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## Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Action by Churches Together – the global alliance of which DCA is member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of South East Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOMSA</td>
<td>Bangladeshi Ovibashi Mohila Sramik Association = Bangladeshi Women Migrants Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAID</td>
<td>Christian Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYN</td>
<td>Cambodian Youth Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA</td>
<td>DanChurchAid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Development Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>Domestic worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAATW</td>
<td>Global Alliance Against Traffic in Women, a network partner based in Thailand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFMD</td>
<td>Global Forum on Migration and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAP</td>
<td>Humanitarian Accountability Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLD</td>
<td>UN High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td>Independent Democracy of Informal Economy Association, a local partner in Cambodia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCW</td>
<td>Legal Support for Children and Women, a local partner in Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Migrant Forum in Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRP</td>
<td>Migrants’ Rights Programme, Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR</td>
<td>Mid-Term Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Migrant worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWRN</td>
<td>Migrant Workers Rights Network, a local partner in Myanmar (with a parent organisation in Thailand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Programme Officer(s) (especially those of Cambodia and Myanmar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pourakhi</td>
<td>meaning ’self-reliant’ in Nepali, a local partner in Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA</td>
<td>Programme Policy and Advocacy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM</td>
<td>Partner Platform Meeting(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Programme Types (in DCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMW</td>
<td>Returnee migrant worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPO</td>
<td>Regional Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Regional Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAARC</td>
<td>South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARO</td>
<td>South Asia Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenaganita</td>
<td>meaning “Women’s Force” in Malay, the main network partner in Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARBE</td>
<td>Welfare Association for the Rights of Bangladeshi Emigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC</td>
<td>World Council of Churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOREC</td>
<td>Women’s Rehabilitation Centre, a local partner in Nepal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Per its internal regulations, DanChurchAid (DCA) conducted a mid-term review of its Migrants Rights' Programme (2012-2016) in late November/early December 2014. To reflect DCA’s priorities as well as to guide the Regional Programme Officer in the final half of the implementation phase, the review concentrated on three main areas:

- Programme Strategy, to determine the strategic fit of the MRP in the current and future international strategies as well as to look into program quality issues.
- Programme Management, to determine if the management of the Programme can be improved and how.
- Programme Partnership, to determine if the partnership model is effective in producing vibrant collaborations which achieve impact and improve Programme implementation.

The team conducted the review process in both an intensive and comprehensive manner: all partners and key DCA staff were interviewed, several group workshops were held, the MTR Team participated in the annual programme Partner Platform Meeting in a variety of roles and a thorough desk review of key Programme documents was conducted. In fact, the Partner Platform Meeting devoted two full days to the MTR, with MTR team members collecting inputs, sharing initial observations, and leading group work so that the partners were able to fully contribute to the process.

One of the review’s main focus points centred on the strategic fit between migration programming and both the current and new international strategies of DCA. There seemed to be considerable debate within the organisation if migration did in fact fit into the strategic priorities (see Chapter 1: Strategy). The review team found that those most familiar with the program overwhelmingly saw a strategic fit and a high degree of value of the migration program to DCA’s overall involvement in the countries in which it works.

Overall, the team found the Programme to be highly-focused on advocacy for the rights of migrant workers. When direct services where included, they were done to build mechanisms for the protection of rights as well as to create and build credibility for evidence-based advocacy. The Programme also exhibited strength of partnership, whereby networks were built not only vertically between DCA and its grantees but horizontally between the grantees themselves as well. Managing the implementation of the Programme faced several challenges, particularly due to its large geographic spread, a high number of partners, and a lack of implementation of a management MOU which was intended to guide management actions between SARO, as the principal regional office, and two additional regional offices with activities within their jurisdiction. Many interviewed for this process mentioned that the previous RPO did not seek collaboration with other regional staff, and thus the migration programme inherited a perception of being a stand-alone programme.

Methodology

The MTR team followed a methodical and highly-detailed process in carrying out this review (see Annex A: Methodology), using mostly qualitative methodologies of interviews, focus groups, and project site observations. An intensive series of interviews with main stakeholders was carried out, including:
• All partners supported by the Programme
• Key DCA staff in SARO and non-SARO ROs
• Key HQ staff
• Key informants (such as the RR for Central Asia to share cross-regional experiences)

Numerous field and site visits were carried out in Nepal, Bangladesh, and Malaysia. This was done in order to ensure that the MTR team was able to see first-hand and form opinions on the actual work of partners on the ground. Finally, an intensive workshop was conducted in collaboration with the 2014 Partner Platform Meeting as well as intensive sessions with RRs. Please see Annex A for further documentation of the meeting facilitation.

This data collection was analyzed by the MTR team, and the results of that process are presented in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Programme Strategy**

- The Migrants’ Rights Programme fits the current strategy under PT1 due to its protection of rights for a sub-population who faces the worst rights violations and has the least access to recourse (especially when out of their own country). The migration programme also fits into the new international strategy particularly under the program areas of “fighting extreme inequality” and “build resilient communities.” (see Strategic Fit section below for details)
- Migration is a key social and economic issue in the Asia region, and as such, migration programming adds value to all interventions in the region.
- Migration perspectives should be taken into account in all current program areas, due to its influence on the societies. The case for integration into current and future programming has been confirmed. In addition, the MTR team found that only integrating or mainstreaming migration would dilute the specific expertise in migration gained by this programme, and should be avoided by supporting relevant technical expertise of migration programming in relevant country offices.

**Programme Management**

- The programme management was demanding, with a relatively large number of partners over a large area. This reduced the amount of technical assistance and monitoring visits that would have otherwise occurred.
- The involvement of two other regional offices (as well as two outreach offices) created the need for more frequent, full communication. Primarily due to the demands of the program (see point above), this did not happen. While a collaborative spirit was consistently noted across all regional offices and outreach countries, the lack of full communication did cause some frustrations and delays.
- The aimed for integration across subregions South and South East Asia has been markedly strengthened and a convincing change in management style towards transparency and
collegiality with the new RPO and POs.

Programme Partnership

- Partnership was a key element and strength in all activities, methodologies, and approaches to the Programme.
- The key achievement in partnership was the fact that linkages among partners were built, and these will contribute to program sustainability. Linkages include trainings and technical support, strengthened networks for advocacy, and operational linkages to support migrants in distress.

Key Recommendations

Programme Strategy

- Migration, due to the fact that it is a pervasive phenomenon and has a powerful impact on societies, should be considered and integrated into future programming.
- Increase discussions on linkages, synergies, and integration of migration into the other PTs, and prepare for future country-based strategies to include migration within the other strategic programming areas in the new International Strategy, as a cross-cutting theme.
- Begin to hold discussions on how migration programming can keep its cross-border activities and regional aspects in a new country-based programming approach.
- Immediately begin fund-raising efforts now to ensure that complementary funding will be available after 2016, with GFU officers and PO in the lead role.
- Increase internal knowledge of the MRP within DCA personnel on how migration fits into the strategy and the country context analysis which created it. This includes discussion of how migration fits into the thematic priorities, what resources should be devoted to it, and what is DCA’s capacity or value-added in the domain of migration.

Programme Management

- Take a more directive approach with partners to influence their proposals and activities, with a view towards greater alignment with the MRP strategy and logframe.
- Immediately ensure that all regional offices concerned understand and recommit to the management MOU which governs how they are to collaborate with each other.

Programme Partnership

- Energize the Partnership Platform Meetings (PPMs) as described in this report to focus on more capacity building and creation of joint products.
- Focus on capacity building, both on programming and administrative matters.
- Continue to strengthen the horizontal relationships among partners—along the lines of advocacy, technical assistance/peer mentoring, and cross-border protection of migrants.
- Request and support that network partners take a greater role in information sharing and technical assistance.

See recommendations in each chapter for further details.
Programme Overview

DCA’s regional Migrants’ Rights Programme (MRP) in South and Southeast Asia is now in its second phase lasting from 2012 until 2016. The Programme is jointly implemented by the South Asia Regional Office (SARO), the Cambodia RO, and the Burma/Myanmar RO, under the direct leadership of the Regional Programme Officer (RPO). It builds upon the former Asia Safe Migration (ASM) Programme (2007-2011), and has partners in seven core countries: India, Nepal, and Bangladesh in South Asia, and Cambodia, Burma/Myanmar, Thailand, Malaysia in Southeast Asia. DCA was successful in leveraging additional funds from the European Union to extend project activities into the Gulf region by supporting a project focusing on labour migration from India to Oman between 2011 and 2014.

The programme is heavily advocacy-based, while relying on inputs and evidence (through service delivery) gathered at the grassroots level. It operates on the premise that the rights of migrant workers can only be effectively protected if rights violations are prevented and addressed throughout the entire migration cycle, i.e. in countries of origin, transit, and destination. As such, the programme has been supporting partners in and along the two major migration routes in the region: (1) from South Asia to the Gulf and to Malaysia; (2) within Southeast Asia, from Cambodia and Burma/Myanmar into Thailand and Malaysia.

Programme Logframe

The following is the original and approved logframe by the DANIDA-funded framework grant in effect from 2012 to 2016.

Overall Goal: Rights-based migrants’ policies and programmes are developed and implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objective</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Objective 1</td>
<td>1.1 Increased number of migrant workers who access services and assistance including intervention from duty bearers through the legal system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant workers are empowered to claim their rights</td>
<td>1.2 Active participation of migrant workers in public actions, lobbying activities and decision-making processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Objective 2</td>
<td>2.1 Strong and systematic monitoring of legislation and government policies and practices by civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society holds governments and other duty bearers accountable for ensuring rights of migrant workers</td>
<td>2.2 International Conventions in particular C 189 and other rights based legislation and policies have been approved and implemented by governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Objective 3</td>
<td>3.1 Organizations and institutions working with migrant rights increasingly carry out strong rights based interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened civil society organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Increased and stronger networking between organizations working with migrants at all levels

The logframe, as it is written, presents several challenges. Firstly, the Immediate Objective 3 is vague in its construction and does not link well into the project’s implied theory of change. Secondly, indicators are written in such a way that they are difficult to measure, vague, and do not necessarily track improvements well, even if measured.

Measurements to the achievement of the objective rely upon qualitative data from the partners according to the M&E system in the MRP’s design. While it’s inadvisable to change the logframe, the MTR recommends changes to the partner report format to better quantify the results and help reporting overall in the future (specific suggestions for doing so are described below). Some specific concerns include:

- **Indicator 1.1**: There is no way to obtain a baseline number for this indicator. Thus, even if an increase in migrant workers is detected by this Programme, it is not demonstrable that all migrant workers are accessing assistance and services.
- **Indicator 1.2**: This indicator is written more like an objective and it does not describe how measurement can occur.
- **Indicator 2.1**: This indicator is written more like an objective and it does not describe how measurement can occur.
- **Indicator 2.2**: This indicator is written like an objective and contains objectives which are beyond the control of this Programme.
- **Indicator 3.1**: This indicator is written more like an objective and it does not describe how measurement can occur.
- **Indicator 3.2**: This indicator is written more like an objective and it does not describe how measurement can occur.

