

Feeling good about feeling bad...

A global review of evaluation
in anti-trafficking initiatives



Global Alliance Against Traffic in Women

Feeling good about feeling bad...

A Global Review of Evaluation in Anti-Trafficking Initiatives

© 2010 Global Alliance Against Traffic in Women (GAATW)

Researchers

Caroline Hames, GAATW-IS

Fleur Dewar, GAATW-IS

Rebecca Napier-Moore, GAATW-IS

Design and Lay out

GAATW International Secretariat

*Acknowledgments to Ms Helga Konrad and
Ms Gerda Theuermann for their detailed
comments and edits.*

*Title credited to David A. Feingold, Ph.D.
Director, Ophidian Research Institute*

Global Alliance Against Traffic in Women

P.O. Box 36 Bangkok Noi, Post Office

Bangkok, Thailand 10700

Email: gaatw@gaatw.org

Website: www.gaatw.org

FOREWORD

To a large extent, anti-trafficking efforts operate without a sufficient evidence-base. Ten years after the unveiling of the United Nation Human Trafficking Protocol there is still a dearth of reliable information on the scope and nature of this highly globalized crime and horrendous violation of human rights. Information on its dynamics, on its interrelations with other crimes, on the various forms, on the trafficking routes, on the *modi operandi* of the traffickers as well as on how trafficking in persons affects our societies and hampers good governance, is still limited.

Although much money has been spent: hundreds of projects at national, regional and international levels have been carried out and recommendations formulated; identification-checklists and standards for victim protection have been developed; training material has been produced and national plans of action crafted; countless conferences, symposia, and meetings have been organized; a continuing stream of commentators, researchers and analysts have informed on the intricacy of the problem; and, many policy tools have been applied - surprisingly little is known about the impact of anti-trafficking responses, efforts, measures and activities.

Data collection in the field of human trafficking must be improved. One of the most important requirements is to enable (and to fund) the production of qualitative knowledge that is as objective as possible. Apart from more specific research into the clandestine side of the crime, evaluation of all anti-trafficking responses, measures and actions must be undertaken.

So far, evaluation has been little more than an afterthought and at best conceived as self-edited reporting on project outcomes by governmental and non-governmental actors alike. This is not enough. What is needed, is independent external objective evaluation; evaluation that is based on professional methodology and standards, informed by trafficking expertise.

Evaluation is the single most critical addition necessary to strengthen anti-trafficking work; resources for evaluation must be an integral part of all anti-trafficking projects.

This report highlights the importance of comprehensive evaluation, and throws new light on evaluation as an essential means of preventing misdevelopment and - eventually - as an incentive to avoid pouring good money after bad.

Helga Konrad
Independent Consultant on Combating Trafficking in Human Beings

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This research explores and assesses the evaluation of anti-trafficking policies and programmes worldwide, including three international, two regional and nine national anti-trafficking initiatives. It highlights common themes and emerging patterns between a range of approaches to evaluation in this sector and finds overwhelmingly that anti-trafficking initiatives are not being sufficiently evaluated, impeding the effectiveness of anti-trafficking responses and limiting progress in combating trafficking. Urgent action in the form of adequate evaluation systems is imperative to ensure anti-trafficking programmes are effectively targeted and delivered.

WHY IS THERE A NEED TO TAKE STOCK OF ANTI-TRAFFICKING INITIATIVES?

Great attention has been paid to combating trafficking at all geographical levels, particularly since the adoption of the Human Trafficking Protocol in 2003, however progress remains slow and the International Labour Organisation (ILO) continues to cite 2.4 million people trafficked at any given time. The lack of progress in anti-trafficking is largely due to inadequate data and insufficient knowledge of the scope or scale of the problem and how it should be tackled. Comprehensive evaluation of anti-trafficking initiatives would reduce this information gap; ensuring programmes are successfully targeted, rights-based and effective.

HOW COULD EVALUATION IMPROVE TRAFFICKING RESPONSES?

Evaluation offers the opportunity not only to collect data about anti-trafficking projects, programmes or frameworks but also to use such data to assess whether objectives and wider goals have been met. Data collected can provide an evidence-base to inform and improve strategic and programmatic decisions. Impact evaluations can offer even greater benefits and are particularly useful in the anti-trafficking context where it is often difficult to clearly define target groups and predict sometimes far-reaching and unintended consequences. As anti-trafficking work primarily depends upon human rights recognition, monitoring and evaluation methodologies can be further enhanced by integrating human rights impact assessments.

WHAT DOES ‘GOOD EVALUATION’ LOOK LIKE IN THE ANTI-TRAFFICKING CONTEXT?

Evaluation is embedded in the programmes and policies of many related sectors, including international development and social assistance. In the development sector, much evaluation is based upon broadly agreed principles established by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC). Such principles provide a firm foundation for evaluation in the anti-trafficking context. Moreover, in this context a number of implementation guidance tools stress the importance of respecting trafficked persons’ human rights, above all seeking to ensure anti-trafficking interventions do *“not adversely affect the human rights and dignity of persons, in particular the rights of those who have been trafficked...”*

Accordingly, ‘good evaluation’ should:

- be conducted by independent and impartial evaluators;
- make methodological frameworks, conclusions and recommendations public and widely available;
- evaluate initiatives for fulfillment of objectives, impact and effects, as well as efficiency and sustainability. Lessons learnt should be documented;
- include the participation of recipients and target groups in the evaluation process;
- evaluate the human rights impact; and
- determine what obstacles prevent effective evaluation of anti-trafficking initiatives.

WHAT ARE THE OBSTACLES TO EFFECTIVE EVALUATION OF ANTI-TRAFFICKING INITIATIVES?

Confusion between monitoring and evaluation is a key obstacle to effective evaluation. Notably, ongoing monitoring of anti-trafficking efforts is common, enabling implementing parties to assess progress in meeting project outputs or achieving objectives. In many instances, therefore, effective data collection methods and processes are in place. However, monitoring is often perceived as an end in its own right, to the exclusion of evaluation. While monitoring plays an important role in project management, it is distinct from evaluation and should be treated as such. Evaluation must be accorded due significance in programme assessment. Where evaluations of anti-trafficking initiatives do take place, they are often carried out by internal rather than independent, impartial evaluators often resulting in uncritical and biased findings.

Impact assessment, a key element of effective evaluation, is rarely implemented by anti-trafficking stakeholders. This in-depth evaluation method builds on ‘traditional’ evaluations by integrating direct and indirect as well as intended or unintended consequences of a given intervention. Critically, impact assessments add context analysis to evaluation, taking into account the environment and conditions within which an intervention has taken place. With impact assessments often more expensive than other evaluation methods, it can be difficult to access requisite levels of funding. This is demonstrated by the fact that none of the case studies assessed included full impact evaluations.

Transparency is crucial to the credibility of evaluations. This involves not only making evaluation reports public, but also publishing methodological frameworks. While many of the evaluations analysed for this research were made public, few detailed their methodological framework. It is difficult to rely on evaluation reports without knowing how findings have been reached. Similarly, many evaluations failed to assess the degree to which project objectives were achieved, rendering them baseless.

WHAT ARE THE CONSEQUENCES OF INADEQUATE EVALUATIONS ON ANTI-TRAFFICKING WORK?

Whilst the impacts of inadequate evaluation on the success of a given anti-trafficking initiative are far reaching, two specific areas which are often overlooked are particularly salient. Firstly failure to evaluate for efficiency: assessment of the impact of a programme against its costs is critical in the anti-trafficking sector where financial and human resources are insufficient to meet the task in hand. It is, therefore, astounding that most evaluations analysed for this report failed to assess programme efficiency in regards to management and value for money. Resources cannot be properly targeted without evaluation for efficiency.

Critically, evaluation processes that exclude trafficked persons are fundamentally flawed. Most anti-trafficking stakeholders now espouse the virtues of ‘victim-centered’ approaches, centered on trafficked persons, yet in practice trafficked people and often civil society organisations are left out of most evaluations. Human rights, also a core element of ‘victim-centered’ approaches, have been largely overlooked by evaluators of anti-trafficking interventions. Without trafficked persons or their human rights included in evaluations there is no space for assessment of the impact of an intervention on the rights and dignity of persons. The failure to understand and evaluate this area not only detracts from the protection of trafficked persons but also reduces the chances of ensuring crimes are prevented and prosecuted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To all those implementing anti-trafficking initiatives:

- Link evaluation to objectives and be clear about beneficiaries and stakeholders from the outset. Critically, trafficked persons, often the target of anti-trafficking interventions, must not be excluded from evaluations;
- Establish comprehensive evaluation methodology and allocate associated adequate financial and human resources from the outset;
- Ensure preconditions for evaluation are in place, i.e. the provision of benchmarks; establishment of clear objectives, and collection of baseline data;
- Engage independent evaluators and trafficking experts, including trafficked persons, their service providers and advocates to conduct evaluations. The appointment of independent national rapporteurs or ombudspersons provides invaluable assistance and credibility to national evaluations;
- Evaluations, including their methodologies, should be made public;
- Evaluate for relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability, with specific reference to impact on human rights;
- Impact assessments offer critical added value, ensuring anti-trafficking initiatives do no harm;
- Ensure human rights, as an integral part of human trafficking responses, are also key to all aspects of anti-trafficking evaluations;
- Following effective evaluations, develop mechanisms for feeding successes, best practices as well as failures or lessons learnt into future policy and programme design.

