issues<sup>29</sup>.
- A continued focus on IRIS was reported by stakeholders interviewed, which was not used prior to the project, however the project report's recommendations still needed to be implemented.
- The Ministry GOJ had developed short videos aimed at building the capacity of migrant workers after the project close and at the time of this evaluation.
- The MLSS reported working on ensuring that private employment operators use IRIS and recognise its principles in their operations through forums that highlight benefits from using the principles and how it can benefit society in general.
- Efforts were also reported to include IRIS principles in the legislation review; however, the results were still pending at the time of this evaluation.

## **20. Was the project supported by national/local institutions and well-integrated into national/local social and cultural structures?**

**Finding:** The project was strongly supported by the MLSS and the PIOJ. The government stated that the project outputs were timely and that they would be “of significant benefit to the Government of Jamaica and the migrant workers themselves”. The fact that there was continuity in the participation of the NWGIMD subcommittee as a SC in various project was also noted as positive in that it allowed for knowledge transfer from one project to another. As mentioned above, however, the limited capacity of the legal department of MLSS (human resources versus workload) also remained a significant obstacle after the close of the project.

The project was strongly supported by the MLSS and the PIOJ. The government stated that the project outputs were timely and that they would be “of significant benefit to the Government of Jamaica and the migrant workers themselves”. As mentioned above, however, the limited capacity of the legal department of MLSS (human resources versus workload) also remained a significant obstacle after the close of the project. The NWGIMD was reported as continuing to consider the recommendations put forward in the three reports.

The SC included representatives from the NWGIMD subcommittee on human rights, social protection, labour mobility and family. The committee continues to meet to date and were

---

<sup>29</sup> Workshop in November 2022 on social security and looking at processes in place for ethical recruitment with participants including the US embassy as well as the Ministry of and Fraud. Two further workshops were organized in December 2022 in Kingston and Montego Bay on IRIS and TIP (how to identify victims).

reported as further considering how to implement the project recommendations. The participation of the subcommittee as a steering committee in various project was also noted as contributing to sustainability through knowledge transfer and learning from one project to another.

**21. Have adequate levels of financial resources and suitable qualified human resources within IOM and partners been available to continue to deliver the project's stream of benefits?**

**Finding:** The IOM project management team had reportedly continued efforts to assist the GOJ with securing further resources even beyond the project end. However, at the time of this evaluation no specific resources were allocated to supporting the continuation of the project's benefits. Stakeholders confirmed that the lack of resources was the greatest impediment to the sustainability of the results generated by the project.

As noted in the PPR, the main guarantee for the continuity of the project results were directly linked to the commitment of the GOJ and adequate human and financial resources capacity from the MLSS to include and implement the proposed recommendations of the project's reports. The IOM project management team had reported continued efforts to assist the GOJ with this even beyond the project end through the strong collaboration that had been established between IOM and the GOJ. However, at the time of this evaluation no specific resources were allocated to supporting the continuation of to the project's benefits. Stakeholders interviewed confirmed that the lack of resources was the greatest impediment to the sustainability of the results generated by the project.

#### **4. Conclusions and recommendations**

The project was able to achieve its objective through the publication of three publications and the organisation of several workshops to allow the GOJ and other stakeholders including the broader Caribbean region to enhance knowledge and access tools to improve ethical recruitment standards and practices in labour migration. Labour practices and legislations were reviewed in line with the IRIS standard and the recommendations for improving ethical practices were shared. However, the project did incur several challenges including significant delays in the collaboration with the GOJ, as well as the COVID-19 pandemic, which emerged towards the end of the project and meant that approaches needed to be adjusted. Positive aspects of the project included the strong links established between IOM and the government counterparts as well as other stakeholders.

Following are conclusions and recommendations drawn from the detailed findings presented in the previous sections:

##### **A. Project Design**

While the project design was based on an initial assessment that identified gaps, which were addressed in the outputs, it did not address substantially sustainability in its design. The project design did not integrate measures to ensure continuity such as a post-project strategy, a plan of action, or ensure that enough resources were available for the continuation of the project's benefits. Government support was strong in the project but as the project progressed

responses were received with significant delays. These may have been avoided with a stronger buy-in from government and clear guidelines from IOM at the onset.

**Recommendation (priority level: 2- medium):** For IOM Jamaica

- For similar future projects of this nature, include government stakeholders early in the project development phase to ensure buy-in and establish clear tasks and guidelines.
- Support stakeholders in defining and securing resource allocation for the continuation of the project.
- Ensure that processes are institutionalised by integrating them into a strategy with a clear plan of action and a timeline that delineates steps for the government after the project end.

**B. Project management**

As mentioned above, significant delays were incurred due to delayed responses on outputs and IOM was not able to influence the process sufficiently.

**Recommendation (priority level: 2- medium):** For IOM Jamaica

- For future similar projects, require monitoring reports from stakeholders to ensure that timelines are respected and maintained. Maintain a close working relationship with the government counterpart and ensure that a monitoring mechanism is established with regular updates provided by all relevant stakeholders to ensure timely delivery of outputs.

**C. Sustainability**

While there was some follow-up after the end of the project, there was no official handover or clear plan of action for a continued implementation of the project outputs.

**Recommendation (priority level 1-high):** For IOM Jamaica

- For future similar projects, ensure that an official handover is conducted and secure a commitment to a post-project plan of action and an implementation strategy.
- To ensure the benefits of this project continue, IOM Jamaica should consider developing new project(s) to support the government in the implementation of recommendations from the project's three reports in the field of labour migration and ethical recruitment.

**D. Beneficiaries**

While the project considered migrant workers in its inception and a project consultant did interview a limited number of migrants, more could have been done to clearly establish mechanisms to reach these populations and develop outputs according to their needs.