**Partner Structure, Model, and Portfolio**

The programme currently has 13 partners in 8 countries, all of which are contributing to several of the above-mentioned Objectives. The composition of the Programme’s partners relies upon a mixture of active, grassroots based organizations in countries along with two network partners. This unique mix was seen as key to the ability to raise the voice of grassroots communities to national, regional, and international advocacy. In so doing, the partnership model or structure contributed greatly to the project’s achievements (for details, please see chapter 3 of this report on ‘Programme Partnership’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obj.</th>
<th>Activities (examples)</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Formation and strengthening of migrants’ groups</td>
<td>WOREC</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community awareness</td>
<td>POURAKHI</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sensitization and CB of TU</td>
<td>NDWWT</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased Media coverage of migrants’ issues in destination and origin</td>
<td>BOMSA</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>WARBE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TENAGANITA</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MWRN</td>
<td>Burma/Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>CYN</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFMN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Reporting to international HR mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Case management and analysis, including use of emerging jurisprudence and judgements to protect migrants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Monitoring and analysis of different government institutions roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Campaigns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Engagement - sensitisation of governments, judicial systems and law enforcement and regional institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Philippines/Intl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GAATW</td>
<td>Thailand/Intl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TENAGANITA</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LSCW</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFMN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>CYN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WOREC</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POURAKHI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NDWWT</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BOMSA</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WARBE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MWRN</td>
<td>Burma/Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Capacity building; developing tools and briefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Participation in different fora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Networking and alliance building with other movements- dalits, women, HR groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Engaging with regional platforms/groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Philippines/Intl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GAATW</td>
<td>Thailand/Intl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TENAGANITA</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LSCW</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFMN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CYN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WOREC</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POURAKHI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NDWWT</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BOMSA</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WARBE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MWRN</td>
<td>Burma/Myanmar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Context: Analysis and Changes

The MTR reaffirmed that migration is a function of both push and pull factors, of globalisation, of government policies, and economies. It is also particularly fluid and agile, with patterns changing quickly. The programming context at the beginning of the Programme and as it has changed during the first half are well-documented in the Program Proposal as well as the Annual Reports which have been produced to date. *It was found that as migration is increasing and vulnerabilities remain, the rights-based orientation of the MRP is still relevant—in fact, more so.* The following table is a quick reference summary for the purpose of this report, but details should be found in the source documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Migration Context</th>
<th>Recent Changes in the Migration Context</th>
<th>National Policy or Legislative Achievements &amp; Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regionally</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Asia increasingly an area affected by migration both internal and cross-regional (the largest percentage of migrants and remittances among global regions) | • Migration is accelerating  
• Becoming a greater factor in development and economies  
• Remittances still are not having a stimulating effect on local economies (although individual families did show progress)  
• Decreasing civil society influence on regional policy-makers  
• Migration policy-making is increasingly being linked to security and economic development goals | • Migration on the post 2015 development goals  
• Migration is featuring in SAARC and ASEAN agendas  
• Rights issues have been acknowledged by the GFMD  
• Concrete measures have been advanced in the Colombo Process on reference wage and standardized contracts  
• More engagement by UN special rapporteurs on migrant worker rights  
• Partners are increasing their regional and sub-regional advocacy engagement in various forums, civil society events, and other opportunities to influence regional policy-making  
• Increasing attention to ILO conventions, especially C189, as a foundation for advocacy agendas |
<p>| • Source region for most domestic workers |                                        |                                                          |
| • Other than India, most govs are receptive to CSO collaboration on migrants’ rights |                                        |                                                          |
| • Focus is on labor export policy for development goals |                                        |                                                          |
| <strong>Nepal</strong>                 |                                        |                                                          |
| • Migration to Gulf and Asia (unknown cross-border flows to India) | • Slight decrease in migration to the Gulf due to the ban but increasing to Malaysia and other | • Advocating for release of budgetary information for migrant work related services |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cambodia</strong></th>
<th><strong>India</strong></th>
<th><strong>Myanmar</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key feature of the economy (29% of GDP), about 400,000 migrants per year</td>
<td>Places in Asia</td>
<td>Government regularly consults partners on migration topics = good relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaps: little regulation of recruitment agencies, lack of implementation of good existing laws, vulnerability of women migrants due to age ban and lack of ability to pass nationality</td>
<td>Foreign Employment Act of 2008 is currently under revision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of govt capacity to address migration</td>
<td>G2G MOUs are being negotiated, particularly with Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing attention on the part of donors to migration issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Myanmar**

- Most migration flows to Thailand and Malaysia
- Blurred lines between migrants and refugees
- Previously, no official system for migration
- Estimated 3 million Burmese migrants in Thailand as well as those in refugee camps who may decide to remain in the country as undocumented workers, but little official statistics
- Men in fishing
- More intl pressure on the govt to deliver reform which could increase the govt’s eagerness to respect intl law, which will benefit migration
- Labor Dept is overseeing the process of migration
- Political changes are still happening which hinder ability to advocate
- Vibrant civil society is emerging but still disorganized
- The process of starting legal channels for migration is beginning
- Partners were able to engage with govt ministries for civil society participation in policy-making (strong recognition of the partner by govt)
- Effective outreach to media and other CSOs
- Horizontal technical assistance from other DCA partners
- CSOs have a good relationship with the recruitment agency sector

**India**

- One of the world’s largest sending countries of migrants. About 800,000 per year.
- Most migration to the Gulf, with a little to Asia, with a lot of internal migration
- Men mostly to construction and women to manufacturing and domestic work
- Central govt has been inactive on reforms for migrants, but hasn’t engaged with low-skilled migration
- More advanced social security schemes for migrants (regionally specific)
- Migration mostly from the South but now shifting to the North poorer states
- Hopes are high for more reforms with the new Modi govt
- More bilateral agreements with receiving countries
- Asserting its bargaining power vis-à-vis receiving countries
- Increasing role of India internationally to protect its rights
- Increasing unionization of domestic workers
- Partners have made inroads with certain state level government agencies
- Increasing engagement with partners in the Gulf countries

**Cambodia**

- Migration mostly to other
- Govt has been inviting
- Govt open to capacity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>countries, mostly Thailand and Malaysia. About 350,000 migrants per year.</td>
<td>CSOs into policy-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A lot of internal migration as well, particularly rural-to-urban</td>
<td>• Implementation of laws continues to be problematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Men in fishing and construction; women into domestic work. Both genders also work in agriculture and factory settings around the region.</td>
<td>• Integration between labor rights and migration advocacy and discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complicated push factors, especially related to land rights, and unemployment.</td>
<td>• Concerns about limitations on civil liberties, which will also impact migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key issue in the country’s development</td>
<td>• An official ban on women for domestic work into Malaysia in 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• G2G MOU negotiations on-going with Malaysia and Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>building and collaboration on migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Raised C189 ratification into the government agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Standardized contract for domestic workers is being developed with Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Negotiated a decrease of passport fees for migrant workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increasing EU and intl attention on land rights (a push factor for migration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Issuing National identification and passports for migrant workers and their dependents in Thailand continues to be a protection concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increasing migration, hosting 5 million migrant workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increasing incidents of bonded labor and forced labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimum wage in place but employers circumvent this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Revision of the country’s labor laws, which will hopefully include domestic work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increasing intl pressure on the Malaysian government which is leading to G2G MOUs with sending countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partner cross-border case management is increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partner is setting precedents on a case-by-case basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Govt allowing NGOs to operate shelters for migrant workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Domestic workers have formed an association under the country’s trade union congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Migration to the Gulf and Asia, of about 600,000 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Failure of G2G MOU with Malaysia due to the recruitment agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Govt has been more engaged in intl negotiations on migrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partners have fixed role in govt training for migrant workers and fixed places for counselling at pre-departure stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Caps on migration fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New migration law passed in 2013, which regulation of recruitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DCA’s approach to this program follows its guiding principles. These have been mainly its rights-based approach as well as its commitment to partners. This Programme’s design and implementation demonstrated the spirit of partnership in all aspects of implementation. In relation to DCA’s right-based approach, the programme was found to have made significant contributions to all of the organisation’s main focus areas enumerated in the policy, namely:

- Interests and rights of the most marginalised and discriminated rights-holders addressed
- Political and legal empowerment of rights-holders
- Advocacy and capacity-building of duty-bearers
- Legal enforcement and access to justice and remedies
- Meaningful participation and influence of rights-holders and partners in projects and programmes
- Organisational policies and procedures are non-discriminatory and respectful of rights

(for examples, please refer to the section on ‘Main Achievements and Challenges’ on pp. 18-20 below).

In terms of DCA’s Partnership Policy as well, the review found a high degree of operationalization of the DCA approach to ‘common values and principles’ between itself and partner organisations, based on “the common goal of reaching out to the poor and marginalized based on respect for human rights and gender equality”, and going beyond a traditional donor-beneficiary relationship” (for examples, see Chapter 3 on Programme Partnership below).
1. Programme Strategy

Case Study
“We have had no water for four days. But today it rained” say’s community leader Zaman and points at three construction workers around a cement vats who are able to wash themselves for the first time in four days. Zaman is a 32 years old community leader from a small village 4 hours bus drive north of Dhaka, Bangladesh. He has worked for 14 years in Malaysia and is a community leader in Cyberjaya. 20 members of his family survive on his remittances.

“Watch out” he warns us as he takes us through a particularly challenging narrow lane between 2 of the 20 ft. metal containers. Pieces of plywood boards and cardboard soaked in rainwater make up a very slippery path. Since the electricity just went out it is pitch-dark as we try to find our way past all the lines with laundry through the settlement by the light from a mobile phone.

We stop outside a container where a group of workers smoke and play cards at the entrance. A big shelf divides the container in an upper and a lower room to allow 12-15 people to live and sleep in the same container. 350 people at the work site sleep cook and live in these containers – mostly men, but also women and 40 young people under 18 of which 12 are babies. There are three latrines for the entire camp. Without access to running water for four days to flush them, they smell badly. When running water is not available, the only access to water is a pond behind the latrines where rainwater and overflowing fluids from the latrines mix. This is then the only water available for washing, cooking and even drinking.

The migrant workers are stuck inside the camp and have not been out for a year or two. Some of them are here without documents, others have had theirs confiscated by the employer against all rules. Outside the labor camp, they risk running into the police – or local gangsters – who abuse their situation and extortion bribes from them because of their vulnerable state. “Our biggest problem is that nobody cares about us,” says Zaman over a cup of tea in a nearby café. “And that we are unable to unite among us”.

This is then the only water available for washing, cooking and even drinking.
Main Findings for Program Strategy

While migration programming fits into both the current and New International Strategy, there appears to be continued debate within DCA for this fit. The potential of how the fit can be operationalized needs to be explored further and put into practice so that staff have tangible experience on how it can and should be done.

While the Strategy was executed in an effective manner, with strong linkages between service delivery and advocacy, there appeared to be too much diversity as a result of a predominantly partner-driven approach. (This was more the opinion of the MTR Review team rather than the partners’ view themselves, although the partners did agree to the recommendations which followed from this finding). The diversity gave the impression of a collection of projects rather than a program achieving aligned objectives.

Overall

- Migration programming fills an important gap in PT1 Active Citizenship project portfolio, by offering protection and fulfilment of rights to a sub-population which often faces the worst violations and has the least recourse to justice (especially when they are outside of their home country).
- Migration also fits well into the New International Strategy in several ways. However, DCA will have to strengthen integration, synergies, and mainstreaming between migration and the other programming areas in order to achieve the full impact of the potential for change.

Fund-Raising

- Expectations for fund-raising did not materialize for a number of factors
- While migration funding is not so plentiful, there is sufficient for DCA to reasonably continue with a portfolio of about 1-1.5 million EUR.
- Partners are not playing as active a role in fundraising as they could be, or they lack the tools and capacity to fundraise effectively.

Current Fit of the Program under PT1 (Active Citizenship)

Despite some past disagreement within DCA, protecting the rights of migrant workers is a critical area for the participation of the most vulnerable in a globalised world. In fact, migrants suffer some of the worst rights violation in all places within the migration cycle and, while in a foreign country, have little recourse for rights violations and a chance to participate as active citizens. In fact, the migration cycle and system virtually forces them into a role of extremely passive citizens.

Thematic Links

Since its genesis in 2007, the Migrants’ Rights Programme (MRP) has been thematically included under the umbrella of PT1 programmes. This was logical due to a number of obvious thematic connection points, reflecting PT1 programme priorities evident in MRP’s orientation:

- Facilitating increased participation by marginalised groups
- Providing space for citizen action through the platform meeting model
- Support for the right to association and the right to identity documents
• Supporting a more equitable distribution of public services and resources, through migrants’ groups’ monitoring of government services
• Supporting dialogue between conflicting groups, including between migrants and nationals
• Private sector monitoring (sensitisation of recruitment agencies)
• Support for organisations and networks consisting of and/or supporting marginalised groups, including migrants, and in particular, women à important example of DCA’s partnership model

In SARO, where the PT1 programme is called ‘Inclusive Citizenship for Accountable Governance (ICAG)’, MRP’s interventions have particular relevance to the following programmatic themes:
• Low ratification rate for international human rights instruments
• Shrinking political space, also due to economic development policies
• Threats to HRDs, which often include migrants’ rights activists
• Gender & Participation: marginalisation of women in the political process; impacts of gender stereotyping on migration policies

The situation was found to be similar with regard to the Cambodia PT1 programme, which in its current incarnation is called, ‘Accountable Governance and Gender Justice’, and is focused on addressing:
• Lack of accountability by duty bearers – a particular challenge in the realm of regulating recruitment and facilitating safe migration
• Restrictions of human rights such as freedom of expression – which makes rights-based advocacy difficult, including on migrants’ rights
• Continued challenges in achieving gender equality – echoing the programme’s origins in Cambodia, designed around addressing rights issues of female migrants in particular, including and especially of migrant domestic workers

Burma/Myanmar presents somewhat of a special case, since the RO launched its own initial version of a country programme in the summer of 2013. The context analysis for this programme did not single out migration as separate issue (focusing instead more generally on governance and democratisation; institutional and regulatory constraints; limited agricultural productivity; conflict; environment degradation, climate change and natural disasters; and social barriers and social exclusion). However, it mentions that work on Migrants’ Rights (Myanmar migrants as well as Cambodian migrants) would be done as an integral part of the DCA Asia Regional Migrants’ Rights programme. Whereas IDP and refugee movements do feature in the programme strategy, labour migration in itself is a relatively new phenomenon in the country, and the MRP partner to cover this was added at the end of the drafting process for the new strategy. Despite these constraints, the review team believes migration to be a relevant social and economic feature of the country, which is being adequately addressed through the MRP in this country context.