CONTENTS

Foreword	3
Executive Summary	4
Recommendations	6
Acronym Glossary	8
Introduction	9
Methodology for analysis.....	9
Findings.....	10
Evaluation of Anti-Trafficking Initiatives	10
Independent, Impartial and Transparent Evaluation	10
Assessing Project Objectives	12
Assessing for Impacts and Effects	13
Evaluating for Project Efficiencies, Sustainability of Impacts and Lessons Learnt.....	16
Trafficked Persons in the Evaluation Process	16
Evaluating for Human Rights Impact	17
Conclusion	20
Annex: Case Studies	21
Reviewed international monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.....	21
Reviewed regional monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.....	21
Reviewed national monitoring and evaluation mechanisms:.....	22

ACRONYM GLOSSARY

ANAO	The Australian National Audit Organisation
CoE	Council of Europe
COMMIT	Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative Against Trafficking
CoP	Conference of Parties
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
GAATW	The Global Alliance against Traffic in Women
GAO	US Government Accountability Office
GRETA	Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
THB	Trafficking in Human Beings
TIP	Trafficking in Persons
UN GIFT	The United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking
UNIAP	United Nations Inter-Agency Project on Human Trafficking in the Greater Mekong Sub-Region
UNODC	The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNTOC	The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime

INTRODUCTION

Despite the enormous investment in anti-trafficking efforts², as well as significant media and political attention, the International Labour Organisation (ILO) continues to cite 2.4 million people trafficked at any given time³ and the extent to which anti-trafficking efforts have impacted on incidences of trafficking or the lives of trafficked persons remains largely unknown.⁴ The scarce research exploring the consequences of anti-trafficking initiatives shows many to be counter-productive, causing harm to the very people they are intended to benefit. For example, a review of the impact of anti-trafficking initiatives on human rights, undertaken in eight countries in 2007, found initiatives repeatedly undermined or violated the human rights of trafficked persons, migrants and sex workers.⁵ The negative consequences of anti-trafficking initiatives demonstrates the urgent need for comprehensive evaluation processes to assess their impact, improve effectiveness and reduce harm, and hold those responsible for policy and programme implementation to account.⁶

This research assesses whether anti-trafficking initiatives are evaluated and, if so, how successful they have been in ensuring work is accurately targeted, rights-based and effective. As one anti-trafficking stakeholder asked, without adequate information about what's working and what's not in anti-trafficking are we just wasting time '*feeling good about feeling bad*'?

METHODOLOGY FOR ANALYSIS

The methodological framework for this research draws upon the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD/DAC) Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance, which define evaluation as:

*an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an ongoing or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors.*⁷

Further theoretical basis has been taken from the commitments made in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005), and subsequent Accra Agenda for Action (2008), which seek to expand efforts to manage aid for results:

*The capacity to plan, manage, implement, and account for results of policies and programmes, is critical for achieving development objectives - from analysis and dialogue through implementation, monitoring and evaluation.*⁸

Literature on evaluations in development, public policy and programme management has also contributed to our methodological framework, including the United States Government Accountability Office report on monitoring and evaluating anti-trafficking responses.⁹

Furthermore, while no human rights-based evaluation guidelines exist (though we understand this is forthcoming from the *Aim for Human Rights* project), we have drawn on the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) Recommended Principles and Guidelines on Human Rights and Human Trafficking.¹⁰

The case studies in this research, include three international, two regional and nine national initiatives. Within these geographical levels, case studies include governmental action plans on trafficking, initiatives led by intergovernmental organisations and a private sector programme (see Annex: Case Studies for a description of each case study reviewed). In terms of sampling, we chose cases for their varying evaluatory strengths, which allows us to highlight positive and negative elements of both robust and minimal/no evaluations. Access to information gives our case selection some bias. For instance, many of the national cases are in countries in which we have members or friends who had access to information or contacts about evaluation in their countries. Two treaty body monitoring mechanisms have been intentionally included because it is crucial that such mechanisms are aligned with evaluation best practice. It should be noted that some evaluation processes reviewed are in their initial stages and still may not have delivered findings. However, in such instances analysis of methodology and approach is still possible and relevant.

In accordance with the methodological framework, the case studies have been analysed on the following five areas: The extent to which evaluation is conducted; Independence, impartiality and transparency; Scope of evaluation, including fulfillment of objectives and impact and effects; Efficiency, sustainability and lessons learnt; Participation of recipients; and, Human rights.

FINDINGS

EVALUATION OF ANTI-TRAFFICKING INITIATIVES

In almost all of the initiatives reviewed, some form of evaluation was conducted, however, none fully complied with the DAC Principles for Evaluation. In some instances, evaluation was entirely absent, with project monitoring perceived to have fulfilled that function. While monitoring plays an important role in programme management, it is not a substitute for evaluation. Evaluation is critical for understanding the impact and effectiveness (or otherwise) of anti-trafficking initiatives; without evaluation it is impossible to understand how to best prevent trafficking and effectively assist those affected.

There is widespread cross-sector agreement that evaluation measures should be integral to the development and implementation of policies and aid for social justice programmes. Such measures are essential to:

- establish the impact of initiatives
- improve the effectiveness of programmes and policies and reduce harm
- hold those responsible for policy and programme implementation to account.¹¹

Despite consensus on the need for evaluation, this research reveals it is either absent from anti-trafficking initiatives or implemented so poorly and weakly understood that it is rendered ineffective. This is particularly true of national anti-trafficking initiatives, with analysis showing initiatives in Russia, Peru, Austria and Spain lack evaluation measures. While the governments of Spain and Austria publish ‘updates’ or ‘reviews’ of their anti-trafficking initiatives, these simply constitute status updates, such as ‘complete’ or ‘in action’,¹² rather than a thorough assessment of the relevance of activities undertaken, how objectives are being met, whether they are efficient and effective, and their impact and sustainability.

Often anti-trafficking initiatives claiming to incorporate evaluation under the banner of ‘monitoring and evaluation’ consistently failed to provide any such evaluation, of policy or programmes, focusing exclusively on monitoring. Anti-trafficking initiatives of Spain and Austria made this oversight.¹³

Although the terms ‘monitoring’ and ‘evaluation’ are commonly used in tandem, they are distinctive in both purpose and design and, therefore, should not be used interchangeably. Monitoring is an ongoing review of implementation against project goals or anticipated outputs. Evaluation is a much more rigorous process conducted after a set period of implementation in order to assess the project theory against results. A further crucial difference between monitoring and evaluation is the independence of the evaluator, as noted by Binnendijk:

Monitoring is usually seen as an ongoing process of data collection, carried out ‘in-house’, in order to track inputs and outputs, serving the interest and need of the management staff. Evaluations, on the other hand, are typically periodic or single studies, conducted by teams external to the project, which attempt to measure intermediate results and longer-term impacts.¹⁴

Whilst ongoing reporting and monitoring of activities is critical to ensuring accountability, credibility and coherence in anti-trafficking work, evaluation permits broader assessment of whether activities are contributing to ideological goals and paradigm shifts required for anti-trafficking efforts to succeed.

INDEPENDENT, IMPARTIAL AND TRANSPARENT EVALUATION

The practice of self-evaluation over independent or external evaluation was common, and in all instances could be linked to uncritical or biased findings. This was in stark contrast to evaluations conducted by independent bodies, where analysis, conclusions and recommendations were more comprehensive and critical. In the majority of cases reviewed, evaluation reports were made public, however, in some cases, access to reports was restricted, making it difficult to hold the implementing bodies to account on report findings. Evaluation methodologies largely lacked transparency, as few reports detailed their research processes, making a quality assessment of the reports impossible. If anti-trafficking efforts are to be robust and evidence-based, evaluation needs to be credible - providing for independent evaluations is key to this achievement.

Impartiality, independence and transparency are critical to the effectiveness and credibility of evaluations and should be considered at all stages of the evaluation process. As stated in the DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance:

Impartiality contributes to the credibility of evaluation and the avoidance of bias in findings, analyses and conclusions. Independence provides legitimacy to evaluation and reduces the potential for conflict of interest which could arise if policy makers and managers were solely responsible for evaluating their own activities...The evaluation process as a whole should be as open as possible with results made widely available.¹⁵

In case studies where evaluations did take place, there was a notable absence of independence and impartiality. Self-evaluation was common and in this context correlates to uncritical findings, analyses and conclusions, as well as bias in recommendations. While reflection and self-evaluation are important elements of evaluations and programme cycles, offering internal insight into initiatives which often cannot be provided by external evaluators, independent evaluation often brings greater critical analysis. The limitations of self-evaluation are evident in United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime's (UNODC) summary report¹⁶, based on the Human Trafficking Protocol self-evaluation questionnaire responses submitted by States Parties.

As Secretariat to the Convention, the UNODC has a vested interest in making recommendations which serve to strengthen its role in implementing the Convention and its Protocols, and ensuring it does not antagonise States Parties to the Convention on whom it relies for funding and political support.

Analysis of concluding comments in the report reveals most recommendations would indeed strengthen the functions of the UNODC if implemented. There were no such recommendations advising State parties to partner with other intergovernmental organisations with expertise in this field, such as those specialising in human rights or social protection. A less partial approach might create opportunities for collaboration which could facilitate more expert, comprehensive, efficient and sustainable implementation of UNTOC.