**Recommendation: (priority level: 1-high):** For IOM Jamaica

- Ensure that enough focus is placed on affected populations in the design and assessment processes to allow for strategies to best reach migrants, mitigate obstacles, and allow for a representative sample to be integrated into the project.

**Lessons identified**

The following lessons were identified that could be of use for future similar projects:

**IOM and government counterpart:**

- Leadership is essential to the project to review documents and ensure participation from government both on the government side and IOM from the onset.
- When implementing similar projects start with obtaining endorsement from permanent secretary of the relevant ministry and keep in contact to ensure that information is being communicated.
- If a steering committee is established, determine early on clear guidelines on expectations and tasks.
- Ensure that the government understands the project's time constraint and if delays occur, be proactive and call for a high-level meeting to find a way forward; ensure that everyone is on the same page in terms of the project phase.

**Work with consultants:**

- Clearly define the scope of the consultant's Terms of Reference to avoid any disappointment related to the deliverables and allow for timely delivery of outputs;
- Ensure that project staff understand their roles and the latitude they have and to be aware of IOM procedures and where IOM stands.
- Ensure that enough budget is allocated in order to be able to hire the most suitable and qualified candidates.

**Beneficiaries:**

- Ensure that enough focus is placed on affected populations in the design and assessment processes.

**Project management:**

- When planning a PPR ensure proper timing when the key people are available to ensure that all information is accurately represented.
- Importance of open communication between IOM and all stakeholders including consultants. Establish a space for regular discussions and resolution of challenges.
- Ensure that gender is mainstreamed in the project proposal.
- Make sure the IOM Development Fund logo is included in all publications and events.

## Annex one: Evaluation Inception Report and Terms of Reference

### 1. Introduction and Context

<b>Project for Ex-Post Evaluation</b>	LM.0333
<b>Duration of the Project</b>	01/12/2017 – 31/12/2020
<b>Budget (USD)</b>	USD 100,000
<b>Donor</b>	IOM Development Fund (the Fund)
<b>Countries covered</b>	Jamaica
<b>Evaluation</b>	External Independent Evaluation
<b>Evaluation Team</b>	Owl RE Research and Evaluation
<b>Evaluation Period</b>	October 2022-December 2022

This document is a combined Terms of Reference (ToR) and Inception report produced for the IOM Development Fund (the Fund), the ex-post evaluation of the project, (JM10P0001/LM.0333) *Promoting Integrity in International Recruitment and Migrant Skill Development in Jamaica*. This report outlines the purpose, objectives, methodology, questions, tools and workplan of the consultancy.

The objective of this project was to assist the Government of Jamaica (GOJ) to improve recruitment practices by ensuring that ethical considerations are included in local recruitment for temporary work programmes overseas. This was done by reviewing current legislation and practices that govern and relate to circular migration programmes, identifying possible areas for improvement in line with international best practices, as well as the standards set out in IOM's International Recruitment and Integrity System (IRIS).

### 2. Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of conducting this ex-post evaluation is to assess the relevance of the project to its stakeholders and beneficiaries, coherence, the effectiveness and efficiency of project management and implementation, the expected impact, how well were cross-cutting themes of human rights and gender mainstreamed in the project, and if the desired effects are sustainable, and/or have the prospects of sustainability, (following the DAC evaluation criteria<sup>30</sup>).

The evaluation aims to promote transparency and accountability which will, in turn, assist the Fund in its decision-making and to better equip staff to make judgments about the project and to improve effectiveness where possible and with regard to future project funding. Concerning the expected use of findings, the ex-post evaluation aims to also identify lessons learned, good practices, and provide a learning opportunity for the Fund and its implementing partners with regard to the project formulation process. The findings will also help make evidence-based strategic decisions in relation to specific projects, while also demonstrating the Fund's on-going commitment to results-based management.

The primary objectives of the evaluation are to:

---

<sup>30</sup> Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance Committee, 'Evaluation of development programmes, DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance', web page, OECD. See <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>.

- (k) Assess the relevance of the project's intended results;
- (l) Assess the relevance of the Theory of Change and design of the results matrix and the extent to which the objective, outcomes and outputs are well formulated; the indicators were SMART and baseline and targets appropriate;
- (m) Assess the coherence of the project with IOM's activities and other interventions in the sector;
- (n) Assess the extent to which the needs of stakeholders and beneficiaries were taken into account during project design and if the project was aligned with national priorities and strategies, government policies and global commitments
- (o) Assess the effectiveness of the project in reaching their stated objectives and results, as well as in addressing cross-cutting issues such as gender, human-rights based approach, etc.;
- (p) Assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of project implementation, along with regular progress monitoring of project resources and if the costs were proportional to the results achieved;
- (q) Assess the impact prospects and outcomes to determine the entire range of effects of the project (or potential effects) and assess the extent to which the project has been successful in producing expected change;
- (r) Assess the sustainability of the project's results and benefits (or measures taken to guarantee it) or prospects for sustainability, and if these benefits generated by the project still continued once external support ceased;
- (s) Assess how effectively issues of gender equality and human rights protection were mainstreamed in the process of project design and during project implementation;
- (t) Identify lessons learned and best practices in order to make recommendations for future similar projects and help the Fund in its decision-making about future project funding.

These objectives are operationalised in a series of evaluation questions and indicators (see annex 1: Evaluation matrix). The Results Matrix (RM) is reproduced in annex 5 to illustrate the intervention logic foreseen for the project.