Beyond that, and this was found to be relevant for DCA’s work across all involved ROs, the MRP also links with the following programme priorities broadly present within the PT3/PT5 programme:
• Food security & livelihoods: high incidence of distress migration due to dependence on volatile agricultural production cycles and lack of local employment opportunities (this distressed migration is seen in internal/external and seasonal patterns)
• Land rights: shrinking access to ancestral and community lands due to the industrialisation processes which prioritise natural resource extraction and large-scale industrial production in city centers
• Climate change: long-term impacts on livelihoods and/or physical environment can lead to cyclical migration or permanent displacement

MRP’s Programme Approval
The DCA HQ Programme Approval Committee meeting held on June 25, 2012 found the programme document ‘to be of high quality’ and listed a condition and some suggestions for the approval. The details of the committee’s suggestions and requirements for approval are listed in Annex B. However, it is important to note that MTR team found that these were addressed in the design and implementation. In particular, the committee required that the MRP include work on the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership standards. In response to this call, DCA SARO mainstreamed HAP standards into the RO’s work with partners, giving introductions on the topic by the regional focal person on HAP at both the Annual Partner Meetings and Partner Platform Meetings; furthermore, partners have completed HAP self-assessments, which are being followed up by the focal person. Some partners have also individually been engaged in increasing transparency and accountability and thus improve their adherence to HAP principles. For example through training and mentoring provided by regional partner GAATW to partners on accountability towards the beneficiaries whose Human Rights they want to protect (one example given was the dilemma when a trafficked migrant is rescued from an abusive workplace to a shelter, but there are not sufficient resources in the shelter to actually help the victim move on). In addition, the committee recommended that DCA explore and avail of possibilities for ACT cooperation, in particular in relation to advocacy with CAID and WCC. Following initial cooperation with ACT and WCC during the WCC 10 Assembly in Busan Nov 2013\(^1\) and bilateral planning with Brot für die Welt, DCA is now co-chairing an ACT Community of Practice on Migration and Development, which focuses on advocacy work.

Geographical links under the current regional approach
The relevance for present and future DCA programming of addressing migration and its inherent gross violation of the rights of some of the most vulnerable in the region was confirmed by all interviewed. Furthermore, the fact that migrants (being out of their own country) are all the more limited in claiming their rights—and therefore being active citizens—was seen quite clearly. They are among the most vulnerable of marginalised groups, and whose options for recourse are the most constrained. The present MRP programme strategy has successfully demonstrated the relevance of addressing migration with a comprehensive, multi-country strategy targeting sending, transit, and receiving countries in order to effectively protect migrants’ rights. Those interviewed for this MTR process almost unanimously confirmed this

---

\(^1\) See https://www.noedhjaelp.dk/nyheder/seneste-nyt/migrantarbejdere-ikke-slaver
relevance at both country and regional levels, with services and policy achievements having been documented.

**Regional Nature and Design of the MRP.** The programme was – as all present programmes under the South Asia Regional Office, that also leads implementation of this programme – developed as a regional programme in line with the 2008 Global DCA Regional Policy. The MRP and the Central Asia on the Move migration programme are the two first programmes in DCA to develop such a regional response to migration. DCA SARO staff interviewed for this review confirmed the overall validity of this approach, and the contributions it has made to more comprehensive and holistic programme interventions in the region. Likewise, DCA partners interviewed underlined the importance of being able to collaborate in a regional setting, as facilitated through the MRP and the partner platform process. They shared many examples of mutual learning and capacity building that had occurred over the life cycle of the programme, including during the last two years, which they directly linked to their being part of the MRP network. This was particularly evident in two areas: (a) the technical support offered by the network partners and (b) support to the Myanmar program from Nepalese and Philippines partners on a short-term assignment (see Chapter 3 for further details).

**Linkages to the New International Strategy and DCA Global Policies**

DCA’s new International Strategy for 2015-18 is characterised by: (1) setting out a number of new ‘international goals’, into which DCA programming is expected to fit in the future; (2) the transition from regional to country programming; and (3) setting out new international goals while establishing new thematic priorities to achieve them. The challenge for all current DCA programmes will then be how to adapt to this newly evolving framework and make preparations in the final current phases so that the transition to the new strategy is as smooth as possible. Even with that challenge, it is important to note that the MRP fills a critical gap in the Active Citizenship portfolio, and has generated a number of value-added aspects and achievements, which DCA should retain into the New International Strategy period. Some of these include:

- The focus on lower-skilled migrants as a particularly vulnerable sub-group of rights holders, many of whom also belong to other PTI target groups, including women, Dalits, and other marginalized groups
- Since migration is an important social and economic issue in many programme countries, the MRP has contributed to making DCA stronger as a whole
- The programme has strengthened civil society’s place in national and international advocacy, turning even smaller partners into effective network members and respected voices in dialogue with stakeholders at all levels

Geographically, DCA has been trying to restructure its approach to global programming in certain regions, establishing ‘focus countries’ where resources and efforts will be concentrated. However, in certain cases, regional extensions will be maintained when reflecting a logic of programme requirements in the focus country, or humanitarian relief needs. Kyrgyzstan, for instance, has maintained such an extension in Tajikistan and Russia, and Burma/Myanmar in Thailand. In the region covered by the MRP, the focus countries are Nepal, Burma/Myanmar, and Cambodia.
**A Future Role for Migration in the New International Strategy**

There has been some debate within DCA as to whether migration fits into the new international strategy, and thus, if it should continue post-2016. In its comments on the draft version of the International Strategy, SARO had raised the concern of the virtual absence of migrants’ rights from the document. This is in spite of the fact that there is growing interest in migration-related programming within the ACT community, and DCA is in a prime position to play a leadership role in this, given our field and policy level experiences.” Despite not having a prominent role in the document, migration programming fits well under the objectives of “Build Resilient Communities” and “Fight Extreme Inequality.”

**‘Build Resilient Communities’**: This focus area speaks to the need, as voiced by many partners, to more actively address livelihood crises as a driving factor behind distress migration. This was voiced at the Partner Platform Meeting in Kuala Lumpur, and also reflected in the comments submitted from PPA at HQ. In addition, this approach has already found its way into several ongoing partner projects under the current programme, and is currently being further elaborated. Examples include the WOREC project in Nepal, which is combining safe migration awareness raising with livelihoods training for potential and returnee migrants, along with national & international advocacy; the POURAKHI project, also in Nepal, providing entrepreneurship training to returnee women migrants, along with safe migration and advocacy initiatives; and similar livelihoods components being tried out on a pilot basis by BOMSA and WARBE in Bangladesh.

**‘Fight Extreme Inequality’**: Evidence-based advocacy on more rights-sensitive migration policies and regulations has been a key component of MRP partners’ work from the start of the programme. These activities – including individual and group-based case work, research and documentation of rights violations against migrants, and linking of these findings to national, regional, and international-level advocacy initiatives – form key contributions to addressing political inequalities in the programme countries, as migrants constitute a particularly vulnerable sub-set of the population. Their weak socio-economic status (most of them lacking sufficient education, skills, and capital, leading to exploitative lending and debt bondage in migration), social marginalisation (marginalised groups and women constituting the main beneficiaries of the programme), and lack of information about safe migration, and lack of ability to access justice, are all factors being addressed by the programme, which fit under this goal.

The paper submitted by PPA (see Annex C) confirmed the fit of the current programme, as designed, and its contributions to the PT1 portfolio, outlining how its activities feed into the Active Citizenship framework by working for Accountable and Equitable Services, supporting Space for Citizen Action and Human Rights Defense, and Equal Participation in Elections. Furthermore, it attempted to conceive of the transition to country programming as an opportunity for “addressing migration through a wider range of DCA thematic areas”, including not only Active Citizenship, but also Right to Food, and Sexual Reproductive Health and Rights. This MTR found those linkages and opportunities are not only available, but many staff eager to implement them. With regard to the inclusion of the migrants’ rights theme in future country programmes, the paper noted the need for migrants to be identified “as a key and prioritised target group under the Rights-Holder Focus, with the accompanying relevant focus under Duty-Bearers”.
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Discussions held by the review team with DCA senior management, RRs, and partners at the platform meeting explored some of these points a bit further. Respondents across the board confirmed the relevance of migration as a theme for rights-based engagement through DCA partners in the region. There was a strong affirmation from all three ROs involved in the programme that they would like to continue working on migration programming under the new framework, and that they see migrants as a particularly vulnerable group of rights holders. This is expected to be reflected in the new country strategies being developed for Cambodia and South Asia, and to be further nurtured under the existing country strategy for Myanmar. Migration was seen as a key competency developed by DCA over the life cycle of the programme up to the present, although it was noted that this had only been insufficiently translated into additional donor support thus far.

**Geographical scope beyond the focus countries**

Regarding the issue of regional extension of programme work under the country programme approach, the review found that continuing the work of partners through networks and in destination countries would be crucial for the continued success of the programme. Both partners and DCA senior management (including the DD) recognized that the most atrocious rights violations against migrants often occur in destination countries, and would need to continue to be addressed in a meaningful way in the future. There was agreement within the RR meeting that this was not in conflict with the strategic direction set by the new International Strategy, which expressly permits regional extensions of programmes, wherever these have a logical link to the issues addressed in focus countries. Since all three focus countries represented in the programme (Nepal, Burma/Myanmar, and Cambodia) are major sending countries for vulnerable migrants, whose nationals suffer egregious rights violations in destination countries (primarily, the Gulf, and Malaysia and Thailand), which are being addressed through interventions by strong partners in those countries, it follows that those partners are providing crucial support to rights holders from focus countries, and would thus will continue their presence in migration-related DCA programming. This would especially be the case for Tenaganita in Malaysia, which was found to provide crucial assistance to many migrant communities from sending countries throughout the programme (in particular, Nepal, Cambodia, Burma/Myanmar, Bangladesh, and India), and whose work also forms the backbone for strong evidence-based advocacy in sending countries and Malaysia alike. In addition, future support could also be continued to be provided for those partners that could be classified as resource organisations, which are providing important networking and capacity building functions for the rest of the programme partners – in the case of MRP, this concerns principally MFA and GAATW, whose contributions to the work of all partners in the programme stood out among the main achievements of the programme during the review (see also section 1.2 above). A similar approach to funding network resource organisation has been pursued (and is expected to continue) under other DCA programmes, for instance to the International Dalit Solidarity Network (IDSN) in the PT1 programme.

**Additional Linkages across DCA non-Asia regions**

Interaction between the MRP Partner Platform and the RR from Central America during the review also demonstrated the relevance of possibly developing migration response in a wider range of DCA focus countries, if DCA so wishes. More importantly, the review clearly demonstrated the relevance of addressing migration more comprehensively through a wider
range of DCA thematic areas: all partners and DCA staff suggested closer integration of livelihood support. Many are also interested in integrating migration response with DRR and climate change, as well as with sexual and reproductive health.

Central Asia’s migration program is widely recognized for its effectiveness and productive partnership model. As such, two key Central Asian partners as well as the Central Asia RR were invited to attend the 2014 PPM in Kuala Lumpur. They shared experiences and participated in brainstorming sessions which explored how successes could be replicated in Asia and South Asia. Additional cross-learning took place through separate side events and meetings with stakeholders, which had been organised by the RPO, in coordination with hosting partner Tenaganita, on issues including legal aid and consular support to migrant workers. This collaboration, which was seen as very beneficial by all involved, is expected to continue with a counter visit from MRP partners to the Central Asia programme in 2015.

Switch from individual migrants only to migrants’ families approach
There is a tendency to approach migration programming with an individual targeting, often leaving out the effects of migration, rights violations, and social costs on the individual migrants’ family. This MTR team found that it is also appropriate to serve migrants with a family-based approach as well, as migrants are part of a family unit which shares the burden of rights violations, pays social cost for having a family member abroad, and is affected by the phenomenon. While this observation does not constitute a recommended change in the MRP, this approach and expansion of the framework should be considered where appropriate in the programs—especially when considering integration of migration into other PTs.