Similarly, the Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative Against Trafficking (COMMIT) Annual Progress Reports are produced by the programme's administrating body, the United Nations Inter-Agency Project on Human Trafficking in the Greater Mekong Sub-Region (UNIAP). The 2009 report provides a summary of the progress of the six participating Mekong countries toward the agreed targets, but provides no assessment of the activities undertaken.¹⁷ Only "activity highlights" are emphasised; insufficient or inadequate activity and inactivity is not discussed. As the role of UNIAP involves offering simultaneous support to "Governments in the institutionalization of effective multi-sectoral approaches to combat trafficking"¹⁸ whilst also evaluating their performance, a clear conflict of interest exists. Interestingly, a semi-independent evaluation of UNIAP was conducted in 2009, drawing on the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. The result is a balanced evaluation which looks critically at the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the programme.¹⁹

The practice of self-evaluation in the anti-trafficking field is further evident in the national context. The responsibility for undertaking evaluations of the Austrian, Spanish, and Kenyan national plans of action for example lies with their implementing bodies. Whilst Kenya is yet to conduct any evaluation, in the cases of Austria and Spain, the results are similar to the COMMIT example, where reports take the shape of a non-critical monitoring report.²⁰

Despite an absence of impartiality and independence in the evaluation of many anti-trafficking initiatives, there are good examples where independent evaluations are proposed and conducted. For example, both the Thai and Dutch governments make provisions for independent evaluations of their national anti-trafficking policies and programmes. In 2000, the Netherlands appointed a National Rapporteur on Trafficking in Human Beings, to regularly evaluate the implementation of relevant policies. The Rapporteur is independent to the government and submits annual reports to the Dutch government on their implementation.²¹

An independent performance audit of the management of the Australian Government's Action Plan to Eradicate Trafficking in Persons aimed to assess: arrangements for overseeing the Action Plan; and whether the Plan's measures had been administered effectively to deliver the intended results. The Australian National Audit Organisation (ANAO) found that while the action plan identified four key indicators for measuring success, no measurement or reporting of these indicators has occurred to date. It stated:

Greater discipline in seeking to measure the effectiveness of strategies employed would enable the agencies to refine their individual approaches, and better inform government and the Parliament as to the success of the overall anti-trafficking strategy.²²

The ANAO's independence clearly enabled a critical review of anti-trafficking initiatives in Australia, their processes and practices. The report's recommendations and conclusions, if taken up, should greatly improve anti-trafficking responses in Australia.

The United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking (UN. GIFT) has outsourced its evaluation to an independent evaluation firm.²³ Whilst the evaluation report has not yet been published, this is a positive move. The evaluation mechanism of the Council of Europe (CoE) Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings provides for impartial and independent evaluation of the Convention's implementation: The Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (GRETA), comprising 13 independent experts chosen at the Conference of Parties to the Convention, and the Council of Europe Conference of Parties to the Convention together constitutes the evaluation body. GRETA established its own rules of procedure, including the rules and scope of evaluations to be undertaken. As the evaluation process began in February 2010 and the evaluation questionnaires sent to States under review have not yet been responded to, reports from GRETA are not yet available. Therefore, no assessment of their impartiality in practice can be made. Evaluations of MTV EXIT and the International Organisation for Migration's (IOM) Cambodia project were conducted by independent consultants.

As noted in the DAC Principles transparency is also important, bringing validity and credibility to conducted evaluations. In many instances - such as Thailand, the Netherlands, Austria, Spain, Australia, Thailand, COMMIT, UNIAP and UNTOC - reports were made easily accessible to the public. In other instances, however, accessing the evaluations was more difficult. For example, although extensive, MTV EXIT's reporting is not yet available to the public. In another example, the United Kingdom (UK) Action Plan on Tackling Human Trafficking makes reference to the need for evaluation throughout. However, the only document available to the public is the monitoring report *Update to the United Kingdom Action Plan on Tackling Human Trafficking*.²⁴ It is thus unclear whether or not these evaluations have taken place, how the evaluations might be informing policy and programmes, and the effectiveness of the Plan in meeting its objectives. Similarly the Nigeria Plan of Action makes provisions for the "*commissioning of an independent consultant to carry out impact assessment survey and produce and disseminate National Annual TIP Reports and fact sheets*".²⁵ Whilst such a step would be welcome, it remains unclear if such an evaluation has actually taken place.

It is important that the evaluation process and final reports are transparent. Only MTV EXIT, which has a relatively unique evaluation procedure, provided detailed methodologies used in reporting.²⁶

ASSESSING PROJECT OBJECTIVES

While the scope of evaluations undertaken varied, most did not assess the extent to which objectives were achieved. In some instances, detailed actions of a programme were outlined, but no attempt to assess how undertaken activities are contributing to the overall objectives was made. In other cases, specific elements of a particular project were assessed, but not the project in its entirety, rendering the assessment incomplete. Barriers to effectively evaluating objectives included no provisions for initial baseline data collection and the execution of poor methodologies, such as surveys or interviews with poorly designed questions, and incorrectly identifying survey or interview participants. Without assessing how undertaken activities are meeting anti-trafficking initiative objectives, it is impossible to know how effective we are in reducing trafficking and providing quality assistance to trafficked persons.

Project objectives must be robust and meaningful; to ensure effective evaluation, project objectives must be clearly defined at the outset, with operational plans and relevant baseline data included. Evaluation of the fulfillment of prioritised objectives should then take place. The DAC Principles state that effectiveness of aid is "*a measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives*".²⁷ Evaluations should assess to what extent objectives were or are likely to be achieved and what the major factors influencing the achievement of those objectives.

This review found that many evaluations do not measure the extent to which the programme's objectives were achieved. Some reports detail actions taken, but do not assess whether objectives were met through those actions. Spain, for instance, provides a status update on actions outlined in the Spanish Action Plan; however, no evaluation of how these actions are meeting the overall objectives is made.

Furthermore, in both the plan and the annual report, no reference to benchmarks, indicators or baseline data is made, making it impossible to assess fulfillment of objectives.

Some evaluations assess only part of a policy, project or programme's objectives. The GRETA/CoE questionnaire, for instance, does not examine whether the one of the purposes of the Convention, "guaranteeing gender equality"²⁸ is being met. Whilst the target groups of interventions are questioned and other objectives are evaluated, there is little reference to women or lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex people as specific groups in order to interrogate the gender equality aspects of the Convention's purpose. There are, however, questions, which relate to human rights.

The evaluation process for UN.GIFT, which includes an online questionnaire and a more detailed semi-structured interview, largely focuses on awareness of its own programmatic work. One question asks "which aspects of trafficking does your organization focus on?"²⁹ The implication is that survey respondents already work in this field. A broad sample of several hundred, largely anti-trafficking, stakeholders responded to UN.GIFT's online evaluation survey many of whom may not have had anything to do with UN.GIFT.³⁰ It seems, therefore, that the evaluation is of the success in raising awareness of UN.GIFT and the UN work on trafficking in general rather than in raising awareness of the issue of trafficking. This fails to account for the primary objective of raising awareness of human trafficking.

Other evaluations, such as that of UNIAP, look at objectives and show where the project either succeeded or not. This offers more effective evaluation as it allows for lessons learnt and recommendations to be incorporated in future programme design in order to improve outcomes.

ASSESSING FOR IMPACTS AND EFFECTS

We found this more thorough, resource intensive and complex form of evaluation was rarely attempted or conducted with efficiency or success. In some instances, the intention to assess impact was stated in a project or evaluation plan, but not carried out in practice. Where impact assessment was carried out, it was often limited to analyses of the direct impact of a project in relation to set objectives, and did not assess for wider or unanticipated impacts.

Impacts are defined by the OECD as "Positive and negative, primary and secondary long term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended".³¹

By integrating direct and indirect effects as well as intended or unintended consequences of a given development intervention, impact evaluation is a more involved and sustainable form of evaluating project outcomes than 'traditional' evaluation methodologies. As noted above, whilst 'traditional' evaluation aims to assess the way in which a project's progress or outcomes is contributing to reaching the overall project goal, impact evaluation incorporates broader ripple effects of implementation and in this way can capture unexpected outcomes, both good and bad.

Although many evaluations of anti-trafficking responses acknowledge the merits of impact evaluation, few succeed in effectively establishing the stringent methodological and theoretical frameworks required to adequately assess impact. The Nigerian Plan of Action on trafficking, for example, states an intention to commission an independent consultant-led impact assessment and yet those working on trafficking in Nigeria suggest that thus far evaluations have only resulted in "it's-all-good-we're-doing-very-excellent-work-thank-you-very-much kind of reports".³² Similarly, the Dutch National Rapporteur's stated objective is to report "the nature and extent of human trafficking in the Netherlands, and on the effects of the anti-trafficking policy pursued".³³ In practice, however, her report lists developments in legislation and programmes and areas of concern or challenge, with little analysis of the effects or impacts of anti-trafficking frameworks. Likewise, the UNODC asserts the importance of "considering the actual impact of [such] legislation or measures"³⁴ but fails to explore impact evaluation in its entirety, detailing what is meant by impact evaluation in quantitative terms while omitting any information on qualitative impact evaluation.

Roche defines impact evaluation as:

*the systematic analysis of the lasting or significant changes - positive or negative, intended or not - in people's lives significant or lasting changes in people's lives, brought about by a given action or series of actions.*³⁵

He also notes the importance of context in assessing changes which might have taken place as a result of an intervention:

Development and change are never solely the product of a managed process undertaken by development agencies and NGOs [non-governmental organization]. Rather they are the result of wider processes that are the product of many social, economic, political, historical and environmental factors.³⁶

While impact assessment is time and resource intensive, a broad (vs. narrow) impact assessment is even more so. Roche's definition of impact evaluation suggests a wider look at impacts, a project's ripple effects, intended and not, as part of and interacting with wider social, economic, political, historical and environmental factors. He also acknowledges that in doing so the critical questions of causality arises, as the broader the scope and reach of the evaluation, the harder it becomes to attribute causes and effects.

The World Bank impact evaluation group and other development actors employ a quantitative model to identify causality of impacts, through a counterfactual analysis.³⁷ In contrast to Roche's definition, this analysis emphasises enumerating the changes that have taken place by means of establishing a counterfactual. This is done by identifying a sample 'without' the intervention (the counterfactual) to compare to those 'with' the intervention (the factual), seeking means to eliminate bias or contamination of assessment groups. Perceived differences in the 'with' sample may be credited to the development intervention by drawing on this counterfactual.

