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

March 2009

Paul Cunnington and Samantha Hung

Table of Contents

List of acronyms and abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AFESIP	Agir pour les Femmes en Situation Précaire
ARTIP	Asia Regional Trafficking in Persons Project
ATD	Anti-Trafficking Division
ATU	Anti-Trafficking Unit
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
AYAD	Australian Youth Ambassador for Development
BATWC	Bureau on Anti Trafficking in Women and Children
CCA	Common Country Assessment
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CO	Country Office
COMMIT	Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Trafficking
CSEC	Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DFID	Department for International Development (of the UK government)
DSDW	Department of Social Development and Welfare
DSI	Department of Special Investigation
DSW	Department of Social Welfare
ECPAT	End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking in Children for Exploitation
GMS	Greater Mekong Sub-region
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
ILO	International Labour Organisation
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
LICADHO	Cambodian League for the Promotion and Defence of Human Rights
LNTA	Lao National Tourism Authority
LPN	Labour Rights Promotion Network
LWU	Lao Women's Union
LYU	Lao Youth Union
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MLSW	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare
MoEYS	Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports
MoFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MoHA	Ministry of Home Affairs
MoI	Ministry of Interior
MoJ	Ministry of Justice
MoLVT	Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training
MoPS	Ministry of Public Security
MoSVY	Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans and Youth Rehabilitation
MoT	Ministry of Tourism
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MoWA	Ministry of Women's Affairs
MSDHS	Ministry of Social Development and Human Security
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
MTV EXIT	Music Television – End Exploitation and Trafficking
NOCHT	National Operation Centre on Prevention and Suppression of Human Trafficking
NPA	National Plan of Action
NPC	National Project Coordinator
NZAID	New Zealand Agency for International Development
OPP	Office of Welfare Promotion, Protection and Empowerment of Vulnerable Groups
PDD	Project Design Document
PMO	Project Management Office
POCHT	Provincial Operation Centre on Prevention and Suppression of Human Trafficking
PPC	Project Proposal Concept

PSC	Project Steering Committee
RPM	Regional Project Manager
RTP	Regional Training Programme
SCUK	Save the Children UK
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SEARCH	Southeast Asia Regional Cooperation in Human Development
Sida	Swedish International Development Agency
SIREN	Strategic Information Response Network
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bound
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SPA	Sub-regional Plan of Action
THALACC	Thai-Lao Cross-border Cooperation
TICW	ILO-IPEC Mekong Sub-regional Project to Combat Trafficking in Children and Women
TIP	Trafficking in Persons
UNDAF	UN Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	UN Economic, Social and Cultural Organisation
UNFPA	UN Population Fund
UNIAP	United Nations Inter-Agency Project on Human Trafficking in the Greater Mekong Sub-region
UNICEF	UN Children's Fund
UNODC	UN Office on Drugs and Crime
UNRC	UN Resident Coordinator
UNV	UN Volunteers
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD	US Dollar
WHO	World Health Organisation

Executive Summary

Introduction to the Project
The United Nations Inter-Agency Project on Human Trafficking in the Greater-Mekong Sub-region (UNIAP) was established in 2000 to facilitate better coordination amongst counter-trafficking agencies, supported by improved information on trafficking trends and the efficacy of responses. Phase I (2000-2003) promoted critical analysis, built linkages between agencies and supported small-scale pilot initiatives to address emerging issues. Phase II (2003-2006), originally seen as a consolidation phase, greatly exceeded its original goal by facilitating the development of a sub-regional Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the governments of the six GMS states (Cambodia, China, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam), accompanied by a Sub-regional Plan of Action (SPA I) to operationalise the agreement. This process, known as the Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Trafficking (COMMIT, to which UNIAP is the Secretariat), provides a sub-regional institutional framework for counter-trafficking initiatives that has high-level political backing. Phase III (January 2007 – November 2010) essentially aims at further consolidation and institutionalisation of existing initiatives, complemented by a 'research and development' role. It has four Objectives:

Objective 1: Services to Governments. To support Governments in the institutionalization of effective multi-sectoral approaches to combat trafficking.

