

# Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation

## 1. Executive Summary

Request from:	ADRA Thailand		
Type of assessment:	<input type="checkbox"/> Appraisal	<input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluation
Type of Program:	Migrant Rights Advocacy		
Agreement Symbol	NDICI HR INTPA/2023/451-606		
Funding Source	The European Union		
Project title:	Strengthening CSO Capacity and Networks for Migrant Rights Protection Project		
Project duration:	1 Jan 2024 to 31 Dec 2025 (24 months)		
Overall Project Objective:	To promote and protect labour rights and promote safe working environment for vulnerable migrant workers in and around Mae Sot District, Tak, Thailand, for decent work and economic growth.		
Specific Project Objectives:	<i>Specific objective:</i> (1) To increase private sector compliance of labour/human rights standards in and around Mae Sot District, Tak, Thailand; (2) To strengthen local CSOs' effectiveness for the advancement of migrant workers' labour/human rights.		
Objective of the Evaluation:	The main objective of this evaluation is to provide ADRA and the European Union (EU) with an independent assessment of the project's performance and results, in full compliance with the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria. The evaluation will systematically assess the project's Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, and Sustainability, capturing key outcomes and potential broader impacts. It will also generate lessons learned and practical recommendations to inform the design and implementation of future projects.		
Methodology	Potential (non-exhaustive) mixed data-collection methods could include key informant discussions, individual interviews, Focus Group Discussions, surveys, direct observations, and document reviews.		
Period of field assessment:	Second week of December 2025 (tentative dates)		
Expected completion date: (Final Evaluation Report)	28 February 2026		

## Background to the Project

*In January 2024, the Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) and the Human Rights Development Foundation (HRDF) launched a 24-month project titled Strengthening CSO Capacity and Networks for Migrant Rights Protection, funded by the European Union. The project aims to promote*

***and protect labor rights and promote a safe working environment for vulnerable migrant workers, for decent work and economic growth. It targets 4,000 migrant workers in and around Mae Sot District, Tak Province, Thailand.***

Thailand has been a key destination for low-skilled migrants from neighboring countries for decades, hosting approximately 3.9 million documented and undocumented migrant workers from Cambodia, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Myanmar, and Viet Nam (IOM, *Protecting Migrant Workers in Indo-Pacific Supply Chains*, 2022). Migrant workers make up over 10 percent of Thailand’s labour force, which totals 38.7 million. Nationals from Myanmar form the largest migrant group, with recent estimates placing their population at 2.3 million (International Migration Report, 2019).

Tak Province, in particular, is a common destination for Myanmar migrants due to its road linkages to Myanmar, porous border crossings, and the availability of jobs in its factories and growing agricultural sector.

Before the COVID-19 pandemic, migrant workers in Thailand faced significant risks, including excessive recruitment fees and migration-related costs, restrictions on freedom of movement, poor working conditions, irregular work schedules, and lack of access to legal and social protection. Informal barriers further exacerbated these challenges. The pandemic has intensified these vulnerabilities (IOM, 2021).

**The major problems facing Myanmar migrant workers include:** (i) *Weak law enforcement for labour rights protection.* While the Labour Protection Act and related measures are intended to safeguard the labour rights of migrant workers, enforcement remains inadequate. Additionally, many migrant workers are unaware of their labour and human rights under the Act. (ii) *Limited Capacity of CSOs: CSOs struggle to effectively engage in national-level dialogue* due to weak coordination, insufficient resources, low digital literacy, language barriers, and their location outside of the capital cities and in remote areas. (iii) *Occupational safety and health concerns:* Workplace injuries remain a significant issue for migrants, many of which could be prevented with the effective implementation of safety standards as outlined in existing laws.

It is envisaged that these identified problems will be tackled through the “Strengthening CSO Capacity and Networks for Migrant Rights Protection” Project. The stated objective will be achieved by four expected results described below:

Output.1.1: Increased awareness of duty bearers and target employers about migrant labour/human rights;

Output.1.2: Strengthened capacities on labour laws and measures addressing access to legal protection of migrant workers from Mae Sot area against unfair labour practices.

Output.2.1: Enhanced CSOs knowledge and skills for effective advocacy in migrant rights.

Output.2.2: Enhanced opportunities for dialogue and collaboration among duty bearers, CSOs, and private sector for the improvement of the protection of labour rights for migrant workers.