The choice of methods to achieve the counterfactual in impact evaluations is important to note. Whereas traditional evaluations might draw solely upon either quantitative or qualitative methodologies, impact evaluation necessitates mixed methodologies. White³⁸ breaks down the question of whether a development intervention has been successful into three further questions: why, how and at what cost? He argues that it is necessary to draw on qualitative and quantitative data in order to effectively answer these questions. An example of this for anti-trafficking projects would be identifying why an awareness campaign has been successful by including a qualitative analysis of attitudinal shifts. Such analysis could draw on participatory, anthropological and sociological primary and secondary research including exposure visits to project sites.

In order to establish adequate counterfactuals in the anti-trafficking context, many more baseline surveys are required. As one prominent anti-trafficking expert noted in background discussions on this research, funders rarely wish to put money into baseline data collection, often resulting in its removal from the project. However, the UNIAP mid-term evaluation and UNIAP staff interviewed for the purpose of this research cite the importance of impact assessment to ensuring that financial resources channeled into anti-trafficking responses are used wisely and effectively³⁹. The independent evaluators of the UN.GIFT programme noted that no baselines were conducted prior to establishing the logical framework. This places a strong emphasis on increasing awareness and knowledge, but without baseline data it is impossible to assess from what level these have increased. MTV EXIT and the IOM Cambodia project include baseline surveys.

The recent GRETA questionnaire produced for the purpose of providing "an overview of implementation of the CoE Convention"⁴⁰ goes some way towards establishing a meaningful baseline as a foundation for a future counterfactual analysis. A quantitative survey is included in the questionnaire, but there is also a qualitative aspect probing programme theory of the impact of anti-trafficking measures on trafficked persons:

Section II. 1. Q. 22 Has a national/regional/local campaign or programme to alert the potential victims of THB to the various forms of exploitation been carried out in your country during the last two years? If so, was it based on research for determining effective prevention methods? [...] If possible please provide an assessment of the impact of the campaign/programme [...]; and Q. 31 Has an assessment of the impact of the above mentioned preventative measures taken by your country been carried out? If so, please specify the results of the assessment.⁴¹

However, it remains to be seen whether meaningful baseline data will be established for each Party to the CoE Convention and whether such data will then be used to form part of a counterfactual analysis or a periodic evaluation process. One clear potential obstacle to a rigorous impact evaluation in this instance could be found in State's responses to the questionnaire, which have not yet been collected.

Whilst the counterfactual provides a means of identifying and quantifying effects, an accompanying programme theory adds the explanation of why the effects have taken place, uncovering the contents of what is termed the 'black box'. A theory-based impact evaluation maps out the theory of change

(outcomes and impacts) in a given context and draws upon a credible counterfactual using various methods.

Programme theory guides the programme practice by indicating how goals are to be achieved, what impact might be anticipated, generated and mitigated. This also permits analysis of short and long-term impacts and the knock-on effect of the former on the latter. A baseline survey produced as early as possible, including an analysis of potential impacts and incorporating a wide range of perspectives, assists accurate programme theory development. Further context analysis is crucial to this method, applying the “*social, economic, political, historical and environmental*” analytical lenses outlined in Roche’s definition above.

Often, however, where logical framework theory does exist, it fails to include contextual factors. The UK Multi-Agency Action Plan on Tackling Human Trafficking sets out objectives, actions, the party responsible for delivering the action, and an assessment tool or indicator. Evaluations for effectiveness and impact are included in the plan. However, interim evaluation findings report success on the basis of increased trafficking convictions or training of police officers on human trafficking, rather than the impact of these activities on trafficked persons or the reduction of trafficking.⁴²

Conversely, the audit of the Australian Action Plan to Eradicate Trafficking in Persons, which also aimed to assess oversight and effective administration, did go some way towards meeting its aims. The ANAO found that while the Action Plan identified four key indicators for measuring success, no measurement or reporting of these indicators had yet occurred. It highlighted the unanticipated impact of anti-trafficking measures, noting, “*the absence of adequate guidance in a number of important areas has resulted in inconsistent application of the law [which has] resulted in inconsistent outcomes for alleged victims*”.⁴³

A well-designed impact evaluation can answer the question of whether an anti-trafficking programme or policy is working or not, highlight lessons for improving future or similar initiatives, and hold implementers to account for their actions.⁴⁴ While this highly complex field is difficult to evaluate, thorough impact evaluations in this field are essential. As the Global Alliance against Traffic in Women’s (GAATW) 2007 publication *Collateral Damage*⁴⁵ shows, the absence of impact evaluations in anti-trafficking programmes contributes directly not only to the failure of such programmes to reduce trafficking, but in actually causing harm to those they intended to assist.

An impact assessment with a wide remit might look at impacts affected by the intervention on women, sex workers or migrating people and how it is interacting with other factors. Do people, especially women, face stigma or pressure from the State or communities to migrate or not to migrate? Do returned trafficked persons face discrimination because people are now more aware of trafficking or because they now conflate trafficking with sex work (and judge sex workers negatively)? After learning about trafficking, do States positively do more to help people realise rights to livelihood, or do they restrict people’s right to move? Both could be construed as ways to reduce trafficking, and have different effects on human rights. Both could be policy to address trafficking.

In the few cases where impact evaluations took place, their scope is often limited and there is a reluctance to consider the contextual factors highlighted by Roche. IOM’s Cambodia project evaluation probed the quantities of people who are aware of trafficking or a hotline number promoted following the development intervention, but failed to look at the broader human rights impacts on migrating people or vulnerable groups such as trafficked persons and sex workers. MTV EXIT did not evaluate wide contextual impacts either, evaluating only those directly impacted by the project rather than those indirectly affected as well. This is understandable as those evaluating aid generally only want to evaluate direct project effects. However, if global, regional and national projects do not account for narrow and broad impacts, it is difficult to see how they can significantly contribute to a reduction in trafficking and its harmful effects. One evaluator stated, looking wider would be ‘unfair’ to the project.

Impact evaluation must be based on a clear theory linked to accurately defined programme partners and beneficiaries, whether this is integrated into the concept or logical framework of a programme, or the purpose or aims of a treaty. The UNTOC Conference of Parties (CoP) questionnaire is not framed in the theory provided by the Convention and its Protocol’s purpose and aims, but an awkward article-by-article analysis of the Convention’s implementation. Questionnaires completed by States only offer ‘yes’ or ‘no’ tick box responses to questions about implementation by States of each article, as if each

were a stand-alone treaty. Should any State responses seem at odds with the aims of the Convention, the report on questionnaire responses simply makes note of this rather than expanding on explanations for such inconsistency.

Jamaica reported that the problem of trafficking had never existed in the country and therefore no legislative action had been taken [...] Angola reported that its legislation penalised prostitution but not necessarily for the purpose of exploitation⁴⁶

Impact evaluation goes far beyond traditional monitoring and evaluation methodologies and consequently requires greater time, resources and insight into programmatic theory and anti-trafficking frameworks. As interviews for this research demonstrated it is financial, resource and time constraints that force stakeholders to neglect impact evaluation rather than a lack of will. The OECD reported in 2008 that “*This is a turnaround moment— there is more financing, and greater conviction than ever before that rigorous evaluation can help confront the growing problems*”.⁴⁷ However, it seems that perhaps the anti-trafficking community has some way to go in joining this ‘turnaround’, despite initial signs of a shift in approach to evaluation.

EVALUATING PROJECT EFFICIENCIES, SUSTAINABILITY AND LESSONS LEARNT

The sustainability of results and impacts were rarely considered. The majority of evaluations undertaken did not assess the efficiency of a programme, both in regards to management and value for money. Reflections on lessons learnt were rarely reported, despite being critical to advancing responses, most probably due to the prevalence of self-evaluation and the reluctance of managing bodies to be critical of their own practices.

A broad analysis of the overall success of an initiative, which considers efficiencies (the impacts and effects alongside the costs of a programme, the achievement of objectives in reference to allocated time and budget, and major shortcomings and achievements) should be included in all evaluations.⁴⁸ The sustainability of achievements and impacts is also important to assess, as are lessons learnt for future initiatives.⁴⁹

The UNIAP Report discussed the issue of efficiency in some detail and concludes that the staff and project represent good value for money.⁵⁰ The GRETA/CoE questionnaires also present opportunities for such analysis, including questions such as:

II. 2 Q. 39 Does your state budget allocate specific funding for these assistance and protection measures? Please indicate the amount (in euros), the criteria for receiving such funding and who receives it. Please specify the bodies/agencies/NGOs which actually cover the costs of the different types of assistance?⁵¹

This is in contrast to UNTOC self-assessment questionnaires that do not seek any information on spending, making assessments on efficiency impossible.

Thailand was an exception to the rule in calling for evaluation to improve efficiency. The National Action Plan states:

6.6 Development Plan for Admin-Management 6 year phase (3): Calling for a critical review of current national policy and plan, while probing some possibilities of initiating or creating necessary mechanism to ensure higher and improved efficiency and being able to keep abreast of the rapidly changing situation regarding trafficking.⁵²

No other national reports made such assessments. This is surprising given an increase in public demand for accountability of government spending and international pressure to assess programmes for results, accountability and efficiency; visible for example in the Millennium Development Goals⁵³ and the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness which saw more than 100 governments commit to developing effective and efficient programmes⁵⁴.

Only the UNIAP evaluation explored sustainability. This is concerning as sustainability is critical in measuring a programme’s effectiveness and efficiency and assessing whether it is good value for money. Exploration and detail of lessons learnt were similarly absent, with reports instead preferring to highlight achievements and showcase activities undertaken (see Austria, Spain, UK, COMMIT).

TRAFFICKED PERSONS IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Not one evaluation included trafficked persons in their analysis, despite the fact that they are key recipients of many anti-trafficking programmes and policies and have critical knowledge about trafficking. Very few consulted civil society organisations such as service providers and advocates, either.