Incidentally, a family-based approach would make it easier to create synergies. By linking livelihoods, reproductive and sexual health, and active citizenship to family-based interventions where at least one member is a migrant would create a deeper, more organic link to those programs. Two partners (WOREC in Nepal and BOMSA in Bangladesh) already do this especially related to support for reintegration for returning migrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Achievements and Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Meeting of project goals & contribution to programme objectives (Logframe indicators)
The objectives and indicators in the logframe, as they are written, makes it difficult to provide quantifiable results attributed to the project. Nevertheless, incremental steps have been achieved (see 2013 Annual Report for full details):

Migrants are empowered to claim their rights
- Throughout the region, partners built structures to ensure safe migration. Most notably, many are there were instances where partners set up a presence in government training facilities (Bangladesh), had airport information booths (Nepal), and sensitisation in communities (nearly all countries).
- Partners developed cross-border or multi-country support mechanisms, to offer support for migrants whose rights had been violated in countries of origin, transit, and destination.
Civil society holds governments and other duty bearers accountable for ensuring rights of migrant workers

- Partners conducted advocacy on the local, regional, and global levels throughout the implementation of the Programme. Most notably, nearly all partners are well-recognized in their own countries as being important voices for migrants. Government officials often call upon them for recommendations, participation, and collaboration.
- Partners, particularly with help from the network partners, are gaining traction in international advocacy events. Recent achievements include statements being included in the GFMD as well as the inclusion of migration into the SAARC 2014 Summit’s civil society agenda.
- Partners have gained visibility in international advocacy events, such as Intl Migrants Day, etc.

Strengthened civil society organisations

- While both technical and programmatic capacity building occurred throughout the Programme, the main form of strengthening of civil society was among the CSOs as a group and a network. Horizontal linkages were built for advocacy and operations (cross-border support for migrants in distress). This strengthened NGOs through better programming, stronger advocacy, and mechanisms for collaboration.

**Gender specificity**

Male and female migrants from the South Asia and Southeast Asia region face enormously different types of migration patterns, risks, vulnerabilities, and impacts on their families. Generally speaking, males enter construction, unskilled labour such as cleaning, and factory type settings whereas women largely enter domestic worker and factory-type jobs. In particular, females who become domestic workers are at high risk for psychological, physical, and sexual abuse in the homes of their employers. Women also bear the majority of the responsibilities of pregnancies, children, and obtaining legal documents for those children. These are issues that were being addressed in various partner projects, which thus contained innovative and important comparative advantages, and they should be highlighted as such.

Generally speaking, the partners were addressing these specific concerns and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While program documents asked partners for information on gender equality, in reality migration in Asia requires gender specificity. Partners were found to be using highly innovative and effective ways of including gender specificity but it was not well documented in their proposals nor reports which hinders DCA’s ability to “sell” the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vulnerabilities. However, they were not documenting them well. For example, some partners had included sexual harassment that domestic workers were likely to experience in the homes of their employers into pre-departure trainings. Others had addressed domestic violence and husbands forcing women to work as domestic workers abroad as a push factor for women to migrate. Even others had found ways to help women who had given birth abroad to register the birth at home and maintain the citizenship of the child.

**Rights-based orientation**

Overall, the program maintained a rigorous focus on rights-based programming and did not waver from that approach. This is an important comparative advantage of DCA’s approach to migration, given the growing but not always rights-focused donor landscape internationally and in the region.

Expressing this rights-based orientation was not only evident in the activities supported but also in the targeting. All activities focused on migrants whose rights were violated or were at high risk of having their rights violated. Furthermore, advocacy and support to the legal mechanisms for migration were all oriented towards safe migration channels.

The contextual analysis on migration showed that the phenomenon is actually increasing. Push factors—such as poverty at home, women’s poor social status, and other country-specific factors such as cultural trends, land rights, and climate change—are increasing pressure on people to leave their home countries to work abroad. On the other hand, many countries have increasing demands for migrant labour. In Malaysia and the Gulf, booming economies and labour shortages mean that there is near constant demand for migrant workers. In India and Thailand, many employers prefer to hire migrant workers at cheaper wages. DCA’s MRP accepts a person’s fundamental right to choose whether or not to migrate. Thus, the programme seeks to reinforce human and labour rights in a framework of “safe migration”.

**Challenges**

Predictably, the Programme Strategy faced a number of challenges to achieving the impact of creating safe migration for all in the Asian region. Each partner and project contains its own risk assessment and takes measures to address these challenges—many mitigation measures of which Some of these included:

**Contextual**

- Both push and pull factors for migration are so strong, that even sensitised persons continue to take risks in the migration process. Partners mitigate this through awareness raising on risks and orienting them towards safe migration methods.
- Governments in the region generally lack capacity, especially at the local level, to protect migrants. In some cases, they lack the political will to do so. Partners address this through persistent and strong advocacy.
- Businesses in the migration process (especially employment agencies) are powerful at lobbying and very agile, able to change tactics much faster than NGOs. NGOs are usually and likely to remain one step behind them. NGOs are not well-placed to challenge the recruitment industry but they do discuss it in their policy recommendations to government. Unfortunately, the lobbying power of the industry is often much greater than that of the NGOs.
There is increasingly more discourse on security and border management, which often increases rights violations of migrants by state authorities.

**Civil Society’s Role**
- Governmental meetings and regional forums are becoming increasingly restricted to the amount of participation from civil society. In other cases, they offer a token forum but do not include civil society in real decision-making. Partners are addressing this through continued advocacy and by making this phenomenon visible, including through DCA support, for example through the ‘Shrinking Political Space’ theme at DCA’s Head Office.

**Programmatic**
- Partners often take diverse views on the same topic (ie, some are in favour of bans while others are against them). The recommendation in this report of tightening the DCA’s directional control over project design will address this to some extent.

### Fundraising and Resource Development

The Program was able to leverage external funding, however the expectations for migration funding were higher than what was actually materialised.

Some key reasons of why fundraising has not been successful:
- The GFU was seen as having to look for non-traditional donors which it was not prepared to do so.
- Migration has not been a priority for donor representation by RRs
- The regional approach creates the management conditions which hinder fundraising. It was found that staff in country offices who theoretically should be building close relationships with donors based in their country are not able to do so because the holder of the Program is in another country. This hinders the ability to forge interactions through regular and frequent meetings.

Migration funding globally is not large as other programming areas; however, given DCA’s small size it could develop a 1-1.5 million EUR per year migration program through a combination of funding sources. Migration funding can be obtained under a number of programming areas (migration, human rights, trafficking, and as target groups for other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Funding Leveraged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• EU-funded program in Bangladesh (2010 to 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EU-funded program on protection for Indian migrants destined for the Gulf state (2011 to 2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
programming areas such as livelihoods and governance) as well as under a number of donor funding (EU, UG Government agencies such as USAID, GTIP, DHRL, BPRM, and others, foundations, and UN agencies).

There are a number of concerns which should be addressed. However, the over-arching recommendation is that *fundraising efforts for the migration program should begin in earnest now in order to ensure funding after 2016*. Specifically,

- Donor mapping
- Quick-impact capacity building for partners should occur
- Partners should be informed and understand that they are also responsible for gathering intelligence and fundraising
- GFU and country offices should examine calls for proposals to see if a migration project could fit into the call for proposals (either a target group or with synergy such as reintegration or other that could include migration programs).
- Ensure that all regions and DCA staff should be able to represent the migration program on a holistic level. Every person should be aware of their fundraising responsibility.
- Ensure that DCA is aware of all funding opportunities, especially those targeted at country level – i.e., ensure that DCA does not miss calls for proposals. The GFU FO in every office should earmark an adequate amount of time to network and build DCA visibility on migration
- Increase upward communication from country programmes to RPO on funding opportunities, networking opportunities, and donor intelligence
- All stakeholders in the organisation and partners should commit to donor representation on DCA’s migration work, and attempt to influence their strategies & decision-making
- Continue to explore non-traditional sources of funding

### DCA’s Value Added

DCA can add value in a practical and applied way but these efforts need to be strengthened and re-energized. The main value-added of DCA was found to be the powerful impact it had in *linking partners to national, regional, and international advocacy efforts*. The MTR team confirmed that this would not have happened without DCA support.

The second main area of DCA value-added was seen in capacity building. Partners universally mentioned that they benefitted from both administrative and programmatic capacity building. Administrative capacity building focused largely on financial management, which was useful for partners. Technical capacity occurred in many ways, including one-on-one planning with the RPO, peer mentoring in which one NGO partner assisted another, trainings conducted by the network partners, and learning-by-doing experiences. The innovative means of capacity building and the willingness to look for any and every opportunity to provide capacity building was a major value-added of DCA’s work.

### The Transition to Country-Based Programming

The MTR team was asked to glean some insights on the positive and negative consequences of the upcoming transition to country-based programming, while understanding that the 2nd half of the MRP will remain regionally based. "Investigations into this topic produced serious questions and highlighted a lack of consistency among DCA on what exactly regional and country-based
programming actually is and what the consequences are. This summarizes the debate.

**Potential Positive Consequences for MRP:**

- **Synergy:** In theory it will be easier to create linkages and synergies as migration falls under a country-based strategy and portfolio. Given that Programme Coordinators would have increased influence over migration programming, it should serve to increase synergies on the local level (including geographic and beneficiary targeting).

- **Visibility and Fundraising:** Visibility requires consistent and persistent presence in the country-based community of practice and donor community. It will also increase the ability of country-based staff to represent the Programme to country-based donors, and to cultivate those donor relationships.

- **Management clarity:** While the MOU provides for improved management communications, practicality dictates that having a manager in the same office will prioritize attention to the projects being implemented in said office.

**Potential Negative Consequences for MRP:**

- **Diluted technical expertise:** A transition to country-based programming will likely yield more generalist grants managers who will devote only a percentage of their time to migration. This will likely dilute technical expertise and naturally create varying levels of technical expertise between country programs.

- **Reduced ability to achieve commonality across the region:** Whereas the RPO holds management authority over the Programme and can implement common approaches, methods, and systems, doing so in a country-based model will require coordination among country offices which will present an additional challenge to translating that coordination in actual programs on the ground.

*To minimize the potential negative consequences, the MTR team discussed with the DD and the RR the possibility of creating a regional technical advisor position in the future, who would not manage but provide technical support to all projects in the programme.*

---

**Key Recommendations for Programme Strategy**

**Overall**

- As migration is a key social and economic issue across the Asia region, DCA should integrate its various program areas with migration. This could be done both by programming integration as well as integration through geographic and beneficiary targeting.

- Strategy integration of migration programming should be done carefully: it can and should be a factor mainstreamed into other programming areas. For example, in livelihoods programmes, migration of farmers or heads of households will have a strong effect on the project’s implementation and should be considered as such.

- Migration programming should continue under the New International Strategy

- Encourage partners to address advocacy towards the role of employment agencies. In all cases of rights violations, employment agencies usually play a role and they should be addressed in programming (even if not directly, but indirectly).
**Programme Quality**

- Focus on program quality and infusing the activities with advanced techniques and methodologies to increase effectiveness and document best practices, lessons learned, etc.
- Fund several key research studies to be conducted and publicized by the partners (Proposed topics include legal analysis of migrants claiming their compensation and analysis of dead bodies of migrant workers returning to their home country). Partners should drive the process and maximize publication for advocacy and fundraising objectives.
- Increase DCA steering of the program, especially in bringing partners into a tighter sense of alignment with the logframe. This will require perhaps more directive instructions to partners as they produce their proposals. If partners participate in the process, they are more likely to acknowledge and value the objectives of the program better and design their projects accordingly.
- Put more directives into the proposal and reporting formats so that partners will “own” the program more and highlight or explicitly demonstrate certain things—like focus on gender specificity, focus on linkages with faith-based institutions, focus on linkages with external actors like ILO and IOM.
- Due to limited resources and the need to achieve the targeted objectives in the logframe, the MTR recommends to NOT fund reintegration activities on a larger scale at this point, even though partners are requesting such. Doing so will dilute resources from the objectives and are likely to be so small that their impact would not be significant. However, reintegration for migrants in distress (i.e., those who have lost savings and been detained abroad) would be good candidates for livelihoods assistance under other DCA PTs and thus represent an opportunity to create synergies.