### ***Project Activities (According to the “Description of the Action”)***

---

A.1.1.1 Improve the capacity of FTI to support its member factories to improve safety standards in the workplace;

- A.1.1.2 Provide 4 workshops to FTI's target factories to improve safety standards and reduce inequality in the workplace;
- A.1.1.3 Technical support to LPO to enhance workplace safety monitoring;
- A.1.2.1 HRDF train paralegals and migrant leaders on labour case referrals and develops a training curriculum to enhance knowledge transfer;
- A.1.2.2 Migrant leaders conduct community outreach to raise labour rights awareness and engage in network building;
- A.1.2.3 Provide legal aid and litigation support (50% women) to migrant workers by one sub-grantee and HRDF;
- A.1.2.4 Provide capacity building to the taskforce comprising government agencies in MWAC concerning migrant labour/human rights, particularly rights related to migrant women;
- A.2.1.1 Conduct Occupational Safety and Hygiene outreach to migrant workers by one sub-grantee;
- A.2.1.2 Provide operational and management capacity building to CSOs;
- A.2.1.3 Provide technical capacity building to CSOs and migrant leaders on human rights and migrant legislation and policy;
- A.2.1.4 Provide technical support to two local migrant rights promotion platforms to enhance advocacy and networking;
- A.2.2.1 Organize four multi-stakeholder forums among CSOs, local authorities, employers, and migrant workers to raise issues related to labour/human rights;
- A.2.2.2 Hold policy dialogues and consultation meetings with central authorities;
- A.2.2.3 Organize joint activities among different stakeholders (CSOs, local authorities, private sector, migrant workers) to strengthen collaboration.

## **Key Project Stakeholders**

---

**Migrant workers** in Mae Sot who have participated in project activities, including safety and hygiene training, legal aid consultation, community outreach, and more.

**The Labour Protection and Welfare Provincial Office (LPO)** serves as an associate partner, providing guidance on the implementation of this proposed action. As a government agency dedicated to promoting and protecting labour rights, the LPO plays a key role in offering legal assistance to migrant workers and monitoring labour law compliance in the target factories.

**The Federation of Thailand Industries (FTI)** serves as an associate partner, coordinating with factories and offering guidance on project implementation. FTI is also part of a consultative team responsible for identifying target factories in collaboration with ADRA to promote a safe working environment.

**Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in Mae Sot** are local groups led by Thai and/or Myanmar workers. Nine CSOs have been selected to receive technical support through the project, with two of them identified to receive sub-grants. These sub-grants will enable the CSOs to provide legal assistance and deliver training on occupational health and hygiene promotion to migrant workers.

## **Key Components of the Final Evaluation**

---

**The main objective of this evaluation is to provide ADRA and the European Union (EU) with an independent assessment of the project's performance and results, in full compliance with the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria. The evaluation will systematically assess the project's Relevance, Coherence,**

**Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, and Sustainability, capturing key outcomes and potential broader impacts. It will also generate lessons learned and practical recommendations to inform the design and implementation of future projects.**

This project implementation period is 24 months. This evaluation aims to focus on the project implementation period till December 2025.

The evaluation will further document key challenges, best practices, and lessons learned during implementation. It will contribute to ADRA's organizational learning and provide actionable insights to strengthen the design and delivery of future projects of similar scope.

To achieve the above objective the Final Evaluation will address the following:

1. Assessment of the project progress towards attaining its objectives and results using **logical framework** matrix and indicators, particularly outcome indicators, (Note: A review of output indicators will be provided by the project team); Assessment of the Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning (MEAL) system in capturing and analysing data;

The following questions should be answered:

- To what extent has the project taken recommendations from the mid-term evaluation and incorporated into the remaining period of the project?
- To what extent do the achieved or unachieved project results align with findings from qualitative and quantitative analyses?

2. Assess the **relevance** of project in addressing the problems stated in the proposal;

The following questions should be answered:

- Have the project interventions (methodologies and activities) been relevant to achieve the project objectives?
- Have the project interventions (methodologies and activities) been relevant to the context and target group?
- Has the project been adequately adjusting to changing situations or contexts?
- Were there any changes made in the design of the project during implementation?
- What evidence is there to demonstrate the value of the intervention?

3. Assess the **coherence** of the project, both internal (within the organization) and external (with national and local government policies) in addressing the problems stated in the proposal;

The following questions should be answered:

- How well is the project aligned with ADRA's overall strategy, mandate, and thematic priorities?
- How consistent is the project with the European Union's development cooperation priorities and policy frameworks?
- To what extent does the project align with national and local government policies, strategies, and plans relevant to its focus areas?
- How coherent are the project's activities and approaches with those of implementing partners and stakeholders?
- How well has the project ensured consistency between its different components or interventions (internal coherence)?

4. Assessment of the performance of the project in terms of **efficiency** of the project implementation; The following questions should be answered:
  - Has the project been managed efficiently in terms of human resources, financial management, and other inputs relative to the results achieved?
  - What external constraints affected the project's efficiency, and how effectively were these mitigated?
  - To what extent were synergies leveraged with other local and international actors implementing similar initiatives?
  - To what extent has the project demonstrated value for money in relation to the resources and funding utilized?
  