Whenever appropriate, the views and expertise of groups affected should form an integral part of evaluation. Trafficked persons are experts on their own trafficking situation. They know what changes and measures

could have made a difference to their situation, but are so rarely asked. Survivors of trafficking can, on a strictly voluntary basis, make important contributions to developing and implementing anti-trafficking interventions and evaluating their impact. Principles of ethical participation are crucial in this instance. These include, but are not limited to:

- being cautious not to induce re-traumatisation
- protecting identity
- treating people as agents with power rather than helpless victims
- avoiding tokenism
- making information and discussions accessible, paying particular attention to literacy and use of jargon
- creating environments in which people can participate as equals with other stakeholders.

Most evaluations in anti-trafficking measures do not include trafficked persons or project recipients, such as potential migrants. Further, few government programme evaluations include civil society. For instance, while the Austrian Task Force on Human Trafficking includes civil society organisations (CSOs), the government report reviewing their anti-trafficking efforts, many of which are overseen or implemented by the Task Force, was produced internally without involvement wider civil society or trafficked persons. Some evaluations, such as UNIAP's, consciously decide not to include trafficked persons. The UNIAP report stated *"Given that UNIAP's role generally does not involve direct service provision to trafficked persons, the evaluators did not include trafficked persons amongst the stakeholders to be consulted. The evaluators' decision was also influenced by 'do no harm' principles, particularly with regard to avoiding any risk to the wellbeing of trafficking survivors."*⁵⁵ However, programmatic work that does impact on trafficked persons directly or indirectly (for instance through policy making or training law enforcement officials) should strongly consider inclusion of trafficked persons and others who might be affected, such as migrants, women or sex workers. In the UNIAP case, even though trafficked persons were not consulted, civil society was to a limited extent. In the list of stakeholders consulted, only approximately 15% included non-governmental organisations, and only approximately 5% of those were national non-governmental organisations⁵⁶.

Some evaluations included civil society, which may or may not equate to inclusion of direct recipients. Civil society may have more direct contact with recipients than government bodies and inclusion of CSOs would be informative. Rule number 7 of GRETA's rules of procedure states that GRETA:

*may decide to address the questionnaire adopted... and any other request for information to specific non-governmental organisations, other relevant organisations and members of civil society of the parties [....] They shall be active in the field of action against trafficking in human beings and preferably national coalitions of organisations, or national branches of international non-governmental organisations. Moreover, they shall have access to reliable sources of information and be capable of carrying out the necessary verifications of this information."*⁵⁷

Whilst this does not commit GRETA to including civil society in their investigations, in practice GRETA members have so far communicated directly with civil society and held consultation meetings with key European civil society networks.

Furthermore, whilst States included civil society in compiling responses to the questionnaire, this is not mandatory and copies of the final reports submitted are not made available to civil society. This suggests participation by civil society is somewhat tokenistic as it allows States to remove critical comments prior to the report's submission to GRETA. One civil society organisation we spoke to that was consulted noted that they had been asked by their respective national government to only respond to certain questions. This further restricts the role of civil society in evaluation, particularly as there is no formal shadow reporting process. The only role of civil society at present is apportioned by GRETA or the State.

EVALUATING FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IMPACT

Consideration of human rights was rare and, where mentioned, not successfully integrated through the evaluation process. Unfortunately, few evaluations of anti-trafficking measures establish clear human rights impact indicators and even fewer make the distinction between enjoyment of rights and obligations to uphold rights. In some cases, the intention to evaluate for human rights was stated but carried out in practice. With research indicating that in many instances anti-trafficking responses violate the human rights of trafficked persons and migrant workers, evaluating for the human rights impact is critical.

The Human Trafficking Protocol Saving Clause (Article 14) notes *"nothing in this protocol shall affect the rights, obligations and responsibilities of States and individuals under international law, including international*

humanitarian law and international human rights law.”⁵⁸ In her annual report, the Dutch National Rapporteur elaborates on this concept in relation to monitoring and evaluation of anti-trafficking work: “For the purposes of a human rights approach to combating human trafficking, a strategy should be developed for dealing with the effects these measures against human trafficking can have on human rights and collateral damage should be avoided as far as possible in the implementation of new policy”.⁵⁹

Stakeholders use various tools and guides to ensure their anti-trafficking programmes are within the human rights framework outlined in UNTOC. For example, in 1999, GAATW, the Foundation for Women and International Human Rights Law Group issued a set of *Human Rights Standards for the Treatment of Trafficked Persons*.⁶⁰ In 2002, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights produced a set of *Recommended Principles and Guidelines on Human Rights and Human Trafficking*, which acts as a guide for anti-trafficking stakeholders when interpreting the human rights provisions in UNTOC. These urge governments, intergovernmental organisations and NGOs to monitor and evaluate “the relationship between the intention of anti-trafficking laws, policies and interventions, and their real impact”, and to distinguish “between measures which actually reduce trafficking and measures which may have the effect of transferring the problem from one place or group to another.”⁶¹ Other stakeholders such as the UN Children’s Fund, the UN Refugee Agency, the IOM and the World Health Organisation have also provided guidance on human rights law as it relates to anti-trafficking.⁶² *Aim for Human Rights* is in the final stages of developing a step-by-step toolkit to aid groups in assessing the impact of human rights laws and measures on trafficked persons and other groups impacted by anti-trafficking measures.⁶³

Common to all interpretations of human rights provisions in UNTOC is a belief that anti-trafficking measures must comply with existing human rights obligations as established in core human rights treaties such as, inter alia, the right to liberty and security, the right to privacy and family life, the right to freedom of movement and freedom of association.

A good example of best practice in monitoring and evaluating for human rights in anti-trafficking measures is the framework established by GRETA. GRETA’s questionnaire to States includes a section dedicated to the “integration of the Human Rights approach to action against trafficking in human beings” and one seeking to “obtain information on the implementation by the parties of measures to protect and promote the rights of victims”⁶⁴ (Sections I and II). Within these sections, various questions aim to establish indicators of States’ human rights approaches to trafficking:

*Section I. Q 4. Please indicate if, in your internal law, THB is considered as a HR violation; Q 5. Please indicate what special legal protection exists under your internal law (including case law if any) in cases of violations of human rights, which would apply in cases of THB; II. 1. Q 23 Please describe the social and economic empowerment measures for disadvantaged groups vulnerable to THB which have been implemented or planned; Section II.Q 55 Please describe the measures taken in your internal law to protect the identity and safety of victims before, during and after investigations and legal proceedings.*⁶⁵

This questionnaire is based on the human rights framework clearly detailed in the CoE Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings. When evaluation is not grounded in such detailed human rights frameworks, various sources can be drawn on to facilitate the adaption of international human rights law and normative standards to monitoring and evaluation indicators. For example, some have integrated established and widely recognised benchmarks, such as those provided by the Millennium Development Goals⁶⁶, as key outcome indicators or measurements. Indicators based on this international framework then provide information which identifies “the extent to which a legal right is fulfilled or enjoyed in a given situation”.⁶⁷

Human rights impact assessment indicators must take into account the critical distinction between having and enjoying rights. This requires moving from the theoretical to the practical, ensuring that relevant information is sourced about the effect on the rights of all those targeted or impacted by a development intervention. Casla talks of two complimentary means of measuring human rights, firstly “the enjoyment approach” and secondly “the obligations approach.”⁶⁸ Human rights indicators must focus simultaneously on the individual enjoyment of rights and a duty-bearer’s obligation to protect, respect and uphold rights. Casla notes that such indicators should, therefore, reflect the principled priority a human rights framework places on the legality of the duty-bearer’s behavior, the impact of legal and administrative processes, and the situation of the marginalised and least well-off.⁶⁹

Unfortunately, few evaluations of anti-trafficking measures establish clear human rights impact indicators and even fewer make the distinction between enjoyment of rights and obligations to uphold rights. The UNTOC questionnaires, for example, only draw on the human rights articles of the Convention as standalone rather than integrated concepts and do not consider duty-bearer’s obligations at all. Indeed, the first

UNTOC questionnaire focuses on crime control, noting that protection and presumably human rights would be considered at a later date. The second questionnaire considers “*matters related to assistance and protection; [...] repatriation; and [...] border measures*”. It is hardly surprising that the Convention has been separated in this abstract manner when UNODC itself notes that the Protocol’s implementation should “*build on a combination of repressive measures against and effective prosecution of traffickers on the one hand and prevention, as well as protection of and assistance to victims of trafficking on the other*”.⁷⁰ Human rights must be integrated into all implementation frameworks if UNTOC is to be successfully implemented and yet the questionnaires fail to mention, let alone establish indicators for, the human rights impact of crime control measures.

The Special Rapporteur on the Right to Health⁷¹, developed a trio of indicators in this regard which, if applied to anti-trafficking interventions, would ensure better integration of human rights impact assessment:

- **Structural:** Evidence of requisite structures for the realisation of human rights (e.g. laws, policies, administrative guides, institutions)
- **Process:** Efforts made to implement structures, programme and practice
- **Outcome:** Impact of programmes, activities and interventions on rights-based targets

Unfortunately, in all case studies researched there is barely any mention of human rights and, where there is, evaluations fail to find appropriate means of integrating evaluation for human rights. The UNIAP mid-term evaluation, for example, notes that the aspects of the programme design would ensure the “*application of gender and human rights perspectives*”.⁷² However, in practice the evaluators fail to adequately assess the human rights impact of programmes and conflate human rights with gender, leaving out any observations related to human rights in favour of gender recommendations. Similarly, the Dutch national rapporteur notes “*measures to combat human trafficking sometimes actually restrict the possibilities and the rights of the people the measures are intended to protect, by curtailing freedom of movement and the right to work, for example*”.⁷³ However this analysis is not applied to the situation in the Netherlands. One evaluator interviewed indicated he would like to find how to incorporate human rights. It seems for the most part that human rights theory and practice are still quite distinct in the minds of anti-trafficking stakeholders.