**Strategic Fit**

- Document the justification for the strategic fit of migration in the new international strategy. This will include its role under active citizenship as well as synergies with other programming areas. It will also imply internal sensitization so that the staff of DCA understands well the fit of migration in the overall strategy.
- Further inceptions of this Programme post 2016 should highlight the linkages with the new International Strategy as described above.
- In order to enhance the effectiveness of livelihoods components in migration programming, integrated planning with PT3 programmes should be promoted, including through joint funding support and joint back donor applications.

**Synergies with other Programming Areas**

- The PPA’s working paper on creating synergies between migration and other PTs (see Annex C) offers useful guidance. In particular, the strongest linkages are those with Active Citizenship (i.e., encouraging migrants and their families to claim rights at home and abroad) and this is where migration should be housed within the framework of the DCA strategy, but there are other linkages as well such livelihoods (i.e., providing services to prevent migration under economic distress as well as to help migrants who have experienced distress to reintegrate).
- DCA’s new International Strategy takes into account new challenges for human
development such as climate change. This topic was addressed during the 2014 Kuala Lumpur Partner Platform Meeting, and partners were quite interested to mainstream climate change and DRR considerations into their work, particularly where and insofar as migrants’ rights would be affected.

- Consider widening the programme approach from individual migrants to migrants’ families for better synergy across DCA thematic areas. By doing so, the impact of migration on the whole family can be better documented and the synergies with other DCA thematic areas can be seen to serve a family unit rather than just one individual.

**DCA Value-Added**

- Focus on *DCA value-added activities* to the partners, and document it more explicitly. These will mostly relate to the creation of joint products (see Chapter 3) and enhanced advocacy through networks (see Chapter 3). It will also likely include DCA’s technical support of helping partners to apply best practices and new methodologies as well as forging operational linkages with faith-based organizations in their programing.

**Fund-Raising**

- Overall: Start fundraising efforts *now* in order to have funding secured by 2017
- *Activate the GFU* to expand searches for donors beyond the EU and traditional donors
- Conduct a *donor mapping* for the migration field, with strategic advice on which donors to focus on
- Describe and share the benefit to partners’ long-term sustainability by encouraging them to *take an active role in fund-raising*, to do representation and share donor intelligence
- Conduct a *proposal writing training* for partners, with a proposal guidance manual given to each of them as a leave-behind
2. Programme Management

Case Study
“I am a migrant worker myself! Each case that I serve, each woman who comes seeking our assistance is someone just like me.” Pourakhi’s Project Manager explains that all its staff are former migrant workers, “I see myself in their stories.”

“I was a school teacher earning about $25 a month. Imagine, I was a school teacher but I couldn’t afford to enroll my son in the school in which I was teaching. So I followed my husband to work in Japan. I worked in a factory with many dangerous machines. One time, my arm got caught in one of the mechanisms and I almost lost my arm,” at this point, the Project Manager began crying about her experience nearly 20 years ago.

“One night, our apartment building was raided by the police. I never had handcuffs on in my life! I told the police officer that I was a school teacher, not a criminal, and I started crying and screaming. I couldn't believe that I end up with handcuffs on me.”
Main Findings for Programme Management

The management structure—especially with multiple regions involved in the Programme—added complexities but these were outweighed by the programmatic benefits of a well-integrated set of partners and activities.

**Overall Management**
- A clear and detailed MoU for the management modalities of programme management across the three ROs has been developed and signed, but has not been followed which lead to consequences of confusion and mild tension between SARO and non-SARO regional offices.
- Integration of migration perspectives into other DCA programs across subregions South and South East Asia has been strengthened. Despite some minor issues, the integration has been largely positive but remains a work in progress.

**Financial and Programme Management mechanics**
- Excellent rapport and trust building with partners achieved
- Convincing change from the previous RPO management style towards transparency, collegiality, and increased ownership of the programme has been achieved across the RO staff.
- The SARO finance unit has not provided the agreed (in the MOU) quarterly financial programme overviews, which had a number of consequences and contributed to frustration among several actors.
- DCA has leaned towards a more partner-driven approach which was appropriate for the first half of the MRP’s implementation but the time for a more directive approach has arrived. DCA’s flexible and partner-driven approach was commended by partners who also support a more DCA driven approach in the second part of the programme.

**Programme implementation aspects**
- There was widespread and universal recognition of DCA’s technical input and value-added.

---

**Overall Management**

The Migrants Rights Programme is among the most complex in DCA, in terms of management structure, which demanded significant time and human resource attention to its implementation. Some key features of this complexity included:
- the geographic spread,
- a high number of partners with diverse capacities and mandates,
- differences in the migration patterns and government support (or lack thereof) of the countries involved,
- three DCA ROs involved (that is, South Asia, Myanmar, and Cambodia) in addition to a partner in a destination country.

Given this complexity and the Programme crossing three Regional Offices, an internal management MOU was developed and signed by the three Regional Representatives in October 2013. While the overall management is under the South Asia RO the roles and responsibilities of
all stakeholders in the three offices are described in detail with specifics on budget (contributions by all three offices), approval of projects, project monitoring, fundraising/back-donor relations, and initiatives for improved coordination. The MTR Review Team found that most RRs were not knowledgeable on the specifics of the MOU and that it was **not being implemented.** Furthermore, the team that the MOU would still be useful and that all ROs/RRs need to recommit to following it. Additionally, the MTR Review Team found that financial information was not being shared regularly among all the Regional Offices, which hindered their ability to make data-based decisions and fostered a sense of frustration and lack of transparency.

### Collaboration with Cambodia and Burma/Myanmar ROs

Both Cambodia and Myanmar offices stated that migration programming was an important element of their projects portfolio. In fact, they made several areas of contribution to it but some issues related to the MOU non-observance did cause frustration.

The MoU sets **budget contributions from each of the three participating ROs.** Out of the total budget the aim is to have appr. 300.000 DKK available for partner contributions in each of the five programme countries and the rest available for regional and cross cutting spending (so country programs will not achieve a 1:1 match between their contributions to the MRP and the budgets they offer to local partners). This was clarified during the MTR as there had been some misunderstanding around that. In addition to financial resources, **both ROs committed time from POs to support monitoring and capacity building.** Both POs actively took up this mandate by offering technical assistance (in Myanmar) and establishing MRP monthly meetings (in Cambodia). Furthermore, both ROs regularly include MRP partners in their general trainings and capacity building. Partners mentioned the benefit of financial management and procurement trainings recently as concrete examples of this.

Smooth implementation of the MRP was hindered by the non-observation of the MOU. In particular, **the lack of quarterly provision of programme budget updates** by the responsible SARO Finance Unit had causes much frustration and should be redressed quickly.

**Monitoring** of in-country MRP partners has been devolved to the POs as a part of their job responsibilities, but all stakeholders highlighted the need for the RPO to offer technical assistance, more dialogue on implementation concerns, and additional fostering of regional linkages in exchange for some of the monitoring responsibility having been devolved to POs.

When this programme phase (2012-2016) was designed, much attention was given to a better inclusion of the two ROs and partners in these countries. That has happened to the extent that Myanmar is now included with one new partner and that an additional partner has been added in Cambodia. The Programme has successfully brought these two partners into its community of NGOs through horizontal linkages (see example of technical assistance from MFA and Pourakhi to MWRN) as well as cross-border case management (most notably between Tenaganita in the country of destination and the Cambodian partners). However, it was also found that the non-observation of the MOU hindered programme integration. Furthermore, there is a need to document the contribution to – and benefit from – the regional cooperation, as this was not fully clear to the South East Asian ROs. The two network partners (GAATW and MFA) both add
tremendous value to the program by including support on linking the partners’ daily transactional work to larger theoretical and framework discussions on migration. They also play a vital role in linking them to international advocacy opportunities. These activities are regularly documented in the Annual Programme Reports, as well as individual partner project reports.

**Collaboration with the DCA Head Office**

A number of staff changes at the HQ level has resulted in *less HQ programme support* for the MRP than had been originally anticipated.

Advocacy support for the programme has been handled by the Regional Coordinator (RC) for Asia rather than by the Programme Policy and Advocacy Unit (PPA) directly. Thematic and advocacy support from within PPA was thus limited to those core issues that were directly within the remit of the overall PT1 portfolio (that is, political participation, freedom of expression, association, speech, etc.). However, it should be noted the RC was highly engaged in creating linkages with ACT partners, such as Bread for the World and ACT Community of Practice, and other church actors through the WCC. This resulted in concrete discussions and added value to the advocacy portion of the programme. Unfortunately, this support has not been as extensive as that of PTAs for other corresponding DCA programmes, which have been better integrated into DCA’s global advocacy efforts. (In those cases, advocacy at the EU and UN level, including direct communication with human rights bodies, special rapporteurs, etc., were successful in pushing for higher visibility of partners’ work from other PT1 programmes).

Tentative plans to include migration in the remit of a PPA staff as a result of the ongoing restructuring of that unit seems to have been abandoned due to a recent decision to downsize. This represents a lost opportunity for DCA.

**Management Mechanics**

The *project proposals and annual reports were the main mechanisms* for DCA to ensure program quality and influence the partners’ activity methodologies and management structure (especially as monitoring visits by the RPO are only scheduled on a once-annual basis). However, the fact that all the (most) proposals and reports must be completed in the December-January months each year, this created an overwhelming situation for the RPO for 13 reports to be approved in only two months’ time. This hindered the opportunity to work intensively with each partner.

Furthermore, there were opportunities to create a tighter sense of alignment and internal consistency during this proposal and reporting process which could be strengthened into the future. In particular, the proposal formats could be adjusted to encourage partners to:

- specific alignment with the MRP logframe objectives and indicators
- how the project engages with religious institutions
- how the project engages with or takes into account external stakeholders (such as ILO, IOM, embassies, and others working in the field of migration)
- how the project incorporates gender specific approaches
• how the project engages with other DCA partners, especially the network partners (GAATW and MFA)

Reporting formats should be adjusted to include guidance so that the reporting is also useful to both DCA and partners in the future—not only for the report but also in communications, future proposals, and donor visibility. Some areas to strengthen include:

- highlight gender specificity
- highlight visibility of the activities to donors, local government, and key external stakeholders
- highlight capacity building efforts from DCA and specific improvements to their work as a result of them
- include at least two case studies of migrants assisted for communications purposes
- better align the individual partners’ annual reporting format with the overall Annual Programme Report for DCA

Overall, the change of RPO from the previous phase (2007 – 2012) to this one (2012-2016) was seen to improve management dramatically both with partner relationships as well as the integration of the MRP into DCA’s internal management structures. Most notably, improvements were documented with regards to transparency (especially on procurement requirements), collegiality (particularly with more regular, frequently meetings with finance and programme teams), and increased ownership of the programme across the RO staff. Several staff, including RRs, had noted that great improvements were made in the 2012-2016 project especially with regards to engagement and transparency. However, full observation of the management MOU still needs to be implemented.

Monitoring activities by DCA-SARO – programme and financial

Both an earlier HQ Spot Check exercise and a new MTR sport check by the Programme Assistant have demonstrated compliance with report filing requirements and uploading of documents. As in all SARO programs, the MRP sets an objective for only one (instead of the usual two) monitoring visits per year to each project. However, the RPO compensates for this by additional online check-in meetings (via Skype and telephone) as well as side meetings during advocacy events and the PPMs.

Despite the efforts being made to improve programme monitoring, financial monitoring proved to be more problematic. This was the result of budget expenditure and pipeline reports not being shared widely enough by the SARO finance unit.

Discussion of the Approach

The MTR discussed the approach of the MRP in terms of the management responsibility of having relatively large numbers of partners and geographic spread vis-à-vis the benefits of the approach programmatically. Larger numbers of partners and more geographic spread make the average project value decrease and the management responsibilities increase. At the same time,

2 The MTR team made several attempts to interview the SARO Head of the Finance Unit, but this meeting was not made available to the team.
supporting a larger number of partners in more countries builds critical mass for a regional movement on migration. The final evaluation of the MRP can judge the effectiveness of this approach. The MTR team concluded that the approach of building critical mass was prudent and effective, especially in the sense that it supported regional advocacy and cross-border case management. However, the team also acknowledged that the management capacity of the Programme is completely full and no further partners should be added in the second half of the Programme implementation.