### 3. Methodology

The evaluation framework will focus on the standard DAC criteria and cross-cutting themes criteria, supported by standard tools (i.e. interview guide and evaluation checklist – see annexes 3 and 4) and will take place over a period of 11 weeks. The evaluation will take a participatory approach involving and consulting with the relevant stakeholders in the different steps of the evaluation and integrating this approach into the methodology as far as is feasible. It will use a mixed methods approach and cross validate evaluation findings through the triangulation process, where possible.

#### 3.1. Research methods/tools

Research tools will be both quantitative and qualitative and will be used across the different themes and questions. The following table provides further information on these tools and how they will be deployed.

Tool	Description	Information Source
------	-------------	--------------------

<i>Document review</i>	Review of main documentation.	IOM documentation on PRIMA, including internal/external reports, relevant publications, review of the website, country reviews etc.
<i>Interviews internal</i>	Some 2-3 semi-structured interviews using an interview guide.	IOM country office program staff and regional staff
<i>Interviews external</i>	Some 6-8 structured interviews using an interview guide.	Government officials, private sector representatives, consultants, and other stakeholders that were involved in the project.

### 3.2. Sampling

Overall sampling will be purposeful in that the stakeholders will be selected for the evaluation, based on their involvement as staff, consultants, experts, partners, or beneficiaries of the project. The selection of participating stakeholders will be led by the project co-ordinator and will aim to be representative, to ensure that a balance is found in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, age range and other project-specific criteria.

### 3.3. Analysis

The findings from the desk review, key informant interviews will be collated and analysed using appropriate quantitative and qualitative techniques and the evaluation criteria used will be rated by the evaluator based on the scale in the table below, with supporting evidence described. Where the evidence is weak or limited, it will be stated.

Findings will be used to assess the achievements of results as articulated in the Results Matrix, (see Annex 1) both numeric and descriptive results and used to rate the project as a whole, according to the assessing evaluation criteria, see table below for further explanation.

<b>Evaluation Criteria Scaling</b>	<b>Explanation</b>	<b>Supporting evidence</b>
5 Excellent (Always)	There is evidence of strong contribution and/or contributions exceeding the level expected by the intervention.	<i>Supporting evidence will be detailed for each rating given.</i>
4 Very good (Almost always)	There is evidence of good contribution but with some areas for improvement remaining.	
3 Good (Mostly, with some exceptions)	There is evidence of satisfactory contribution but requirement for continued improvement.	
2 Adequate (Sometimes, with many exceptions)	There is evidence of some contribution, but significant improvement required.	
1 Poor (Never or occasionally with clear weaknesses)	There is low or no observable contribution.	



### **3.4. Limitations and proposed mitigation strategies**

The following limitations have been identified with accompanying mitigation strategies to minimize the impact described, where possible. If it is not possible to fully rectify the limitations identified, findings will have to be reached based on partial information. Where this occurs, the evaluation will seek to be transparent about the limitations of the evaluation and to describe how these may have affected the overall findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

- (a) **The context of COVID-19 recovery:** The timing of the evaluation during the COVID-19 pandemic recovery will likely impact on the availability of IOM staff and project stakeholders/beneficiaries, and/or extend the time it will take to respond to the evaluation request and provide inputs.  
*Mitigation strategy:* Early and close involvement of the project manager to help coordinate meetings and ensure availability of key stakeholders. Interviews will take place in-person (in Jamaica) and remotely, if necessary, with a flexible time period to compensate for any disruptions caused by a COVID-19 resurgence.
- (b) **General problem of insufficient data or insufficient representative data collected:** Owing to poor response rate from interviewees, partially due to staff changes in both government and IOM.  
*Mitigation strategy:* Early coordination with the project manager to ensure that contact can be established with former staff involved in the project. Triangulation with other data gathering tools from different sources will help address data gaps.
- (c) **Objective feedback:** Interviewees may be reticent to reveal the factors that motivate them or any problems they are experiencing or being transparent about their motivation or about internal processes.  
*Mitigation strategy:* Anonymizing sources and ensuring interviews are conducted on a one-to-one basis in confidentiality can help address issues of reticence.
- (d) **General bias in the application of causality analysis:**  
*Mitigation strategy:* Judgements will be informed by the team and all findings will be reviewed jointly, as well as by the project managers and the main evidence for ratings will be described.

## **4. Workplan**

The workplan is divided into three phases, covering a 11-week period:

- **Phase 1 – Inception:** An initial meeting with the project manager to discuss the evaluation framework, identify stakeholders and to ensure involvement and ownership from the start. From this, a methodology, timeline, standard tools and evaluation approach has been developed and detailed in the inception report (this document).
- **Phase 2 – Data collection:** During the second phase of the evaluation field work will be conducted with an onsite visit to Jamaica by the evaluator during the week of 20 November and all relevant project data will be collected and reviewed.

- **Phase 3 - Report writing:** During the final phase collected data will be analysed and a report drafted for validation. The results of the evaluation will be disseminated by means of the report and a briefing held with the project manager and other IOM staff as relevant.

The key tasks and timing are described in the following table:

Week beginning	November – December 2022										
	10.10.	17.10.	24.10.	31.10.	07.11.	14.11.	21.11.	28.11.	05.12.	12.12.	19.12.
Key tasks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Kick off meeting with project manager; document review											
Drafting and delivery of inception report											
Validation of inception report											
Data collection: including field visit to Jamaica.											
Data analysis and report writing											
Delivery of draft report											
Validation of the report by the project manager and Fund staff; finalisation of report and evaluation brief and management response											

#### 4.1. Team management

The evaluation will be carried out by Patricia Goldschmid with Glenn O’Neil as a support and for quality control.

#### 5. Deliverables

The following deliverables (draft and final) are foreseen for the consultancy: Inception report (this document), Executive summary, (2 pages), Evaluation report and Evaluation learning brief.