CONCLUSION

Amidst the countless programmes and policies intended to fight trafficking and provide assistance to trafficked persons, few thoroughly assess the effectiveness and impact of their work. While resources for anti-trafficking initiatives are abundant, resources for evaluating initiatives are much less generous and are often the first casualty of budget limitations. The lack of impetus to comprehensively evaluate anti-trafficking responses suggests an innate assumption of a programme's ability to "do good." However, as this research clearly indicates, extensive evaluations have never been conducted, meaning that there is no such evidence to support this sentiment. For trafficking initiatives to be successful, they must be evidence based.

Trafficking is a complex phenomenon, requiring multifaceted programmes and policies by various stakeholders. Dynamic evaluation methodologies, which consider the most comprehensive form of evaluation, must be carried out if trafficking in persons is to be reduced and assistance provisions made more effective. Anti-trafficking responses are still in their infancy and much remains to be learnt. Standards such as the DAC Principles, impact assessment methodologies and principles of human rights must be taken and integrated into the context of anti-trafficking in order to produce a robust body of evidence to better understand the impact of anti-trafficking responses, to improving the quality of anti-trafficking responses and to hold implementers to account.

ANNEX: CASE STUDIES

REVIEWED INTERNATIONAL MONITORING AND EVALUATION MECHANISMS

Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime:

The Conference of Parties to UNTOC is comprised of all States Parties and meets on a biennial basis in order to improve States ability to “*combat transnational organised crime and to promote and review the implementation of this convention*” (Article 32, UNTOC). In order to achieve the established objective of the Conference, two self-assessment questionnaires were prepared in reference to the Human Trafficking Protocol, by the United Nations Office of UNODC, as secretariat of the Convention. The information within these questionnaires has now been consolidated in the form of the Comprehensive Assessment Checklist/ Omnibus Survey Software. These self-assessment tools are designed to assess States Parties’ implementation of the Convention and Protocols, the UNODC uses questionnaire responses submitted periodically to produce a general report on implementation of the Protocol which is delivered to the Conference of the Parties for adoption. State reporting also feeds into the discussions of the working groups established under the purview of UNTOC - particularly the Working Group on Technical Assistance.

Source: www.unodc.org

United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Trafficking Evaluation

UN.GIFT was launched in March 2007 and is managed by a steering committee comprised of inter-governmental organisations working on human trafficking, the UN.GIFT mission is to reduce trafficking by working to “*increase the knowledge and awareness on human trafficking; promote effective rights-based responses; build capacity of state and non-state actors; and foster partnerships for joint action against human trafficking*” (see UN.GIFT website). An independent evaluation of the past 3 years work conducted by the UN.GIFT programme is currently being undertaken, the results of which will be presented to the UNTOC 6th Conference of States Parties in October 2010. The evaluation draws upon two tools for primary data collection, a quantitative data tool - an online survey distributed to ‘several hundred’ anti-trafficking stakeholders and a qualitative semi-structured interview of around 60 anti-trafficking stakeholders. The survey participants include: UNODC and other inter-governmental organisation representatives serving on the UN.GIFT steering committee; member state representatives; and civil society engaged in anti-trafficking efforts. Secondary data sources include UN.GIFT publications and analysis of trends in anti-trafficking efforts.

Source: www.ungift.org and personal communications with programme/evaluation staff.

MTV EXIT

MTV EXIT is an anti-trafficking prevention campaign funded by USAID involving primarily video documentary and concerts to popularise anti-trafficking messages and raise awareness of the problem as well as ways people can protect themselves when they move. In Asia the MTV EXIT campaign has implemented high quality, independent impact evaluations by Rapid Asia an external evaluator, with baseline surveys, a post concert interview, and a follow on interview one month after events. The impact evaluation uses an index of 15 questions measuring knowledge, attitude and behavioural change, as a proxy for trafficking prevention. A statistically relevant random sample is interviewed in a control group and then another in an ‘exposed group’. Questions measure direct impacts of the campaign’s messaging, looking at whether people know basic definitions of trafficking, whether they discriminate against or have empathy with trafficked persons, and whether they would take actions such as reporting abuse or finding out more information about an overseas job before taking it. A strategic selection of MTV EXIT’s concerts are evaluated for impacts in this way.⁷⁴

Source: www.mtvexit.org and personal communications with programme staff.

REVIEWED REGIONAL MONITORING AND EVALUATION MECHANISMS

The United Nations Inter-Agency Project on Human Trafficking (UNIAP) Phase 3 2007-2010 Mid Term Evaluation Report

UNIAP was established in June 2000 to strengthen and coordinate trafficking responses in the Greater Mekong Sub-region. Within its third Phase (January 2007 - November 2010) it aims to provide support to Governments in anti-trafficking responses; services to UN agencies and donors and offers direct support to anti-trafficking projects. Phase II of the project (2003-2006), facilitated the development of a sub-

regional Memorandum of Understanding between the governments of the six GMS states accompanied by a Sub-regional Plan of Action (SPA I) to operationalise the agreement, thus establishing the Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Trafficking (COMMIT) in 2004. The evaluation focussed on the Phase III objectives and the continuing implementation of COMMIT and was conducted by two evaluators, an independent consultant and a representative from a UNIAP donor, NZ AID. The evaluation took place over the course of 30 days and drew on primary data drawn from semi-structured interviews with government, national and international NGO, inter-governmental agencies and UNIAP representatives.

Source: <http://Erc.undp.org>

The Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Human Trafficking (COMMIT)

COMMIT was designed as an anti-trafficking collaboration mechanism for six governments, Cambodia, China, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand, and Vietnam. The COMMIT, Sub-regional Plan of action, operationalises the Memorandum of Understanding agreed by these six governments. COMMIT's stated objectives are:

To promote and strengthen systems of inter-country and regional cooperation against human trafficking; To establish a holistic regional response, covering all aspects of the human trafficking problem and ensuring that concern for the victim is at the centre of all interventions; To identify and adapt successful models between countries as appropriate; and To enhance national capacities to address human trafficking in order to facilitate each country's engagement at the regional level, building on existing strengths in each country'.

UNIAP, as the Secretariat to the COMMIT Process, prepares annual summary reports on the progress of the six countries towards targets set in the Sub-regional Plan of Action.

Source: www.no-trafficking.org

The Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings and the Committee of the Parties to the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings

The Council of Europe Convention establishes within its provisions an independent monitoring mechanism in order to provide oversight of the implementation of the provisions in the Convention. The Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (GRETA) and the CoE Conference of Parties to the Convention make up the monitoring body. GRETA is comprised of 13 impartial and independent members who are nationals of States Parties to the Convention, elected in 2008 for a term in office of four years. GRETA, which has determined its own rules of procedure and monitoring procedures, prepared its first questionnaire for monitoring implementation of CoE Convention this year. The questionnaire will be sent to 10 countries per year each of whom have 6 months to respond to questionnaire. Comments from non-state stakeholders are also received during this time and once questionnaire responses are returned GRETA will begin country visits over a 4 month period. Final reports are prepared once this process concludes and are sent to the Committee of the Parties which makes recommendations to States on the grounds of the report findings. The Council of Europe has described the independent monitoring mechanism of the Convention as *"one of its main strengths"* adding that *"Experience proves that, in areas where independent human rights monitoring mechanisms exist, as is the case in the fields of torture and minorities for example, they have high credibility"*⁷⁵.

Source: www.coe.int

REVIEWED NATIONAL MONITORING AND EVALUATION MECHANISMS

Australia

Management of the Australian Government's Action Plan to Eradicate Trafficking in Persons by the Australian National Audit Office.

In 2003, the Australian Government announced an investment of \$AUS 20.5 million in measures to combat human trafficking, this was shortly followed by the development and publication of the *Australian Government's Action Plan to Eradicate Trafficking in Persons* in mid 2004. Since its publication, limited monitoring or evaluation was conducted. In 2008 and 2009, however, following a recommendation of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on the Australian Crime Commission, the ANAO carried out a performance audit of the management of the Plan and assessed whether the Plan's measures were being effectively administered to deliver the intended results. The audit examines: the whole-of-government arrangements in place to monitor contributions to the achievement of outcomes; and whether the measures have been effectively managed, monitored and assessed for performance.

Source: www.anao.gov.au/director/publications/auditreports/2008-2009.cfm?item_id=EA5167111560A6E8AAD4B61835C6D6F7

Austria

The First Austrian Report on Combating Human Trafficking.

The First Austrian National Action Plan against Human Trafficking was adopted in March 2007. The First Austrian Report on Combating Human Trafficking was produced in accordance with Item 7.1 of the Plan: *“Report on the actions taken and planned for combating trafficking in human beings”*; there is limited reference to evaluation made throughout the plan. The report, published in 2009, was produced from within the government, from contributions of participating ministries. The report, *“offers a current overview of the activities and measures Austria has launched with respect to human trafficking”*.

Source: www.bmeia.gv.at/fileadmin/user_upload/bmeia/media/2-Aussenpolitik_Zentrale/Menschenrechte/Menschenhandel_aktualisierter_Bericht_04_03_09_-_Englisch.pdf

Cambodia

IOM Information Campaign to Combat Trafficking in Women and Children

IOM has carried out myriad anti-trafficking projects globally. Over the years a handful have gone through a more thorough impact evaluation process.⁷⁶ One of those is the Information Campaign to Combat Trafficking in Women and Children in Cambodia, implemented by IOM in partnership with the Ministry of Women's Affairs (MOWA) and with funding from USAID. The campaign was conducted in all provinces in Cambodia through a mass information campaign; a village-based/micro-information campaign; a database; and policy and advocacy work. *“The core aim of the project [wa]s to build the capacity of MOWA through event-specific activities and campaigns - learning by doing - in conjunction with specific capacity-building workshops and training.”*⁷⁷ IOM's Cambodia project impact evaluation aimed *“to assess changes in both awareness and attitude of the primary target group in six target provinces after implementation of the MOWA mass information campaign and village meetings”*.⁷⁸ A baseline survey before the project evaluated for the same indicators that a post-campaign survey and focus groups also evaluated for. This kind of evaluation is rare in anti-trafficking monitoring and evaluation.