Discussion of Partner vs DCA-driven approaches
One of the MTR team’s main concerns in this exercise was focused on the appropriate level between partner versus DCA-driven strategy implementation. The discussion revealed a high degree of appreciation by partners for the space given to partners to identify needs, serve needs flexibly within their own financial frameworks, and to take a supportive role of partners’ own organizational development. At the same time, the MTR team found some instances where this approach tended to give the impression that the collection of the projects caused the strategy to not be executed in as tight, internally-consistent manner as would be ideal. Furthermore, it gave the impression that DCA was sub-granting more than driving the strategy execution. Of course, the reality is a gray area, mixing both approaches. After substantial debate and input from multiple sources, the MTR team noted that the partner-driven approach was effective in building the Programme and gaining the foothold of DCA in each of the countries. However, the time had come in the second half of the Programme’s implementation to increase the level of directiveness that DCA asserts. This should be done primarily through revised project proposal formats which will highlight and increase DCA’s role.

Programme Implementation

Attention to technical assistance to partners was a natural follow-on from the exceptional partnership spirit displayed by the MRP. The technical assistance to the programme came from a variety of sources including the ROs, the RPO, the regional resource organisations and by collaboration between the partner organizations.

In all three ROs the MRP partners are involved along with any other partners in trainings, workshops, annual partner meetings. This has included trainings on advocacy, strategy planning, gender mainstreaming, behavioural change communication, financial management and organisational development. Partners expressed universal satisfaction with the trainings and placed a high degree of value on them.

The Regional Programme Officer provides technical assistance in two main formats: during the processing of proposals and reports (in which specific, in-depth discussions are held with partners during the development and approval process) as well as during monitoring visits on site (in which technical discussions and dialogue on implementation is also included). The RPO also effectively used advocacy events, PPM meetings, and other opportunities to hold side meetings. Partners noted that they valued the participation of the RPO in interactions and programmes with the government (workshops, negotiations) where RPO presence added to their capacity, reputation and bargaining power. More such support was called for. In general the RPO is seen to represent a wider regional outlook and analysis that adds value.
Through the regional resource organization (network) partners were also an important source of technical assistance. They receive information and create policy briefs for national advocacy (for example, from MFA on standardized contracts, reference wages, etc), access to and orientation on advocacy towards intergovernmental structures (for example, SAARC and ASEAN civil society forums) and specific trainings (for example, in accountability towards end beneficiaries and dance therapy methods conducted by GAATW). DCA played an important role in leveraging these instances of assistance from the network partners to the country-level partners, through activities such as:

- Preparation and input into regional working/policy papers,
- Leveraging technical expertise (as was the case when MFA supported India and Myanmar programs with program support)
- Preparation for and input into international migration advocacy events

The Partner Platform (see Chapter 3 for further discussion and details) provides horizontal linking, exposure and learning from others. In fact, it was widely documented to be the main source of technical assistance to partners.

Both partners and DCA staff identified some priorities for future technical assistance. These included: M&E training; assistance in better documenting organisational and project achievement; fundraising and donor relations; information on migrant reintegration programs; and, advanced advocacy techniques, methods, and skills.

### Key Recommendations for Programme Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Urgently sensitize all ROs and recommit to following the existing clear, detailed and already signed MoU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better induction, sensitization, and information sharing by the RPO—with support and assistance in coordination from the RRs – for other staff so that they gain a greater depth of understanding of the MRP. This understanding will enable them to represent the Programme to donors, and better create synergies with their other programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The job description of the PO responsible for the MTR partners in Cambodia and Myanmar respectively must state that responsibility and should state the time allocation for that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better documentation and National partners formulate clear benefits of the regional cooperation. This needs to be more explicitly documented and shared with management in the ROs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial and Programme Management mechanics**

- The programme management should develop a more directional approach to ensure greater clarity about partners’ contributions to specific programme objectives.
- Flow down the log frame to partners but give the leeway within the objectives.
• Better spacing of partner proposals development to avoid bottlenecks in December/January and allow greater (R)PO involvement
• SARO Finance Unit to provide quarterly programme finance overviews to all ROs and involved (R)Pos.
• Ensure clarity among all ROs of their financial commitments to this program.

**Programme Implementation Aspects**

• The final evaluation to pay particular attention to the viability of the approach in the design and implementation of the programme of building a movement of NGOs in migration for broader based advocacy.
• Programme staff should assist partners in their own fundraising for programme activities
"Money, na!," a widow from rural Bangladesh explains that she has no money. After losing her husband and without land or assets, she was forced to take a job in Qatar as a domestic worker to provide education for her children and just survive.

Unlike many migrants, she was realistic about the job. She knew it would be hard work, she knew it would break her heart to leave her children, and she knew that there are dangers. But she felt she had no choice. Arriving in Qatar, she quickly saw that she under-estimated the dangers. For months, she was subjected to abuse—even torture—by the employer. She was physically and sexually assaulted for months.

By luck, she escaped with the help of a driver in the household. The Bangladeshi Embassy was able to get her released from the country and returned home. Ironically, she says, "Yes, I would go back. I came home and I am still without money or land. When you are poor, it means you have no choices in life."
Main Findings for Programme Partnership

Partnership is a key feature, implementation methodology, and objective of the Migrants Rights Programme

Overall Findings

- The Migrants Rights Programme displayed leadership on partnership: both in terms of implementation through partners, holistic support of partner capacity building, and efforts to build linkages among partners. The MTR found exceptional realization of DCA’s partnership principles as well as universal satisfaction on the part of partners as to the working relationship with DCA.

- The Programme implementation gave substantial consideration to partner-identified strategic directions in project-level activities, which was appropriate for building trust and networks in the first half of the Programme. That approach should evolve into a more directed approach in the second half.

- The Programme successfully linked partners with each other (horizontally) across countries in the region on technical and advocacy levels. The Partner Platform Meetings are a powerful and beneficial mechanism for operationalizing partnership; however, enhancements are required to ensure that they achieve their full potential.

- Other key findings include:
  
  a. Network organizations greatly added value to the collection of more service-based, country-level partners
  
  b. Significant and innovative examples of collaboration with faith-based and religious institutions have already occurred, and partners expressed an interest in expanding these types of collaboration even further.

Partnership was a key feature of this Program, both in line with DCA Partnership Approaches as well as in practice throughout the implementation. This Programme made a concerted effort and invested significant resources in creating mutual relationships and joint learning as well as in organizational development and capacity building of partners.

Main Achievements

The main achievement of the Programme with regards to Partnership has been the ability of DCA to bring local partners’ contributions into high-level advocacy efforts. This was seen numerous times in regional forums, including the SAARC People’s Summit, the Abu Dhabi Dialogue space for civil society, and the GFMD. DCA played a critical role in elevating their grassroots perspectives to high levels of national government and international advocacy. In addition, DCA has begun to build horizontal relationships among the partners. Evidence of this was particularly true on case management (such as cross-border support between the partner in Malaysia and the partners in the country of origin) and technical assistance (such as the support offered by a Nepalese partner to a Burmese partner on scaling-up its program in the context of opened political space for civil society cooperation). This is one of the key value added elements of DCA’s role in the Programme.
However, DCA should alter its approach to partnership in the management and implementation, moving towards greater steering and influence. It was seen that during this transition (between Phase I and II of the Programme, that also involved a change in RPO) that partners—as a confidence building and capacity building measure—were the main influence on program design. It was seen that this may have led to the strategy containing a very wide, diverse range of activities with significant diversity in their implementation methodologies between partners and between countries. For the final half of the Program, DCA should take a greater role in steering and influencing the Program. Doing so will transition the Program into a more streamlined, strategic, and cohesive program as well as forge the opportunities for greater joint products and synergies between partners in different countries. It will also allow DCA to make greater linkages to other programs (ie, active citizenship and livelihoods).

**Benefits of DCA’s Partnership Approach**

Partners themselves identified a number of benefits of the DCA Partnership Approach. Partners mentioned the various *types of trainings* they had received from DCA. The non-SARO regions also showed a commendable willingness to include migration partners in their trainings on generally applicable topics (most notably, financial management, procurement, and project design). However, follow-up and application of the trainings was not well documented and it was unclear if partners’ proposal writing, reporting, and financial management had actually improved after the trainings (to be fair, this is a general concern for all NGOs and not particular to DCA in any way). DCA should therefore conducted follow-up assessments, either formally or based on the RPO’s judgement. Further trainings or follow-up mentoring should be scheduled as required.

Partners mentioned the *benefits they received from the regional approach and the opportunity to forge operational and learning relationships* from the other partners (see text box). Examples of horizontal relationships, information sharing and cross-technical assistance were documented by the MTR. The inclusion of Tenaganita in the country of destination (Malaysia) added value to the project. DCA’s support helped to forge *operational relationships between NGOs in sending and receiving countries* as did the EU-funded project on Indian migrant workers bound for the Gulf States. This was particularly helpful in: (a) ensuring coordinated case management for migrants in distress; (b) supporting each partners’ evidence-based advocacy; and, (c) adding depth and richness to each partners’ work through a better understanding of the work and context in the sending and receiving countries.

DCA has gone to great lengths to offer *technical assistance* to partners, but the management context has reduced the effectiveness of such especially in terms of

---

**Horizontal Capacity Building & Learning**

In Myanmar, MWRN wanted to build its relations with the government and DCA facilitated Pourakhi and MFA to conduct a technical assistance trip to build their capacity in a workshop that was jointly attended by government officials. This lead to a quick follow-up by the President's secretary, who instructed all relevant ministries to cooperate with MWRN on all issues related to migration as well as approval of MWRN's registration.
not being able to visit each partner frequently and limited time to work intensively on their proposals each year. The RPO is in regular and frequent contact with all partners, but the once-yearly monitoring visits are insufficient to build technical capacity in depth. Despite these time and geographic limitation, the RPO effectively used proposal development and reporting (see Chapter 2: Management for further discussion on these matters) as opportunities to strengthen program design and increase the effectiveness of the activities and methodologies. The RPO also effectively managed the monitoring visits so that opportunities for technical assistance and dialogues on resolving implementation issues were included in the same visit. Partners universally expressed gratitude for this service.

**Particular Role and Value-Added of Network Partners: GAATW and MFA**

The inclusion of the “network” partners greatly added value to the Programme, by creating a structure in which the service-based, country-level partners collaborated with network partners. Many of the country-level partners were already GAATW and MFA members, but DCA’s Programme offered them structured ways of collaborating with those networks’ activities by attending trainings and contributing to network statements, position papers, etc. The MTR documented the following benefits of the network partners’ role in the Programme:

- **Conduit for regional and international advocacy:** Both GAATW and MFA are formidable advocates in civil society participation in regional and international policy-making fora. In all significant regional fora (see HLD, GFMD, the Abu Dhabi Dialogue, Colombo Process as well as ASEAN and SAARC civil society spaces), MFA and GAATW actively participate and advocate for evidence-based policy reforms. Most importantly, they draw on grassroots experience and expertise from their member organizations—an ability that has been strengthened due to the country level partners’ contributions (which DCA’s MRP enabled).

- **Conceptual frameworks and reflection:** While it is expected that country-based partners would be focused on the day-to-day, service provision aspects of their work, the collaboration with the network partners provided a welcome opportunity to reflect and to be reminded of the conceptual frameworks in which the daily work is being carried. This reflection was documented to enhance partners’ ability to advocate, to represent their work to donors, and “speak the language and discourse” of migration programming.

- **Access to resources:** Both GAATW and MFA have a wide array of products and resources such as toolkits, position papers, analysis, etc which are accessible to the partners online. Partners gave numerous examples of how these were useful to local level advocacy in their countries as well as examples of how they contributed to their creation. They also have web-based mechanisms for information sharing which they offered to put to use for the benefit of partners (however, partners’ access to the web and using online sharing tools needs to be addressed. All partners are able to access to the internet and download products for adaptation and modification, but they may require additional bandwidth and familiarity with software that allows for document sharing. These can normally be budgeted into new projects).
Cooperation with Faith-Based and Religious Institutions

Around the world, faith-based and religious institutions are the major provider of services and protection to migrants. As had been prudently suggested by the Programme Approval Committee, the Programme has explored and encouraged partners to explore opportunities for cooperation with these institutions on a local level.

Partners showed a history of effective collaboration with these institutions in a number of countries across the region:

- Bangladeshi partner, WARBE, has proactively included local religious leaders (imams, monks and priests) in their Migration Advisory Committees to monitor local government structures around the country. This has led to ownership and knowledge sharing within their communities.
- Indian partner, NDWM, is secular, but in fact the local Catholic Church has seconded staff (both priests and nuns) to most of the organizations’ key posts.
- Malaysian partner, Tenaganita, has successfully interacted with both religious communities individually as well as structures (for example, the Council of Churches in Malaysia, Catholic Archdiocese in Malaysia) for matters of individual case management and advocacy. A particularly efficient strategy employed by Tenaganita engaged Christian and Muslim youth groups in work with migrants—which consequently, and competently, raised demand within the religious groups for further engagement on the issue of migration.
- Burmese partner, MWRN, engaged with the Myanmar Council of Churches and the Myanmar Catholic Church on their migrants programme. They have already reached out to Buddhist monks to explore collaboration as well, leveraging the monks’ powerful connections to local communities.