5. Assessment of the performance of the project in terms of **effectiveness** of activities undertaken; The following questions should be answered:
  - To what extent has the project achieved its specific objectives: (1) Increasing private sector compliance with labour and human rights standards in and around Mae Sot District, Tak, Thailand; and (2) Strengthening local CSOs' effectiveness in advancing migrant workers' labour and human rights?
  - How effective was the capacity-building support provided to CSO partners?
  - Have beneficiaries been sufficiently involved in project implementation, and is there an effective feedback mechanism between beneficiaries and project implementers?
  - How effective has the collaboration been between project partners and local government authorities?
  
6. Assess the **impact** of the project in achieving the overall project goal. The effect of the project on its wider environment, and its contribution to the wider policy or the project's overall objective. In particular, the evaluation of impact should address the following key elements:
  - Policy level impact;
  - Social level impact;
  - Economic level impact;
  - Technical level impact.
 The following questions should be answered:
  - To what extent has the project contributed to the overall goal of promoting and protecting labour rights and ensuring safe working conditions for vulnerable migrant workers in and around Mae Sot District, Tak, Thailand?
  - What measurable changes (positive or negative) have occurred as a result of the project at the policy, social, economic, and technical levels?
  - What are the unintended effects of the project, both positive and negative, on the target population, local communities, and other stakeholders?
  - How has the project influenced broader systems, policies, or practices beyond the immediate project outputs?
  - If the project had not been implemented, what would have been the likely situation or trajectory for labour rights, workplace safety, and migrant worker conditions in the target area?
  
7. Assess the prospects of the **sustainability** of the project outcomes and benefits and make concrete recommendations for its further improvement for future projects based on the evidence collected; The following questions should be answered:
  - To what extent are the risk mitigation and sustainability plans in the project proposal, in

addition to unforeseen risks, addressed during project implementation? How realistic were these?

- What evidence is there to suggest the project’s interventions and/or results will be sustained after the project ends?
- Can the project be scaled up or replicated in the future?

8. Identify and describe the main **lessons learned** from the project performance to date.

The following questions should be answered:

- How was learning addressed within the scope of the project?
- What are the lessons learned on different levels – organization, implementation, beneficiaries, CSOs, and risks (both internal and external)?

### **Cross-Cutting Themes: Gender Equality, Inclusion, and Safeguarding**

The evaluation must systematically integrate gender equality, social inclusion, and Do-No-Harm/safeguarding principles throughout the process. The consultant should assess how the project has contributed to promoting equitable participation and benefits for women, men, and marginalized groups, and whether implementation adhered to safeguarding standards. Data collection and analysis should be sex- and age-disaggregated where relevant and should identify any differential impacts on diverse groups of migrant workers. The evaluation must also ensure ethical conduct, confidentiality, and the protection of all participants during fieldwork and reporting.

### **Methodology of the Final Evaluation**

---

The evaluation will be based on the findings and factual statements identified from review of relevant documents including the project contractual documents and in particular Description of the Action (the proposal), the interim report to the donor, the mid-term evaluation, findings from primary data collected from the field visit, as well as any technical reports, Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning Plan, training materials and different promotional materials produced by the project. A list of the above documents will be shared with the evaluator before the beginning of the mission. The mission will also undertake field visits and interview the stakeholders including target beneficiaries, government officials, CSOs, migrant workers, etc.

Participation of stakeholders in the evaluation should be maintained at all times, reflecting opinions, expectations and vision about the contribution of the project towards the achievement of its objectives. In particular, the following stakeholders should be visited and interviewed:

- ADRA’s Project Team including Program Director, the Project Manager, and Field Coordinators for a detailed overview about the project performance, successes and challenges encountered;
- Labour Protection and Welfare Provincial Office (LPO) for an overview about the joint Factory Model Initiative, relevance of the project and collaboration with ADRA’s project team;
- Two sub-granting CSO partners for a detailed overview about the partnership with ADRA, effectiveness of the activities and challenges encountered;
- Minimum of 3-5 factory owners/managers who have participated in the Factory Model Initiative for feedback on the initiative and benefits for the factories;
- Minimum of 20 migrant factory workers who have been participating in the project activities for feedback on the effectiveness of the activities that target them and any suggestions for improvement.

- A survey among CBOs focuses on capacity building provided by the project (sample size: less than 30; this can be done online or in person)
- A survey among migrant workers who received legal aid on negotiation with employers (sample size: approximately 100; this can be done online or in person)

Methodologies such as focus group discussions, semi-structured interviews, surveys, and direct observations, etc. will be applied as appropriate.