Objective 2: Services to UN Partners. To maximize the UN's contribution to the overall anti-trafficking response, including the COMMIT process.

Objective 3: Services to the anti-trafficking sector in general, including donors. To facilitate optimal allocation and targeting of anti-trafficking resources.

Objective 4: Special Projects. To continue to play a catalytic role in the anti-trafficking response by identifying and supporting special projects to address new and emerging issues and opportunities.

UNIAP is managed from a Project Management Office (PMO) in Bangkok, with Country Offices (COs) in the capitals of the six GMS states. Overall funding proposed for Phase III is USD 9 million[1], of which USD 7.7 million has been committed to date by some 15 different donors, whose contributions range from USD 2,300 to USD 2.9 million in size. USD 1.3 million thus remains to be raised by the Project, though additional funding above this sum could be readily utilised to improve and augment current programming.

Evaluation objectives, scope and methodology
The objectives of the Mid-Term Evaluation are to systematically assess how effectively the four Phase III objectives are being fulfilled and to offer concrete recommendations, where appropriate, for improving Project performance. The period formally evaluated runs from December 2006 to the time of the evaluation (February 2009), though some consideration has been given to earlier phases of the project in order to place the evaluated period in context. The methodology applied is in-line with current good practice, as laid out in, for example, the *DAC Evaluation Quality Standards* and the *Standards for Evaluation in the UN System.* A review of relevant project documentation was followed by interviews with Project staff and all types of stakeholder in Thailand, Cambodia and the Lao PDR, time constraints making visits to all six countries unfeasible. For the three countries not visited by the evaluators, country office staff and stakeholders were sent tailored lists of questions by

---

[1] Though the Project is seeking, and has begun to secure, additional funding to respond to the impacts of the global financial crisis.

email, as were individuals who have been involved with the project in some way but live outside the region.

The basic analytical framework was provided by the aforementioned *DAC Evaluation Quality Standards*, particularly the five DAC Evaluation Criteria. However, it was agreed with Project management that given the limited time available for the study, the huge challenges presented by the issue of attribution and the fact that the study is a mid-term rather than final evaluation, no formal attempt to assess the DAC criterion of Impact would be made. To ensure that concerns regarding aid effectiveness were given due attention, the DAC criteria were complemented by considering relevant elements of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action.

Analysis of Findings
There is no doubt that UNIAP is making a major contribution to improving the counter-trafficking response in the GMS. As a project not an agency, it is unconstrained by a specific mandate, endowing it with the potential to analyse trafficking issues holistically and, through a range of inter-linked Project components, catalyse partnerships to support truly integrated responses (see Sections 3.3.3.1 and 3.3.4.2, for example). Its speed of response, creativity and willingness to challenge received wisdom are notable. Certain aspects of the Project could be improved, as discussed below, but given its achievements to date, continuing key role and the fact that human trafficking is a complex and evolving issue requiring ongoing innovative programming, there is a strong case to be made for continued support to the remainder of the current phase and subsequent support to a fourth phase. The design of Phase IV should include serious consideration of a realistic exit strategy for the Project and should seek long-term commitments from donors.

Relevance of the Project
UNIAP's work in support of governments and the COMMIT process under Objective 1 is highly relevant and recognised by virtually all stakeholders as such (see Section 3.1). UNIAP's role with regard to the provision of services to UN partners under Objective 2 is also relevant, but is less recognised and in some quarters highly contested, especially at regional level. The main activity areas under Objective 3 are all highly relevant, though questions were raised by some informants concerning the purpose and target audience of the Strategic Information Response Network (SIREN), the Project's main information and analysis service. Objective 4 is also highly relevant, as it is successfully addressing important new and emerging issues and opportunities through a range of special projects. However, UNIAP needs to become more effective at supporting the institutionalisation of successful models that emerge from such projects, and also needs to better communicate the underlying rationale of this Objective to government and UN stakeholders.