When discussed at the 2014 Kuala Lumpur Partner Platform Meeting, partners recognized that collaboration with religious institutions holds tremendous opportunity (see text box above for possible avenues of collaboration). They all reaffirmed their interest in pursuing such. However, partners also cited a number of challenges of engaging with these institutions and sought DCA’s support on overcoming them. In particular, these included some Muslim leaders who associate female migration with commercial sex work and sought to confine women to their homes as well as difficulty in engaging with

Areas of Cooperation with Religious Institutions:

- Awareness-raising, taking advantage of the institutions’ trust with communities and presence in remote areas.
- Advocacy, taking advantage of the public voice of religions among the public as well as government policy-makers
- Service provision, particularly for migrants in distress with temporary shelter, psycho-social support, and humanitarian assistance
- Fund-raising support, from members to provide funds for programs
Christian communities in the destination countries who often must keep a low profile in Muslim-majority populations.

**The ACT Alliance**

The **ACT Alliance** holds the possibility of leveraging additional resources and adding additional stakeholders for the benefit of the Programme’s partners and advocacy momentum. As an ACT Alliance member, DCA has explored opportunities for leveraging the support of other members. DCA has co-chaired the **Community of Practice on migration** within the alliance, creating a valuable leadership role and visibility among the members. Specifically, **DCA explored collaboration on programming and advocacy with German member, Brot für die Welt (BfdW)**. This has led to initial plans for co-financing of local partners (modeled on existing, successful collaboration on BfrW and DCA collaboration in Central Asia) and to the setting up and co-sharing with BfdW of an ‘ACT Community of Practice on Migration and Development’ focused on advocacy cooperation. Whilst this has been a successful programme achievement, **ACT sister agency co-financing of programme and partners has not yet materialized**. Additionally, DCA encouraged ROs and POs to engage with ACT Alliance members in each of the countries. Due to competing demands in these offices, this has not yet happened to the fullest possible extent.

**Partner Platform Meetings (PPMs)**

While the partner platform meetings are a powerful mechanism for deepening partnership (both vertically and horizontally) as well as offering practical means of capacity building to partners, **the partner platform meetings should be re-energized and restructured to truly live up to its potential**. Appropriately, the Migration Rights Regional Programme Officer (RPO) has used the previous two PPMs as the means to build trust, collaboration, and a sense of community among the partners. Having now past the mid-way point in the Programme, it is now time to adjust the PPMs with the following objectives in mind:

- **PPMs should be partner-driven** with DCA playing more of a role in facilitation, guidance, and capacity building. But the essence of the PPMs should be “for partners, by partners” to the greatest extent possible.

- **PPMs should produce more tangible outcomes**, including space on the agenda for more training opportunities, programming discussions, and joint planning/creation of products.

In the 2014 PPM in Kuala Lumpur, partners and the MTR team called for incorporation of the following into future PPM agendas and formats:

- Offering partners the opportunity to influence themes, topics, and the program through a survey at the planning phase (at least 3 months prior to the PPM)
- Offering one or two partners the opportunity to plan significant pieces of the PPM to reinforce its partner-driven nature and as a capacity building opportunity for them
- Establishing a theme(s) for each PPMs.
- Creating an inventory of products that the partners have produced already and a sharing mechanism. The recommendation is to use MFA’s internet-based platform for sharing of documents. This would make downloading available and easy to all partners.

- Creating joint products as a team
- Including external experts/guest speakers relevant to the chosen theme(s)
The suggestion format for future Partner Platform Meetings:

Day 1: Business items, updates, and news-worthy events/achievements  
Day 2-3: Practical training on key theme(s), requested by partners through a survey during the PPM planning phase  
Day 4: Organizational Development Capacity Training (on a specific and targeted subject that can reasonably be covered in one day)  
Day 5: Group work on a joint/team product, requested by partners during the PPM planning phase

The decision by SARO for all the regional programmes to have only one Partner Platform meeting per year of course present a challenge as it limits the horizontal interaction between programme partners. However, the RPO made concerted efforts to find other opportunities for horizontal linkages. In addition, DCA tasks the two network organizations, MFA and GAATW, to support the regional cooperation and capacity building. Both organizations have multiple membership meetings, trainings and consultations processes where the MRP partners participate and interact. In addition, partner organisations meet and interact in regional advocacy to intergovernmental processes like SAARC, ASEAN, the Colombo Process and the Abu Dhabi Dialogue. Obviously, the preparations for such events involve a high and frequent decree of online communications. DCA’s budgetary support and encouragement of the partners to participate in such events was an important enabling factor in raising their grassroots perspectives up to these international forums.

**Challenges**

The main challenge to effective partnership has been in relation to the level and depth of support that DCA is able to provide in a tangible, practical way. The root cause of this challenge is management-based: the structure of the Programme relies upon one RPO covering a relatively large amount of partners across a large geographic region. Although the support of POs in Myanmar and Cambodia was highly beneficial, the limitations of this regional structure were found to hinder the ability to deepen partnership and provide intensive capacity building. The MTR found that tremendous efforts were made and there was over-and-above support from the Myanmar and Cambodia POs; nevertheless, one RPO covering such an amount of partners over such a geographic spread has natural limitations. Furthermore, offices around the region likewise have competing priorities and were limited in their ability to regularly devote time and attention to in-depth partnership. The MTR team believes that the transition to country-based programming (assuming that adequate time is allocated to the Migrant Rights Programme at the country level) will improve this situation.

Additional challenges found in the MTR include:

- Some partners had low capacity both in programming and management, requiring more intensive capacity building support.
- Partners were diverse in their strengths, programming focus, and operational context making uniform approaches difficult to implement.
• Partners’ time constraints and limited capacities in certain areas meant that they themselves were challenged to offer capacity to regional initiatives, to create joint products, to devote sufficient time to regional meetings, etc. While a regional programme would benefit greatly from partners with the ability to contribute more, most were found to be consumed with their own needs and local programming which meant that their contribution to the region and regional counterparts was limited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Recommendations for Programme Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>DCA’s Migrants Rights Programme should be acknowledged and commended for its strong commitment to DCA Partnership Approaches &amp; Principles</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- DCA should begin to apply a more directive approach with partners to steer the internal consistency of the Programme’s achievement of its strategic objectives.
  - Partner proposal formats should be adjusted to include specific mention of: (a) gender specificity in projects; (b) collaboration with religious institutions; (c) coordination with external stakeholders, etc. (see Chapter 1: Strategy for further information and details on proposed revisions to the proposal formats). These are subject to the context of each proposal.
  - Future partner projects should be more explicitly linked to the Programme logframe, ensuring that alignment with the Programme’s logframe flows down to the partners’ responsibility and gives the partners a better sense of how they contribute to the Programme’s objectives.
  - Common, regional priorities should be identified, accepted by partners, and workplans created for partner contribution to achieve them. This applies most specifically to joint products designed to improve program quality such as manuals, toolkits, or guidance.
- DCA should use the Partner Platform Meetings in an enhanced manner, as a key element of its activities to make partnership more practical and applied (see specific recommendations in the text above).
- Support WCC in a small research and mapping of the potential actors in the main destination countries in the Gulf States for linkages with sending partners in Nepal, Bangladesh and India as requested by partners.
- DCA should encourage engagement with religious institutions in all countries. This should be mentioned and explored in RPO monitoring visits as well as the next Partner Platform Meeting. Initial brainstorming on this topic was quite fruitful in the 2014 PPM and this should be further developed.
- Actively link partners to global resources and communities of practice on migration. In the ACT Alliance Community of Practice, proactively seek to create links with religious actors in the advocacy work. DCA should also identify and link partners to global resources on migration as well such as [http://migratingoutofpoverty.dfid.gov.uk/](http://migratingoutofpoverty.dfid.gov.uk/) as well as USAID COPs as well. These will provide tips, guidance, and global debate on issues in migration to keep partners informed of such.
- DCA should look for opportunities to put GAATW and MFA in a leadership in some activities with partners in order to build their capacity and increase the network
Road Map for the Final Half of the MRP

The following is a road map of key priorities recommended by the MTR team to help guide the final half of the Programme. Key priorities were chosen so that the RPO is able to exert his management judgment of how and when exactly they can be implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative/Management Priorities</th>
<th>Programming Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Half of 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adjust the proposal and report formats as described in this report <em>(in order to improve partners’ ability to build visibility and produce more competitive proposals to external donors)</em></td>
<td>• Explore the appropriateness of adding re-integration methodologies to the partners’ work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase the length and intensity of monitoring visits to give partners a push on planning for fundraising sustainability, better M&amp;E, better documentation of their results, and program quality</td>
<td><em>Recommendation: Only do so with innovative methodologies and high program quality from the very beginning. The resources to expand do not exist so this should be seen as a pilot program</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct a migration donor mapping exercise, and plan an orientation session online for all partners on how to use it.</td>
<td>• Begin to plan a Study to occur in the Second Half of 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Begun fundraising efforts immediately, with support from and in collaboration with the POs and GFU</td>
<td>• Begin to engage MFA with the creation of an online, password protected library on their library of the partners’ products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct a proposal writing training session (can be done online).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct a review of portfolio partners and projects. If any are found to be outside of the logframe, they should be cut or handed over PT1 programming.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarify the MOU with all relevant management staff and ensure understanding of it, and ultimately recommitting to apply it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that the SARO finance unit shares financial management regularly with relevant management staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Half of 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan the Partner Platform Meeting, with the</td>
<td>• Commence data collection and research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
recommendations contained in this report

- Guide partners in creating a comprehensive proposal, which can be modified and set out to donors upon an opportunity arising
- Increase the length and intensity of monitoring visits to give partners a push on planning for fundraising sustainability, better M&E, better documentation of their results, and program quality
- Increase the length of monitoring visits as described above, with a focus on planning and supporting fundraising, documentation, in addition to programmatic support. Consider TORs for each visit by the RPO as well as TORs for the PO’s monitoring (which should be shared with relevant PCs)

First Half of 2016

- Focus on Documenting Results
- Focus on fundraising
- Guide partners in creating sustainability plans
- Increase the length and intensity of monitoring visits to give partners a push on planning for fundraising sustainability, better M&E, better documentation of their results, and program quality

Second Half of 2016

- Make final efforts for fundraising
- Finalize sustainability plans for partners

Visibility

During the MTR process, DCA HQ team member, Jørgen Thomsen, also produced a number of stories related to migration for DCA’s visibility. These can be accessed at:

Annex A: Methodology

DanChurchAid assigned a team of three members to carry out this mid-term review:
- Jørgen Thomson, Regional Coordinator Asia, DCA HQ
- Christopher Varady, Managing Director of SFV Consulting Group (Team Leader)
- Christian Wolff, Regional Programme Officer for the Migrants’ Rights Program, SARO

The mid-term review occurred in late November/early December. The process followed a methodical process:
- Desk review of program documents (prior to travel)
- Intensive data collection through field visits and interviews with both DCA and partner staff (during travel)
- Internal team analysis, discussion, and consensus of findings (during travel)
- Final report writing (after travel)
- Final debriefings and discussions with DCA HQ staff (after travel)

In all cases, findings were not accepted and listed in this report unless triangulated or otherwise confirmed by more than one source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, 17 Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun/Mon, 23/24 Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue, 25 Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed, 26 Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu/Fri, 27/28 Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri, 28 Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat, 29 Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun, 30 Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, 01 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue, 02 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed, 03 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu, 04 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri/Sat, 05/06 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun, 07 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon-Wed, 08-12 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Wed, 17 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before Debriefing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Key Informant Meetings and Activities

As described above, the MTR team conducted a thorough and comprehensive set of meetings with all partners and key staff within DCA.