Deliverables	Schedule of delivery
Inception Report shared with IOM Country Office	19.10.2022
Completed field data collection	25.11.2022
De-briefing session with project manager delivered	25.11.2022
Draft Evaluation Report	09.12.2022
Final Evaluation Report and Evaluation Learning Brief	23.12.2022
Partially completed Management Response	

### **Annex One: Evaluation Matrix**

<b>Key Evaluation Questions and sub questions</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Data Collection Tools</b>	<b>Sources of Information</b>
<b>RELEVANCE:</b> Extent to which the project's objective and intended results remain valid as originally planned or modified.			
1. Is the project aligned with national priorities and strategies, government policies and global commitments?	Alignment of project with relevant national policies, strategies, government policies and global commitments (e.g. international treaties and agreements).	Document review Interviews	Project documentation Interviewees
2. To what extent were the needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders taken into account during project design?	Needs of beneficiaries and stakeholder groups reflected in project design. Evidence of consultation during project development and of project activities and outputs tailored to their needs	Document review Interviews	Project documentation Interviewees
3. Was the project designed with a logical connection between its objective, outcomes, outputs, and indicators based on a solid rationale/needs assessment?	Consistency and logic of the results matrix. Design of project according to IOM project development guidelines; SMART indicators and outcomes, needs assessment carried out.	Document review	Project documentation
4. To what extent do the expected outcomes and outputs remain valid and pertinent as originally intended in terms of direct beneficiary needs?	Current relevance of project outputs and outcomes to beneficiary needs.	Document review Interviews	Project documentation Interviewees
5. How adequately were human rights and gender equality taken into consideration during the project design and implementation?	Reference to human rights and gender equality concerns integrated into project design and deliverables. Informed opinion/perceptions of Project Manager and key informants on human rights and gender equality issues in relation to the project.	Document review Interviews	Project documentation Interviewees

6. Is the project in line with IOM/IOM Development Fund priorities and criteria?	Adherence to eligibility criteria of the Fund, IOM's current strategic focus and the principles/objectives of IOM's Migration Governance Framework (MIGOF).	Document review Interviews	Project documentation Interviewees
<b>COHERENCE:</b> The compatibility of the project with other IOM activities and interventions of the sector.			
7. To what extent is this project compatible with other IOM activities?	Extent to which the project is compatible with other IOM activities in the country.	Document review Interviews	Project documentation External documentation Interviewees
8. To what extent is this project compatible with other interventions in this field?	Extent to which the project is compatible with other identified interventions in this field.	Document review Interviews	Interviewees External documentation
<b>EFFECTIVENESS :</b> The extent to which the project achieves its intended results			
9. Have the project's outputs and outcomes been achieved in accordance with the stated plans and results matrix?	Extent to which project outputs and outcomes have been achieved and the projects deliverables and results (expected and unexpected) led to benefits for stakeholders and beneficiaries.	Document review Interviews	Project documentation Interviewees
10. Was the collaboration and coordination with partners (including project implementing partners) and stakeholders effective, and to what extent have the target beneficiaries been involved in the processes?	Level of Involvement and extent of effectiveness of target beneficiaries, partners and stakeholders in collaboration and coordination processes.	Document review Interviews	Project documentation Interviewees
11. What major internal and external factors have influenced (positively or negatively) the achievement of the project's objectives and how have they been managed within the project timeframe?	Identification of influential a) internal factors (positive and negative) and b) external factors (positive and negative). Effectiveness of project management of internal and external factors.	Interviews	Interviewees
<b>EFFICIENCY &amp; COST EFFECTIVENESS:</b> How resources (human, financial) are used to undertake activities and how well these are converted to outputs.			

12. How cost-effective was the project? Could the activities have been implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results?	Adherence to original budget- Level of budget variance. Extent to which the resources required for project activities could have achieved the same results with less inputs/funds, on a sustainable basis.	Document review Interviews	Project documentation Interviewees
13. How efficient was the overall management of the project?	Degree of timeliness of project inputs provided by stakeholders /beneficiaries needed to implement activities. Narrative and budget reports submitted on time. Implementation of project activities implemented as scheduled; any variations to the project reported and adapted on PRIMA	Document review Interviews	Project documentation Interviewees
14. Were project resources monitored regularly and managed in a transparent and accountable manner to guarantee efficient implementation of activities? Did the project require a no-cost or costed extension?	Level and quality of monitoring of project resources. Incidence of no cost/ costed extension allocated.	Document review	Project documentation
15. Were the costs proportionate to the results achieved?	Comparison of costs with identified results.	Document review Interviews	Project documentation Interviewees
<b>IMPACT:</b> How the project intervention affects outcome and whether these effects are intended or unintended.			
16. Which positive/negative and intended /unintended effects/changes are visible (short and long-term) as a result of the project?	Incidence of positive and negative effects /changes (short and long-term, intended and unintended) to which the project contributes.	Document review Interviews	Project documentation Interviewees
17. Can those changes /outcomes/ expected impact be attributed to the project's activities? Are there any contributions from external factors?	Estimation of contribution of project and identified external factors.	Document review Interviews	Project documentation Interviewees
<b>SUSTAINABILITY :</b> If the project's benefits will be maintained after the project ends.			