### **Products expected from the evaluation**

---

The evaluator will provide ADRA with a short debriefing presentation including the preliminary findings before drafting a comprehensive report for review and comments. Please note that the suggestions, which are made for future improvement, are expected to be incorporated in the final report to the EU. The final report should not be more than 40 pages excluding annexes. The report will include:

- Executive Summary
- Purpose of the evaluation and the methodology.
- The main findings: project relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact of project activities, sustainability with recommendations for improvement. Key questions asked in the “key components of the final evaluation” of this Term of Reference need to be answered and incorporated into the sub-sections under the main findings.
- Lessons learned: Assessment of attainment of indicators, operational and developmental lessons.
- Conclusions and recommendations.
- Annexes: TOR, Itinerary, List of people/groups involved in evaluation (interviewed, consulted, met, etc.), List of documents reviewed/data sources, tools used for evaluation and analysis.

Note: We will encourage regular contact between ADRA and the evaluators to ensure a good understanding of the project activities and the evaluation recommendations. In this context, we envisage at least two meetings:

- Briefing (After the desk review of project documents and before starting the field mission): the evaluators will explain the approach and methodology of the evaluation to ADRA team and the co-implementing partner.
- De-briefing (after completion of the field mission): the evaluators will share the pre-liminary findings and recommendations, which will be developed in the draft report and ADRA and the co-implementing partner will provide a first reaction to them, as appropriate.

### **Timeframe and duration of the evaluation**

---

A total of **22** payable working days is planned for this evaluation:

- 2 days desk review (clarify matters arising from the documents reviewed previously);
- 3 days designing and finalizing the interview and survey questionnaires;
- 6 days field assessment (visiting Mae Sot and interviewing key stakeholders) including training of enumerators as necessary;
- 1 day preparation of preliminary findings to present to ADRA and HRDF;
- 3 days of data entry and analysis (including data entry and analysis for quantitative survey);
- 5 days writing of the draft report (give two weeks for ADRA to provide comments to the draft report);

- 2 days to address comments from ADRA and finalize the report.

The ADRA project team in Mae Sot will facilitate the planning of the field itinerary. Ground transportation, translation/interpretation, printing/photocopy costs, quantitative survey related costs during the field mission will be covered by ADRA.

## **Required Qualifications of the Consultant Undertaking the Evaluation**

---

### ***Technical Expertise and Skills***

- **Evaluation Experience:** Minimum of 5 years of experience in using the OECD-DAC framework and gender-sensitive evaluation approaches in evaluations of similar scale and scope.
- **Technical Expertise:** Demonstrated experience evaluating human rights, migration, or advocacy-focused programs, preferably in Thailand or Southeast Asia.
- **Skills:** Excellent analytical, writing, and reporting skills in English.
- **Ethics:** Proven commitment to ethical research standards and safeguarding principles.

### ***Relevant Experience and Background***

- **Education:** Advanced degree in social sciences, development studies, human rights, or a related field.
- **Professional Experience:** Advanced degree and at least 10 years of experience in conducting evaluations, baseline studies, or impact assessments for development or advocacy projects.
- **Field Experience:** Prior work with migrant communities, Civil Society Organizations, or grassroots networks in Thailand or the Mekong region.
- **Contextual Knowledge:** Strong understanding of the Thai–Myanmar border context and migration dynamics.

### ***Budget***

- **Budget:** The proposed budget should be reasonable and demonstrate cost efficiency in relation to the proposed methodology, scope, and deliverables.

**Eligibility Requirement:** Applicants who have previously worked on this project in any consultancy capacity (e.g., as a trainer or workshop facilitator) are not eligible to apply.

## **Submission of applications**

---

Applications should be submitted no later than 25 November 2025.

Applications in English language, including i) a resume of no more than 3 pages; ii) a technical proposal outlining methodologies, evaluation design and ethical approaches (no more than 3 pages); iii) detailed budget to carry out this consultancy, costs including consultant fee, travel to Mae Sot if based outside of Mae Sot, accommodation in the field; iv) contact details of 2 references should be submitted by email to [linda@adrathailand.org](mailto:linda@adrathailand.org), copy [dararai@adrathailand.org](mailto:dararai@adrathailand.org);

## **Evaluation of applications**

---

Applications will be reviewed by the Selection Committee within 3-5 days the application deadline. All applications will be assessed against the ten criteria outlined in the “Required Qualifications of the Consultant Undertaking the Evaluation” section. Each criterion will be scored on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = Very Poor, 2 = Poor, 3 = Adequate, 4 = Good, and 5 = Very Good. Based on the total scores, the three highest-scoring applicants will be shortlisted for further comparison. The applicant achieving the highest

overall score following the assessment will be awarded the contract. We regret that we are only able to contact the successful candidate once the Selection Committee has completed its review.

---