**November 24, 2014**
Christian Wolff
Regional Programme Officer, SARO
Kathmandu, Nepal
MTR Team

**November 25, 2014**
Renuka Gurung
PT1 Programme Officer, SARO
Kathmandu, Nepal
MTR Team

David Smith
Regional Representative, SARO
Kathmandu, Nepal
MTR Team

Renu Rajbhandari
Executive Director, WOREC
Kathmandu, Nepal
MTR Team

**November 27, 2014**
Field Visit with Partner
Bangladesh
Christopher

Saharail in Manikgang District (approximately 2 hour drive outside of Dhaka)
• Observation of Community Awareness session, with 20 women attending
• Visit to BOMSA Office in the Upazilla building (local government facility)
• Visit to Technical Training Centre (TCC) in Dhaka and observation of pre-departure training by BOMSA staff

BOMSA Staff
Dhaka, Bangladesh
Christopher

Prabir Kumar Biswab, Officer
Sumaiya Islam, Executive Director
Lily Jahan, President

Govt. Training Center
Dhaka, Bangladesh
Christopher

Dr. Eng. Md. Sakawat Ali, Principal (Director)

WARBE Staff
Dhaka, Bangladesh
Christopher

Syed Saiful Haque, Chairman

Hasina Inam
Dhaka, Bangladesh
Christopher

DCA Country Director & Funding Officer, Bangladesh Office
November 27, 2014
Tenaganita Office Visit          Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia   Jorgen & Christian
Agile Fernandez, Director
Liva Sreedharan, Programme Manager
Prema Arasan, Programme Officer / OSH Trainer
Fajar Santoadi, Programme Officer / Researcher
Barath Manian, Programme Officer
Ashikur Khan, Programme Officer
Teresa Mary Lazaroo, Shelter Manager

November 28, 2014
Field Visit with Tenanganita      Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia   Jorgen & Christian
Court proceedings concerning compensation for cheated Indonesian MWs
Meetings with Burmese migrant worker community

Meetings with Tenaganita Staff
Fajar Santoadi, Programme Officer/Researcher
Barath Manian, Programme Officer
Coline Maniez, Tanma Project Coordinator
Marilyn Nu, Part Time Taman Project Coordinator

MTR Team Meeting                    Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia   MTR Team

November 29, 2014
Field Visits                      Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia   Christian & Jørgen
Tanma Federation of Burmese Migrant & Refugee Women

Bangladeshi Labour Camp in Cyberjaya  Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia   Jørgen

November 30, 2014
Tenaganita Event                  Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia   MTR Team
Observation of training of Nepali community leaders

Gereja Baptist Church           Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia   Christian & Jorgen
Participation in a church service for Burmese migrant workers and refugees

December 1, 2014
GAATW Staff                      Via Skype       Christian & Christopher
Bandana Pattanaik, International Coordinator

Betty Thøgersen                     Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia   Christopher & Jorgen
Regional Representative, DCA RO Cambodia

Jerome D’Souza                     Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia   MTR Team
Head of Programs in SARO
Mani Kumar
Programme Coordinator/Acting Regional Representative, DCA Burma/Myanmar RO

Carol Rask
Programme Type Advisor on Active Citizenship, DCA HQ

**December 2, 2014**
MRP Partner Platform Meeting
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
MTR Team

Kristen Rasmussen
Programme Coordinator, DCA Cambodia RO

**December 3, 2014**
MRP Partner Platform Meeting
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
MTR Team

Jonas Vejsager Nøddeker
Development Director, DCA HQ

Thomas Skov-Hansen
Regional Representative, DCA Central Asia RO

Pourakhi Staff
Birjaya Rai Shrestha, Director
Ganga Limbu, Finance Coordinator

Tenaganita Staff
Aegile Fernandez, Director

CYN Staff
Tim Malay
Sar Mory

IDEA Staff
Chum Chamm
Von Samphous

LSCW Staff
Sokchar Mom
Sotheary Min (CFMN)

Tin Tin Mar
PT1 Programme Officer, DCA Burma/Myanmar RO

MWRN Staff
Hseng Htai
Kyaw Zaw Lwin
Nina Kim
PT1 Programme Officer, DCA Cambodia RO
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Christopher

NDWN Staff
Sr. Valarmathi
Fr. Chetan
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Jorgen & Christian

December 4, 2014
MRP Partner Platform Meeting
Meeting of Regional Representatives
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
MTR Team

December 5, 2014
MRP Partner Platform Meeting
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
MTR Team

December 6, 2014
MRP Partner Platform Meeting
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
MTR Team

December 8, 2014
Internal Meetings
Kathmandu, Nepal
MTR Team

December 10, 2014
MFA Staff via Telephone
William Gois, Regional Coordinator
Christopher

December 12, 2014
Martin Rosenkilde Pedersen via Skype
Former PTA for MRP
Christian & Christopher

Annex B: Programme Approval Committee Response

The DCA HQ Programme Approval Committee meeting held on June 25, 2012 found the programme document ‘to be of high quality’ and listed a condition and some suggestions for the approval. See Annex B: Programme Approval Committee Response. These focused on:

- Include work in the programme on the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership standards (condition). In response to this call, DCA SARO mainstreamed HAP standards into the RO’s work with partners, giving introductions on the topic by the regional focal person on HAP at both the Annual Partner Meetings and Partner Platform Meetings; furthermore, partners have completed HAP self-assessments, which are being followed up
by the focal person. Some partners have also individually been engaged in increasing transparency and accountability and thus improve their adherence to HAP principles. For example through training and mentoring provided by regional partner GAATW to partners on accountability towards the beneficiaries whose Human Rights they want to protect (one example given was the dilemma when a trafficked migrant is rescued from an abusive workplace to a shelter, but there are not sufficient resources in the shelter to actually help the victim move on).

- Explore and avail of possibilities for ACT cooperation, in particular in relation to advocacy with CAID and WCC (suggestion). Following initial cooperation with ACT and WCC during the WCC 10 Assembly in Busan Nov 2013\(^3\) and bilateral planning with Brot für die Welt, DCA co-chaired an ACT Community of Practice on Migration and Development. This community focused on advocacy work. In 2015, the community has planned advocacy activities jointly with both WCC and ILO to support partner participation on the ILO’s Domestic Workers Convention 189 as well as further advocacy points to improve migrant worker rights in the Gulf states.
- Explore cooperation with local churches as well as with the WCC (suggestion). Many initiatives have been taken and will be developed further. (see section on Programme Partnership).
- Restraints on expansion of work into Gulf region (suggestion). This restraint has been observed. The only exception was an EU-funded project between 2011 and 2014 focusing on Indian migrant workers destined for the Gulf states. This exception was made on the justification that the work was entirely funded by external sources. Furthermore, a minor research study on migrant workers in the Gulf states is being co-funded by WCC as well as the Dutch foundation, Stichting Rotterdam.
- Development of a programme baseline when guidelines ready from PPU (suggestion). Following recommendations from the responsible PTA officer, this suggestion was scratched and did not occur.

\(^3\) See https://www.noedhjaelp.dk/nyheder/seneste-nyt/migrantarbejdere-ikke-slaver
Annex C: Migration in DCA Country Programmes

MIGRATION IN DCA COUNTRY PROGRAMMES
A discussion paper for the Mid-Term Review of the Asia Migrant Rights Programme

Introduction

DCA has been supporting two regional migration programmes: in Central Asia and in South and South-East Asia. DCA and partners at the field level have developed considerable experience in mitigating and addressing human rights abuses during the migration process: in sending communities, transit countries, and in recipient countries. Migrant workers, particularly undocumented migrant workers, migrant domestic workers etc. are a particularly vulnerable group due to the fractured responsibility of duty-bearers along migration routes. Even migrants that were not vulnerable can become vulnerable by using certain migration paths.

Migration, as a theme, currently falls under the Active Citizenship thematic area within DCA. However, the Mid-Term Review in Central Asia revealed some missed opportunities in addressing migration through only this thematic area, particularly in sending communities. There was an interest to address the causes of migration i.e. lack of livelihood opportunities in migrant-sending communities, support to invest remittances received in a productive manner etc. Migrants returning to their communities with or without earned income, expelled from recipient countries, having incurred debt etc. could also benefit from these types of initiatives. Furthermore, migrants living away from their families for long periods of time are at high risk of facing challenges to their sexual and reproductive health and rights in terms of lack of information on how to protect themselves against sexually transmitted diseases including HIV and they are at high risk of gender based violence and sexual abuse. Ensuring increased access to SRHR services and information could be a vital part of a migration programme.

Working for increased livelihood opportunities in rural areas can offer alternatives to migration to cities and/or other countries. However, it is important to highlight, that the goal for DCA, as a rights-based organisation, should never be to stop migration. If the poor choose to migrate, DCA should work for safe migration that respects the rights of migrants. This can mean that when working in communities with high migration, DCA and DCA partners will always need to ensure, at the minimum, that migrants have access to the necessary pre-departure training in order for better protection en-route, in addition to other advocacy work mentioned below.

Migration within the new DCA International Strategy and Country Programming

- Working on safe migration can potentially fall under the current international goals of Building Resilient Communities and Fighting Extreme Inequality
- Country programming offers possibilities for addressing migration through a wider range of DCA thematic areas: Right to Food, Active Citizenship and Sexual Reproductive Health and Rights.

Integrating Migration in the Focus of Future Country Programmes
- Migration will need to be identified in the country analysis as a key and prioritised problem among the poorest communities in country
- Migrant workers and/or migrant families will need to identified as a key and prioritised target group under the Rights-Holder Focus, with the accompanying relevant focus under Duty-Bearers
- Work in the sending communities/country will need to be the primary focus with limited regional extension (i.e. possibly regional migrant rights network for advocacy in regional and international bodies, migrant rights network in the recipient country). Any regional extension of a country programme will need to be strategically linked to interventions in the country programme.
- Migration could cut across the different thematic objectives in country programmes, where identified as a strategic priority in the relevant country programme (see below)

**Under Current DCA Thematic Areas**

The following are some examples of how migration could potentially fit within current DCA thematic priorities and objectives in country programmes, if the country offices choose to focus on migration issues:

**Active Citizenship**

*Accountable and Equitable Service:*
- Support for the inclusion of the interests of discriminated migrants and their families in community-budget monitoring and in local development plans (including migration services etc. in local development plans)
- Improving migrants’ access to consular services through lobbying Foreign Ministries in sending countries to ensure that services to migrants are adequately dealt with in embassies/consulates abroad;
- National level advocacy for improved migration policies and procedures in sending countries;
- Ensuring migrants, including females migrants and domestic workers, have all necessary documentation and information on their rights as migrants prior to migration;
- Ensuring migrants leaving family members behind have taken necessary legal administrative, and other measures to protect their livelihoods and well-being

*Space for Citizen Action and Human Rights Defence:*
- Support to migrant rights defender networks and legal assistance to migrant workers (included undocumented migrants, domestic workers) in recipient countries. However, service delivery, beyond strategic legal assistance, may be more difficult in future country programmes.
- Advocacy within regional forums for increased respect for migrant rights in the region, for broader ratification of the Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and their Families etc. The current mid-term review is expected to input on the impact of this work
- Advocacy for regulation of private sector recruitment agencies to ensure respect for migrants rights
Support to church/religious networks in recipient countries for supporting advocacy on migrant rights, if they exist.

Equal Participation in Elections
- Advocacy for legal and administrative reforms for ensuring internal migrants are included on voter lists where they live

Right to Food
- Improving livelihood opportunities in rural areas from where migrants come
- Facilitating the use of remittances at community level for development purposes, including possibly supporting activities on financial literacy of migrants, and advocacy to support their inclusion in existing social protection schemes of sending country governments
- Focusing on reducing vulnerability of family members left behind
- Working on the nexus between migration and disaster risk reduction and climate change (needs development)

Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights
- Improving access to SRHR services for migrants in sending countries
- Supporting organisations of migrants who work to improve the sexual and reproductive rights of migrants, including gender-based violence and sexual abuse.

Some Challenges
- While recognising that many rights violations happen in the migration process and in recipient countries, to what extent can these violations be mitigated by continued work within sending countries e.g. on regulation of private sector recruitment agencies, on lobbying the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the necessary consular services for migrants in the recipient countries etc.? What options are there within country programmes to facilitate networking between partners in sending countries and organisations protecting migrant rights in recipient countries? Is DCA’s role only to ensure that migrants get information on links to any migrant rights networks, consular services etc. in the recipient countries. Or can DCA continue to support at least one regional organisation working at regional and international level on migrants rights?
- Limited Danida (and other) financial support to work in recipient countries.
- DCA would not support service delivery to migrants, and particular not in receiving countries. To what extent, can DCA support strategic legal assistance in receiving countries?
- Migration in DCA will be dependent on each country programme identifying this issue as a strategic priority. Visibility of migration as a theme may be affected.
- Global advocacy on migration at least facilitated from Copenhagen will continue to be limited.