18. Did the project take specific measures to guarantee sustainability and how was this supported by partners and the IOM?	Number of documented specific measures taken to ensure sustainability; level of support by partners and IOM.	Document review Interviews	Project documentation Interviewees
19. Have the benefits generated by the project deliverables continued once external support ceased?	Extent to which the benefits generated by the project have continued post external support.	Interviews	Interviewees
20. Was the project supported by national/local institutions and well-integrated into national/local social and cultural structures?	Extent of sustainability measures taken by national /local institutions to support the project. Level of commitment by key stakeholders to sustain project result.	Interviews	Interviewees
21. Have adequate levels of financial resources and suitable qualified human resources within IOM and partners been available to continue to deliver the project's stream of benefits?	Extent of level of financial capacity and human resources of partners and IOM to maintain project's benefits in the future.	Interviews	Interviewees
<b>Cross Cutting Criteria</b>			
22. Was the project designed and planned, taking into consideration a gender analysis, needs assessment and available guidance?	Extent to which the project has carried out a gender analysis and needs assessment and followed MA/59 (Guidelines on Implementing the IOM Programme Policy on Migrants and Gender Issues) and MA/62 (Guide on Gender Indicators for Project Development).	Document review Interviews	Project documentation Interviewees
23. If greater gender equality was created through the project, has there been increased gender equality beyond project completion?	Extent to which gender equality has been created by the project and is still evident.	Document review Interviews	Project documentation Interviewees
24. During data collection (if carried out during implementation), were the persons interviewed or surveyed diverse and representative of all concerned project's partners and beneficiaries and the data appropriately	Extent to which data collected is representative of the diversity of the project's partners and beneficiaries. Application of IOM's Data Protection Principles.	Data analysis Interviews	Project documentation/data Interviewees

disaggregated and in respect of IOM's Data Principles?	Disaggregation of data collected e.g. by age, disability, displacement, ethnicity, gender, nationality, migration status.		
25. How were the various stakeholders (including rights holders and duty bearers, local civil society groups or nongovernmental organizations) involved in designing and/or implementing the project?	Level and quality of involvement of stakeholders in designing and/or implementing the project.	Interviews Document review	Interviewees Project documentation

## ***Annex Two: Draft structure for evaluation report***

1. Title Page
2. Executive summary
3. List of acronyms
4. Context and purpose of the evaluation
  - a. Context/project background
  - b. Evaluation background, scope, and purpose
  - c. Approach and methodology
5. Evaluation findings
6. Conclusions and recommendations
  - a. Conclusions
  - b. Recommendations
  - c. Lessons learned and good practices
7. Annexes:
  - Evaluation terms of reference/inception report;
  - Evaluation matrix;
  - Timeline;
  - List of persons interviewed or consulted;
  - List of documents/publications consulted;
  - Research instruments used (interview guidelines, survey, etc).



### **Annex Three: Interview guide**

This guide is intended for interviews with internal and external stakeholders. The questions will be adapted on the basis of the persons being interviewed.

<b>Interview Questions</b>		<b>Informants</b>
<b>General</b>		
1.	Please briefly explain your work?	All stakeholders
2.	What has been your role and involvement in the project being evaluated?	
<b>Effectiveness and impact</b>		
3.	Could you please describe the project activities you were involved in?	All stakeholders
4.	What results/achievements did you see of these activities? How successful were they do you think?	
5.	What do you think helped achieve these results? Were there any obstacles?	
<b>Relevance &amp; coherence</b>		
6.	To what extent was the project aligned with national priorities and policies?	Government stakeholders
7.	Were there other similar IOM or external projects to this one – and if yes, did they collaborate well together?	All stakeholders
<b>Efficiency</b>		
8.	For your involvement in the project, how well was the project managed? Were the project activities implemented as you thought they should?	All stakeholders
<b>Sustainability</b>		
9.	Now it's over one year since the project has finished. What benefits of the project still continue?	All stakeholders
10.	Do any of the project activities continue in your own organisation or institution today? If yes, please explain which ones.	
<b>Looking forward</b>		
11.	What would you recommend for the continued success for this project's results (and other similar projects)?	All stakeholders
12.	What would you say are the main lessons learned from this project?	
<b>Any other comments</b>	Do you have any other comments or feedback on the project?	

**Annex Four: Checklist for evaluation**

Following is a checklist that will be followed by the evaluation team for the evaluation.

#	Step	Yes / No Partially (specify date)	Explanation comment
<b><i>Inception and preparatory phase</i></b>			
	Document review by Owl RE team		
	Kick-off meeting with project manager		
	Creation of inception report		
	Validation of inception report by project manager		
	Validation of inception report by Fund team		
	Creation of interview schedule by project manager		
	Reception and comment on interview schedule by the evaluation team		
<b><i>Data collection phase</i></b>			
	Initial briefing with IOM manager/staff		
	Data collection conducted with main stakeholder groups		
	Feedback presentation/discussion with IOM manager/staff at conclusion of data collection		
<b><i>Analysis and reporting phase</i></b>			
	Compilation and analysis of data /information		
	Quality control check of evidence by evaluation team leader		
	Submission of draft report to project manager and Fund team		
	Reception of comments from project manager and Fund team		
	Consideration of comments received and evaluation report adjusted		
	Validation of final report by project manager		
	Validation of final report by Fund team Production of learning brief		

**Annex five: Results Matrix**

**OBJECTIVE:** Contribute to the protection of Jamaican migrant workers by promoting ethical recruitment in key labour migration corridors from Jamaica

**OUTCOME 1:** The Government of Jamaica and other key stakeholders improve integrity of international recruitment

**OUTPUT 1.1.:** The Government of Jamaica and other main stakeholders have available information on key gaps and challenges in ensuring ethical international recruitment of workers from Jamaica.