Source: <http://iom.int>

Kenya

National Plan of Action to Combat Human Trafficking in Kenya

The Kenyan Trafficking in Persons Bill was drafted in 2005 and was recently passed by the Kenyan Parliament; it is now awaiting the President's signature before the Act, and related National Plan of Action to Combat Human Trafficking in Kenya (2008 - 2013), becomes fully operational. As a result no evaluation reports are yet available. The Plan does make some reference to the conduction of evaluation, however, specifically in the context of evaluating awareness raising campaigns. The Plan does not however provide details of the evaluation methodologies to be used.

Source: Personal correspondence with civil society actors in Kenya.

The Netherlands

The Dutch National Rapporteur

Following the adoption of the 1997 Hague Declaration, the Dutch government appointed the first Dutch National Rapporteur on Trafficking in Human Beings. The Rapporteur is independent to the government, their *“main task is to report on the nature and extent of human trafficking in the Netherlands, and on the effects of the anti-trafficking policy pursued”*⁷⁹. This review examines the Rapporteur's most recent report - *Human Trafficking: Seventh Report from the National Rapporteur* which: details developments in relevant legislation and programmes in relation to both international and national contexts; highlights areas of concern and challenge in these areas; and makes recommendations to the government for consideration.

Source: <http://english.bnrm.nl/reports/seventh/>

Nigeria

The National Action Plan

The Nigerian National Action Plan has a dedicated section to monitoring and evaluation. Regular assessments of progress and evaluation is referenced as is the need for independent impact assessments. Locating such reports however was not possible, it thus remains unclear if such an evaluation has been conducted in practice.

Source: available on request from NAPTIP, <http://www.naptip.gov.ng/>

Peru

Presently, the Peruvian government does not conduct any evaluation or impact assessment of its anti-trafficking measures. The Multi-sector Work Group against Human Trafficking and its members report their annual activities but this information is not evaluated. The Government is currently considering a

National Plan against Trafficking in Persons; the draft Plan, does include mandatory monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment. Should the Plan be approved, these tasks will be responsibility of the Permanent Secretariat for Human Rights, which also presides the Multi-sector Work Group against Human Trafficking. Source: Personal correspondence with civil society actors in Peru.

Russia

In 2002, the Interagency Work Group on the Issue of Human Trafficking was established by the Russian Parliament. As part of their work, in 2003, the Group introduced two new articles into the Criminal Code of Russia: 127-1 'Trafficking in Persons', and 127-2 'Exploitation of Slavery Labour'. There are no provisions made for evaluating the implementation of these articles or any other anti-trafficking initiatives undertaken. Source: Personal correspondence with civil society actors in Russia.

Spain

Report on the Status of the Comprehensive Plan for combating trafficking in human beings for sexual exploitation.

The Comprehensive Plan for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings for Sexual Exploitation⁸⁰ was approved in December 2008. The Plan makes some provisions for monitoring and evaluation in Article 2.4, whereby the creation of an Inter-ministerial Coordination Group to monitor and evaluate the Plan's actions is directed. The production of half-yearly monitoring reports by the Inter-ministerial Group is also mandated, as is an annual report produced by the Executive Committee for Equality. In April 2010 the first annual report was produced. The report outlines the status of the agreed actions and their degree of compliance with the Plan.

Source: <http://www.migualdad.es/ss/satellite?blobcol=urldata&blobheader=application%2Fpdf&blobheadername1=Content-disposition&blobheadervalue1=inline&blobkey=id&blobtable=MungoBlobs&blobwhere=1244653266035&ssbinary=true>

Thailand

National Policy and Plan on Prevention, Suppression and Combating Domestic and Transnational Trafficking in Children and Women 2005-2010.

The National Policy and Plan on Prevention, Suppression and Combating Domestic and Transnational Trafficking in Children and Women came into effect in 2005. The Plan is divided into three and six year phases, both phases make significant evaluation provisions, including article 6.6 3 Year Phase (2) "*Conducting monitoring and evaluation of results from implementation of the National Policy and Plan*" and 6.6, 6 Year Phase (3) "*Calling for a critical review of current national policy and plan while probing some possibilities of initiating or creating necessary mechanisms to ensure higher and improved efficiency and being able to keep abreast of the rapidly changing situation regarding trafficking*". A three year evaluation report was undertaken and conducted by independent researchers. The National Operational Center on Prevention and Suppression of Human Trafficking is now preparing to evaluate the final stages of the Plan; an independent evaluating body is currently being sought.

Source: Available on request from the National Operational Center on Prevention and Suppression of Human Trafficking Thailand, see: www.nocht.m-society.go.th/en_help_5_4_1.php

United Kingdom

Update to the UK Action Plan on Tackling Human Trafficking

The UK Action Plan on Tackling Human Trafficking was adopted in March 2007. Reference to evaluating projects and campaigns is made throughout the plan such as Action 9 "*To ensure that awareness raising campaigns have proper evaluation mechanisms*".¹ Despite regular reference to evaluation throughout the Plan, the only public document available is the *Update to the UK Action Plan on Tackling Human Trafficking*.² This report, published in October 2009 provides a status update on activities implemented in relation to the objectives and actions outlined in the Plan.

Source: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/254429/0101027.pdf>

ENDNOTES

¹ OHCHR, 2002, UN High Commissioner's Recommended Principles and Guidelines on Human Rights and Human Trafficking (Addendum to the Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to the Economic and Social Council). UN, New York, USA. P. 5, Guideline 3. Available at: www.ohchr.org/english/about/publications/docs/trafficking.doc (accessed 28.09.10)

² Between 2001-07 the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) allocated \$US 152.18 million to combat trafficking. Similarly, the International Labour Organisation (ILO) allocated \$US 46.35 million and the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) apportioned \$US 18.16 million. Between 2001 and 2005, the US government provided approximately \$US 447 million in foreign assistance to international organisations, non-governmental organisations and foreign governments to combat human trafficking. US GAO, 2007, *Human Trafficking: Monitoring and Evaluation of International Projects Are Limited, but Experts Suggest Improvements*, US GAO, Washington, US. Available at: www.gao.gov/new.items/d071034.pdf (accessed 15.09.10)

³ ILO, 2008, *ILO Action Against Trafficking in Human Beings*, ILO, Geneva, Switzerland. Available at: www2.ilo.org/sapfl/Informationresources/Factsheetsandbrochures/lang-en/docName-WCMS_090356/index.htm (accessed 15.09.10)

⁴ See, for example: GAATW, 2007, *Collateral Damage: the Impact of Anti-Trafficking Measures on Human Rights Around the World*. GAATW, Bangkok, Thailand. Available at www.gaattw.org/Collateral%20Damage_Final/singlefile_CollateralDamagefinal.pdf (accessed 03.10.10) and Gozdzia E and M Bump, 2008, *New Immigrants, Changing Communities: Best Practices for Better America*. Lexington Books.

⁵ GAATW, 2007, op-cit.

⁶ See for example: *Cross-border trafficking in human beings: prevention and intervention strategies for reducing sexual exploitation* available: <http://campbellcollaboration.org/lib/download/951/> (accessed 03.10.10); Dottridge, M., 2007a, *A handbook on planning projects to prevent child trafficking*, Lausanne: International Federation Terre des Hommes; Dottridge, M., 2007b, *Measuring Responses to Trafficking in Human Beings in the European Union: An Assessment Manual*, Brussels: Consultancy for Directorate-General Justice, Freedom and Security, European Commission; Dottridge, M., 2010, *In pursuit of good practice in response to child trafficking: Experiences from Latin America, Southeast Europe and Southeast Asia*. Terre des Hommes International Federation and Stichting Terre des Hommes Netherlands; Kelly, L. (2005), "You can find anything you want": A critical reflection on research on trafficking in persons within and into Europe, *International Migration*, 43 (1/2), 235-265; ICF International, 2008, *Where is the Research on Human Trafficking and the Evaluation of Anti-Trafficking Efforts?* ICF International, Fairfax, US. Available at: www.icfi.com/Docs/research-human-trafficking.pdf (accessed 04.10.10);

⁷ Development Assistance Committee, 1991, *Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance*, OECD, Paris, France. Available at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf> (accessed 09.07.10)

⁸ Development Assistance Committee, 1991, *ibid*.

⁹ US GAO, 2007, op-cit.

¹⁰ OHCHR, 2002, op-cit

¹¹ Dottridge, M., 2007a, 2007b, 2010; and Kelly, L., 2005. op-cit.

¹² See: Ministry of Equality Spain, 2010, *Report on the Status of the Comprehensive Plan for Combatting Trafficking in Human Beings for Sexual Exploitation*, Ministry of Equality Spain, Madrid, Spain; and Austrian Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs, 2009, *First Austrian Report on Combating Human Trafficking (covering the period from March 2007 - February 2009)*, Austrian Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs, Austria.

¹³ *Ibid*.

¹⁴ Binnendijk, Annette L 1990, "Donor Agency Experience with the Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Projects" p.166. In Finsterbusch, Kurt, Jasper Ingersoll and Lynn Llewellyn (eds.), *Methods for Social Analysis in Developing Countries*. Westview Press, Colorado.

¹⁵ Development Assistance Committee, 1991, op-cit

¹⁶ UNODC, 2008, *Implementation of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime: consolidated information received from States for the first reporting cycle, and ibid second reporting cycle*. UN, Austria. Available at <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CTOC/CTOC-COP-session4.html> (accessed 16.08.10)

¹⁷ UNIAP, 2009, COMMIT 2

nd *Sub-Regional Plan of Action 2009 Annual Report*, UNIAP. Available at: www.no-trafficking.org (accessed 15.08.10).