**OUTPUT 1.2.:** The Government of Jamaica has gained knowledge through the acquisition of a revised pre-departure orientation curriculum

**ACTIVITIES:**

- 1.1.1. Identify a consultant and develop the detailed methodology for reviewing existing legislation and policy documents;
- 1.1.2. Conduct a desk review of existing national legislation and policy documents;
- 1.1.3. Conduct key informant interviews with representatives of the Jamaican government, recruitment industry representatives, and other stakeholders;
- 1.1.4. Produce an analytical report with recommendations embedded in the IRIS standard as a benchmark of good practice.
- 1.1.5. Identify a consultant and develop a detailed methodology for mapping labour supply chains and recruitment processes;
- 1.1.6. Conduct key informant interviews on recruitment practices for selected skilled and low-skilled migration occupations, skill validation, circulation and retention;
- 1.1.7. Evaluate a pilot sample of private labour recruiters against the IRIS standard;
- 1.1.8. Produce an analytical report identifying key challenges in international recruitment from Jamaica and proposing pathways to address them;
- 1.1.9. Produce and disseminate a project publication comprising the findings and recommendations of the project validated during the national workshop; disseminate electronically and in print to a broad range of national and regional government and non-state actors.

**ACTIVITIES:**

- 1.2.1. Identify consultant to review the current pre-departure orientation content delivered to Jamaican workers participating in government-led recruitment programmes and propose recommendations to the Government of Jamaica on content and modalities for delivery;
- 1.2.2. Government of Jamaica is consulted during the curriculum development process and receives a copy of the final validated document.
- 1.2.3. Present and validate the recommendations with the Government.
- 1.2.4. Organize a capacity-building workshop focused on ethical recruitment practices with focus on IRIS to be conducted virtually for 40 stakeholders in the Caribbean (representatives from Government, private sector, international organizations and academia) over a 3-day period
- 1.2.5. Share and validate the findings of the project and its recommendations to improve the integrity of international recruitment from Jamaica and promote skills circulation.
- 1.2.6. Gauge the interest and readiness of the Government to take further steps towards improving the integrity of international recruitment from Jamaica and promote skills circulation.
- 1.2.7. Share project results as well as best practices (via email) with key stakeholders in the Caribbean; that is with CARICOM and the OECS, as well as with Governments and other stakeholders.

## Annex two: List of persons interviewed

1.	Marcia Brown,	Project Officer	PIOJ, civil registration and migration policy project unit
2.	Stacey Clark-Callum	Programme Manager	PIOJ, civil registration and migration policy project unit
3.	Ayesha Facey	Consultant	Legislative Review and Labour Supply Chains Mapping
4.	Shanika James-Brown	Project assistant	IOM Jamaica
5.	Keisha Livermore	Project Manager	IOM Jamaica
6.	Andrea Miller-Slenneff	Director Manpower Services, Main focal point for this project	Ministry of Labour and Social Security
7.	Janet Morgan	Consultant	Pre-departure Orientation curriculum
8.	Genitta Smidle		
9.	Andrea Miller-Stennett	Director Manpower Services	Ministry of Labour and Social Security
10.	Shinique Walters	Consultant	Legislative Review and Labour Supply Chains Mapping
11.	Tiffany Waugh	RMO	IOM Jamaica

## Annex three: List of documents / publications consulted

### **Project documentation:**

- IOM project document, including proposal and budget.
- Interim project report and final report
- Final financial report
- Request for budget modification

IOM Project Handbook (July 2017)

IOM Fund eligibility criteria (undated),  
IOM mission and strategic focus (undated)

Morgan, Janet Faith; *An Assessment of the Government of Jamaica's Pre-Departure Orientation Curriculum for Short-term Circular Migration Programmes*; International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2019

Dr. Walters, Shinique; *Circular Labour Migration in Jamaica: An Assessment of the Existing Recruitment Regulatory and Monitoring Mechanisms*; International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2019

Dr. Walters, Shinique; *Circular Labour Migration In Jamaica: Mapping the Labour Supply Chains for Government and Private Sector Programmes*, International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2019

### **External documentation:**

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee; 'DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance':  
<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>,

Al-Jazeera; 1 Sep 2022; *Jamaica sending team to Canada to probe work conditions on farm*;  
<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2022/9/1/jamaica-sending-team-to-canada-to-probe-work-conditions-on-farms>; Accessed December 2023

IOM- UNDP, 2023, *Making Migration Work For Sustainable Development*;  
[https://migration4development.org/sites/default/files/2021-09/making\\_migration\\_work\\_for\\_sustainable\\_development\\_brochure\\_english\\_web\\_5nov.pdf](https://migration4development.org/sites/default/files/2021-09/making_migration_work_for_sustainable_development_brochure_english_web_5nov.pdf);  
Accessed January 2023

## Annex four: Scoring matrix for Fund projects

CRITERIA / OECD DEFINITION	DIMENSIONS MEASURED	1-Poor	2-Adequate	3 - Good	4 – Very good	5 - Excellent
<b>RELEVANCE IS THE INTERVENTION DOING THE RIGHT THINGS?</b> The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/ institutional needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of alignment with national priorities, strategies, policies, global commitments and IOM / Fund priorities / criteria.</li> </ul>	Project is not aligned with national priorities, strategies, policies, global commitments and IOM / Fund priorities / criteria.	Project is only partially aligned with national priorities, strategies, policies, global commitments and IOM / Fund priorities / criteria.	Project is mostly aligned with national priorities, strategies, policies, global commitments and IOM / Fund priorities / criteria.	Project is aligned with national priorities, strategies, policies, global commitments and IOM / Fund priorities / criteria.	Project is well aligned with national priorities, strategies, policies, global commitments and IOM / Fund priorities / criteria.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of evidence that beneficiaries and stakeholders were involved in project design.</li> </ul>	No evidence that beneficiaries and stakeholders were involved in project design.	Adequate evidence that beneficiaries and stakeholders were involved in project design but with many limitations.	Good evidence that beneficiaries and stakeholders were involved in project design but with some limitations.	Very good evidence that beneficiaries and stakeholders were involved in project design.	Excellent evidence that beneficiaries and stakeholders were significantly involved in project design.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of needs assessment.</li> </ul>	No needs assessment carried out.	Very limited or no needs assessment carried out.	Limited needs assessment carried out.	Needs assessment carried out.	Needs assessment carried out.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of integration of human rights and gender equality within the project design and implementation.</li> </ul>	No integration of human rights and gender equality within the project design and implementation.	Little or no integration of human rights and gender equality within the project design and implementation.	Some integration of human rights and gender equality within the project design and implementation.	Strong integration of human rights and gender equality within the project design and implementation.	Very strong integration of human rights and gender equality within the project design and implementation.

CRITERIA / OECD DEFINITION	DIMENSIONS MEASURED	1-Poor	2-Adequate	3 - Good	4 – Very good	5 - Excellent
<b>VALIDITY OF PROJECT DESIGN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The validity and logic of the project design as seen in the results matrix (RM).</li> </ul>	<p>Poor vertical logic of the RM (assessing quality of results-formulation as well as linkages between objectives, outcomes and outputs)</p> <p>Poor horizontal logic of the RM (inter alia indicator quality)</p> <p>Indicators do not match the respective result and therefore do not measure progress adequately against the respective result</p> <p>Baselines and targets are inappropriate and unrealistic.</p> <p>No assumptions are described.</p>	<p>Adequate vertical logic of the RM (assessing quality of results-formulation as well as linkages between objectives, outcomes and outputs)</p> <p>Adequate horizontal logic of the RM (inter alia indicator quality)</p> <p>Only some (or few) Indicators match the respective result and measure progress adequately against the respective result .</p> <p>Most baselines and targets are inappropriate and unrealistic.</p> <p>No assumptions are described or very few.</p>	<p>Good vertical logic of the RM (assessing quality of results-formulation as well as linkages between objectives, outcomes and outputs)</p> <p>Good horizontal logic of the RM (inter alia indicator quality)</p> <p>Indicators match well the respective result and measure well progress adequately against the respective result with some limitations.</p> <p>Baselines and targets are appropriate and realistic, with some limitations.</p> <p>Assumptions are described, but more could have been foreseen.</p>	<p>Very good vertical logic of the RM (assessing quality of results-formulation as well as linkages between objectives, outcomes and outputs)</p> <p>Very good horizontal logic of the RM (inter alia indicator quality)</p> <p>Indicators match well the respective result and measure well progress adequately against the respective result with very few limitations.</p> <p>Baselines and targets are appropriate and realistic, with very few limitations.</p> <p>Assumptions are described.</p>	<p>Excellent vertical logic of the RM (assessing quality of results-formulation as well as linkages between objectives, outcomes and outputs)</p> <p>Excellent horizontal logic of the RM (inter alia indicator quality)</p> <p>Indicators match well the respective result and measure well progress adequately against the respective result</p> <p>Baselines and targets are appropriate and realistic.</p> <p>Assumptions are described.</p>
<b>COHERENCE HOW WELL DOES THE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extent of compatibility and coordination</li> </ul>	<p>Poor coherence with other IOM projects; relevant staff not</p>	<p>Adequate coherence with other IOM projects; relevant</p>	<p>Good coherence with other IOM projects; relevant staff aware</p>	<p>Very good coherence with other IOM projects as</p>	<p>Excellent coherence with other IOM projects as</p>

CRITERIA / OECD DEFINITION	DIMENSIONS MEASURED	1-Poor	2-Adequate	3 - Good	4 – Very good	5 - Excellent
<b>INTERVENTION FIT?</b> The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.	with other interventions of the sector.	aware of other IOM projects within the country and at other IOM missions.	staff aware of other projects but little or no contact.	of each other's projects and are in contact.	demonstrated through coordination between projects.	demonstrated through working together, possible joint activities and sharing resources.
		Poor coherence with relevant external interventions as demonstrated through IOM staff not aware of them.	Adequate coherence with relevant external interventions as demonstrated through IOM staff being knowledgeable of some interventions but not all relevant.	Good coherence with relevant external interventions as demonstrated through IOM staff being knowledgeable of them.	Very good coherence with relevant external interventions as demonstrated through contact between IOM and interventions' staff.	Excellent coherence with external relevant interventions as demonstrated through coordination meetings and possible joint activities.
<b>EFFECTIVENESS IS THE INTERVENTION ACHIEVING ITS OBJECTIVES?</b>  The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extent to which the project objective and outcomes were achieved.</li> </ul>	Poor or no evidence that the project activities were translated into short- & long-term results. Evidence of unintended negative results. Project objective and outcomes not achieved.	Some satisfactory evidence that the project produced positive effects. Evidence of unintended negative results. Project objective and outcomes partially or not achieved.	Good evidence that the project produced good positive effects. Few negative unintended effects. Project objective and outcomes partially achieved.	Strong evidence that the project produced very good positive effects. Few negative or no unintended effects identified. Project objective and outcomes partially or mainly achieved.	Excellent evidence the project achieved more than set targets including unintended positive changes. Project objective and outcomes mainly or fully achieved.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectiveness of collaboration and coordination with partners and stakeholders.</li> </ul>	Collaboration and coordination with partners inadequate and evidence of negative impact on results.	Collaboration and coordination with partners inadequate.	Collaboration and coordination with partners effective with some limitations.	Collaboration and coordination with partners effective with very few limitations.	Collaboration and coordination with partners effective.