¹⁸ UNIAP, 2009, *Phase III: 2007-2011: Terms of Reference, UNIAP Phase III Mid-Term Evaluation*. Available at <http://erc.undp.org/evaluationadmin/downloaddocument.html?docid=2358> (accessed 20.09.10)

¹⁹ Cunnington, P. and S. Hung, 2009, *United Nations Inter-Agency Project on Human Trafficking in the Greater Mekong Sub-region (UNIAP) Phase III (2007-2010) Mid-Term Evaluation Report Final Draft*. Available at: <http://erc.undp.org/evaluationadmin/downloaddocument.html?docid=2381> (accessed 22.09.10)

²⁰ See: Ministry of Equality Spain, 2010, *Report on the Status of the Comprehensive Plan for Combatting Trafficking in Human Beings for Sexual Exploitation*, Ministry of Equality Spain, Madrid, Spain; The National Rapporteur, *Human Trafficking Seventh Report from the National Reporter*, The National Rapporteur, the Netherlands. Available: <http://english.bnrm.nl> (accessed 24.09.10); Information source: Personal correspondence with civil society in Kenya.

²¹ See: <http://english.bnrm.nl/>

²² See: www.anao.gov.au/director/publications/auditreports/2008-2009.cfm?item_id=EA5167111560A6E8AAD4B61835C6D6F7

²³ UN.GIFT, 2010, GAATW participation in UN.GIFT evaluation (telephone)

²⁴ The Home Office and Scottish Government, 2009, *Update to the UK Action Plan on Tackling Human Trafficking*, The Home Office and Scottish Executive, UK.

²⁵ Report available on request from NAPTIP: <http://www.naptip.gov.ng/>

²⁶ MTV EXIT, 2010, GAATW correspondence with MTV EXIT and Rapid Asia (e-mail)

²⁷ See: http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en_2649_34435_2086550_1_1_1_1,00.html

²⁸ CoE, 2005, *Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings and its Explanatory Report* (Warsaw, 16.05.2005). CoE Treaty Series 197. Available at http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/trafficking/Docs/Convntn/CETS197_en.asp#TopOfPage (accessed 19.09.10)

²⁹ UN.GIFT, 2010, (telephone) op-cit.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ OECD, 2002, *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*, 24. OECD, France.

³² GAATW personal correspondence with civil society actor.

³³ See: <http://english.bnrm.nl/about/about/>

³⁴ UNODC, 2008, op-cit.

³⁵ Roche, 1999, *Impact Assessment for Development Agencies: Learning to Value Change* (Oxfam Development Guidelines). P21. Oxfam/NOVIB, Oxford, UK.

³⁶ Ibid, p. 25

³⁷ See: Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank, *Impact Evaluation the Experience of the Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank*, Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank, Washington, US. Available: [http://lnweb90.worldbank.org/oed/oeddoclib.nsf/DocUNIDViewForJavaSearch/35BC420995BF58F8852571E00068C6BD/\\$file/impact_evaluation.pdf](http://lnweb90.worldbank.org/oed/oeddoclib.nsf/DocUNIDViewForJavaSearch/35BC420995BF58F8852571E00068C6BD/$file/impact_evaluation.pdf) (accessed 30.09.10).

³⁸ White, 2008, Introduction: Impact Evaluation in Official Development Agencies, *IDS Bulletin*, 39.1. pp. 1-12.

³⁹ GAATW, 2010, Communication with UNIAP programme staff (meeting).

⁴⁰ GRETA, 2010, *Questionnaire for the evaluation of the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by the parties First evaluation round Adopted by the Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings*. Available at [http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/trafficking/Source/GRETA\(2010\)1_en.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/trafficking/Source/GRETA(2010)1_en.pdf) (accessed 15.08.10)

⁴¹ Ibid

⁴² See: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/254429/0101027.pdf>

⁴³ See: www.anao.gov.au/director/publications/auditreports/2008-2009.cfm?item_id=EA5167111560A6E8AAD4B61835C6D6F7

⁴⁴ See: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/46/16/37671602.pdf>

⁴⁵ GAATW, 2007, op-cit.

⁴⁶ UNODC, 2008, op-cit.

- ⁴⁷ Thomas, V, 2008, *Impact Evaluation: Its Status and its Future*, OECD/DAC. P.6. Available at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/24/38/40096409.pdf>
- ⁴⁸ Development Assistance Committee, 1991, op-cit
- ⁴⁹ Ibid.
- ⁵⁰ Cunningham, P. and S. Hung, 2009, op-cit
- ⁵¹ GRETA, 2010, op-cit.
- ⁵² *National Policy and Plan on Prevention, Suppression and Combating Domestic and Transnational Trafficking in Children and Women 2005-2010* (personal communication) report available on request from the National Operational Center on Prevention and Suppression of Human Trafficking Thailand, see: www.nocht.m-society.go.th/en_help_5_4_1.php
- ⁵³ See: www.un.org/millenniumgoals/
- ⁵⁴ OECD, 2005/2008, *The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action*, OECD, France. Available: www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf (accessed 23.09.10)
- ⁵⁵ Cunningham, P. and S. Hung, 2009, op-cit.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid.
- ⁵⁷ GRETA, 2009, Rules of procedure for evaluating implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by the parties. p. 4. Available at [http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/trafficking/Source/THB-GRETA\(2009\)3_en.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/trafficking/Source/THB-GRETA(2009)3_en.pdf) (accessed 19.09.10)
- ⁵⁸ UNODC, 2000, United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime and the Protocols thereto. Available at <http://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNTOC/Publications/TOC%20Convention/TOCebook-e.pdf> (accessed 12.08.10)
- ⁵⁹ See: The National Rapporteur, Recommendation 47, op-cit.
- ⁶⁰ GAATW, 1999, Human Rights Standards for the Treatment of Trafficked Persons. GAATW, Bangkok, Thailand. Available at: http://gaatw.org/books_pdf/hrs_eng1.pdf (accessed 01.07.10)
- ⁶¹ OHCHR, 2002, op-cit. Guideline 3.
- ⁶² See, for example, UNICEF, 2006, *Revised Guidelines for Protection of the Rights of Child Victims of Trafficking*. Available at http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/0610-Unicef_Victims_Guidelines_en.pdf; UNHCR, 2006, *Guidelines on International Protection No. 7: The Application of Article 1A(2) of the 1951 Convention and/or 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees to Victims of Trafficking and Persons At Risk of Being Trafficked*. Available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/443679fa.html>; IOM, 2004, *The Mental Health Aspects of Trafficking in Human Beings: A Set of Minimum Standards*. Available at: <http://www.iom.hu/PDFs/minimum%20standards%20of%20care%20mental%20health%20THB.pdf>; and WHO, 2003, *Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Interviewing Trafficked Women*. Available at: www.who.int/gender/documents/en/final%20recommendations%2023%20oct.pdf (all accessed 12.09.10)
- ⁶³ See the AIM for Human Rights' human trafficking website at <http://www.aimforhumanrights.org/themes/women-s-human-rights/trafficking-in-persons/>.
- ⁶⁴ GRETA, 2010, op-cit.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶⁶ See: www.un.org/millenniumgoals/
- ⁶⁷ Landman, T, 2006, *Studying Human Rights*, Routledge, UK, p.76
- ⁶⁸ Casla, K, 2010, *Impact Assessment of Non Governmental Organisations on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* (draft version). p. 38. Available at: www.humanrightsimpact.org (accessed 19.09.10)
- ⁶⁹ Welling, J, 2008, *International Indicators and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*, Human Rights Quarterly, 30. p.949
- ⁷⁰ UNODC, 2008, op-cit.
- ⁷¹ Hunt, P(2006) *Annual Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Health*, OHCHR. Para. 54. Available at: www.ohchr.org (accessed 05.09.10)
- ⁷² Cunningham, P. and S. Hung, 2009, op-cit.
- ⁷³ The National Rapporteur, op-cit.

⁷⁴ MTV EXIT, 2010, Personal communication with MTV EXIT and Rapid Asia (meeting)

⁷⁵ Gorseth, H, Administrator, Gender Equality and Anti-Trafficking Division, Directorate General of Human Rights and Legal Affairs, Council of Europe, speaking at: *Action against Trafficking in Human Beings: Criminal and Procedural Measures Proceedings of the Regional Seminar Belgrade, 18-19 October 2007*. CoE, Strasbourg, France. Available at: http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/trafficking/Source/eg-thb-sem10-2007_Proceedings.pdf (accessed 12.09.10)

⁷⁶ See IOM website for available internal and external evaluation reports. IOM, *Evaluation*. Available: <http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/about-iom/organizational-structure/evaluations/cache/offonce/>.

⁷⁷ MOWA, IOM and USAID, 2006, *Mass and Micro-Information Campaign Awareness Impact Assessment*, p. 9. Available on request: www.iom.int

⁷⁸ MOWA, IOM and USAID, 2006, p. 10, op-cit

⁷⁹ See: <http://english.bnrm.nl/about/about/>

⁸⁰ Ministry of Equality Spain, 2010, *Report on the Status of the Comprehensive Plan for Combatting Trafficking in Human Beings for Sexual Exploitation*, Ministry of Equality Spain, Madrid, Spain

⁸¹ The Home Office and Scottish Executive, 2007, *UK Action Plan on Tackling Human Trafficking*, The Home Office and Scottish Executive, UK.

⁸² The Home Office and Scottish Government, 2009, *Update to the UK Action Plan on Tackling Human Trafficking*, The Home Office and Scottish Executive, UK.



Global Alliance Against Traffic in Women

P.O. Box 36 Bangkok Noi Post Office
Bangkok, Thailand 10700
Tel: (662) 864-1427/8 Fax: (662) 864-1637
Email: gaatw@gaatw.org
www.gaatw.org