CRITERIA / OECD DEFINITION	DIMENSIONS MEASURED	1-Poor	2-Adequate	3 - Good	4 – Very good	5 - Excellent
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of involvement of beneficiaries in project processes.</li> <li>Resilience/agility to manage and monitor risks, or unexpected internal/external factors</li> </ul>	<p>No involvement of beneficiaries in the project processes.</p> <p>Risks/unexpected factors not managed/monitored adequately</p>	<p>Very limited Involvement of beneficiaries in the project processes.</p> <p>Risks/unexpected factors partially managed/monitored</p>	<p>Involvement of beneficiaries in the project processes but with some limitations.</p> <p>Risks/unexpected factors were managed/monitored</p>	<p>Involvement of beneficiaries in the project processes but with very few limitations.</p> <p>Most risks/unexpected factors were well managed/monitored</p>	<p>Involvement of beneficiaries in the project processes.</p> <p>All risks/unexpected were very well managed/monitored</p>
<p><b>EFFICIENCY</b> <b>HOW WELL ARE RESOURCES BEING USED?</b></p> <p>The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic use of resources (human, physical and financial).</li> <li>Timeliness of interventions (ability to stick to project timeline).</li> <li>Respects reporting requirements</li> </ul>	<p>Little evidence of efficiency; results disproportionate with resources invested. Under 60% use of budget.</p> <p>One or more no-cost extensions.</p> <p>Project reports not submitted to PRIMA on time (with delays between 4 weeks and more).</p>	<p>Only some evidence of appropriate use of resources but some results could have been achieved with less budget or fewer resources. Less than 70% use of budget.</p> <p>One or more no-cost extensions.</p> <p>Most project reports submitted to PRIMA late (with delays between 2 weeks and more).</p>	<p>Evidence of good use of resources and noticeable efforts to choose cost-effective interventions and approaches. At least 70% use of budget.</p> <p>One or no no-cost extension.</p> <p>Most project reports submitted to PRIMA on time (within 1-2 weeks delay).</p>	<p>Very good evidence that results proportionate with resources invested. At least 80% use of budget.</p> <p>No no-cost extensions.</p> <p>All project reports submitted to PRIMA on time.</p>	<p>Excellent use of resources. Strong evidence that the project resources used are proportionate to the results generated. At least 90% use of budget.</p> <p>No no-cost extensions.</p> <p>All project reports submitted to PRIMA on time.</p>

CRITERIA / OECD DEFINITION	DIMENSIONS MEASURED	1-Poor	2-Adequate	3 - Good	4 – Very good	5 - Excellent
<b>IMPACT WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES THE INTERVENTION MAKE?</b> The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The significance of short- and long-term effects and changes of the project</li> <li>The significance of negative effects/changes.</li> </ul>	No positive short- or long-term incidences of effects/changes of the projects identified.	None or very few positive short-term incidences of effects/changes of the projects identified; no indications of potential long-term results.	Positive short-term incidences of effects/changes of the projects identified; some indications of potential long-term results.	Positive short- and long-term incidences of effects/changes of the projects identified; impact looks significant but too early to be sure.	Positive short- and long-term incidences of effects/changes of the projects identified and estimated to have significant impact (e.g. policy in place, practices changed, etc.).
		Negative effects/changes of the project identified with potential negative impact (e.g. project delay policy process, reputation of IOM negatively affected by project, raised expectations of beneficiaries by project, etc.).	Negative effects/changes as a result of the project identified.	Insignificant or no negative effects/changes of the project identified.	Insignificant or no negative effects/changes of the project identified.	No negative effects/changes of the project identified.
<b>SUSTAINABILITY WILL THE BENEFITS LAST?</b> The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Temporality/permanence of outcomes achieved</li> <li>Extent to which processes and deliverables put in place by the</li> </ul>	No evidence of sustainability in the design, implementation, and results.	Little evidence of sustainability in the design, implementation, and results.	Good evidence of sustainability in design, implementation, and results.	Strong evidence of sustainability in design, implementation, and results.	Excellent evidence of sustainability in design, implementation, and results.
		Processes and deliverables of the project not generating benefits.	Processes and deliverables of the project generating very few results.	Processes and deliverables of the project are still generating a few results.	Processes and deliverables of the project are still generating some results.	Processes and deliverables of the project are still generating considerable results.

CRITERIA / OECD DEFINITION	DIMENSIONS MEASURED	1-Poor	2-Adequate	3 - Good	4 – Very good	5 - Excellent
	<p>project continue to deliver benefits beyond its lifecycle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Extent to integration of project in national/local structures</li> <li>● Existence of follow up projects/mechanisms and hand-over</li> <li>● Evidence of resources within IOM and/or partners to continue to deliver project benefits</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence of integration of project processes/deliverables in national/local structures.</p> <p>No evidence of an officially documented hand-over / follow-up plan or actions.</p> <p>No consideration of resources within IOM and/or partners for the continuity of the project results.</p>	<p>Little evidence of integration of project processes/deliverables in national/local structures.</p> <p>Little evidence of an officially documented hand-over / follow-up plan or actions.</p> <p>Little consideration of resources within IOM and/or partners for the continuity of the project results.</p>	<p>Evidence of integration of project processes/deliverables in national/local structures with some limitations.</p> <p>Evidence of an officially documented hand-over / follow-up plan or actions but with limitations.</p> <p>Consideration of sources within IOM and/or partners for the continuity of the project results.</p>	<p>Evidence of integration of project processes/deliverables in national/local structures with very few limitations.</p> <p>Evidence of an officially documented hand-over / follow-up plan or actions.</p> <p>Consideration of resources within IOM and/or partners for the continuity of the project results.</p>	<p>Evidence of integration of project processes/deliverables in national/local structures.</p> <p>Evidence of an officially documented hand-over / follow-up plan or actions.</p> <p>Consideration of resources within IOM and/or partners for the continuity of the project results.</p>