The Project Design Document inherited by the current Project management team has significant weaknesses (see Section 3.2). The Results and Resources Framework that lays out Project Outputs and Activities does not do so in a consistent and logical manner. There are no indicators specified at Objective level, while the indicators specified at Output level are generally not SMART[2] and there is no monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan. Given the resources available, the Project design is extremely ambitious. A positive aspect of the design is that it is relatively flexible, an attribute that enabled the Project management team to adapt and re-orient Project components when implementation began.

Efficiency of the Project
The Project management team is highly competent, having greatly improved planning, monitoring and management systems (see Section 3.2.1). Phase III's approach is thus much more in line with the Paris Declaration principle of *Managing for Results*. That said, there is

---

[2] Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bound

still room for further improvement, notably in the area of M&E (see Section 3.2.2). Project management is acutely aware of this; the fact that the Project has not yet been able to achieve more in this regard is largely because of resource constraints, notably insufficient funds to hire the M&E Specialist mentioned in the PDD (see Sections 3.2.4 and 3.2.6). These constraints place an exceptionally high workload on all UNIAP staff, particularly Project management who have to spend very significant amounts of time on fundraising activities. Given the amount and quality of the work that its staff perform, the Project currently represents good value for money.

Phase III has been characterized by a focus on improving technical aspects of the Project, while less attention has been paid to communication[3] or 'political' aspects (see Section 3.2.1), partly because resource constraints have compelled Project management to prioritise tasks. In contrast, Phase II was characterized by an emphasis on communication with stakeholders, notably governments, that bore fruit in the form of the COMMIT MoU; technical and managerial aspects appear to have received significantly less attention. In Phase III, the Project has to some extent 'over-corrected', emphasizing technical and managerial aspects (that certainly needed improvement) and not paying sufficient attention to communication with all stakeholders.

UNIAP is situated administratively under the UNRC in each country, although this relationship has not been formally defined in consistent terms (see Section 3.2.3); it should be formalised. In terms of overall organisational structure, it would in many ways be more logical for UNIAP to be located under the UNDP Regional Centre, as this would provide a clearer apex to the structure as well as a regional UN voice for advocacy. UNIAP is overseen by a Management Board, though its actual function is unclear and requires review.

Effectiveness of the Project
With regard to Objective 1, UNIAP's key role in supporting governments to institutionalise counter-trafficking initiatives in the sub-region through COMMIT is widely recognised by the full range of stakeholders. The Project is generally being effective in meeting this challenging aim, though some components are progressing more smoothly than others. Supporting implementation of the second Sub-regional Plan of Action (SPA II) under COMMIT is the main means by which UNIAP aims to achieve this Objective. SPA II is composed of eight Project Proposal Concepts (PPCs), in which UNIAP either plays a direct role (PPC 1 and PPC 8) or works to coordinate supportive initiatives from other agencies as well as provide technical assistance.

PPC 1 (Training & Capacity Building; see Section 3.3.1.1) is gradually building capacity, with the Regional Training Programme continuing to be a major success. Most countries are on-track with the development of national training programmes. The NPAs developed under PPC 2 (National Plans of Action; see Section 3.3.1.2) represent a key step towards institutionalisation and have the potential to catalyse donor alignment and harmonisation. The only country that does not yet have an NPA in place is Laos; China's does not use the definition of human trafficking that is mandated by the COMMIT MoU. PPC 3 (Multilateral & Bilateral Partnerships; see Section 5.1.3) is building linkages, despite political obstacles that have been exacerbated by the situation in Thailand in recent years. Under PPC 4 (Legal Frameworks, Law Enforcement & Justice; see Section 5.1.4), progress in developing legislation that is in line with international standards is reportedly slow in China and Vietnam. Under PPC 5 (Victim Identification, Protection, Recovery & Reintegration; see Section 5.1.5), COMMIT regional guiding principles on victim protection were agreed to by all six governments in 2007. IOM, supported by UNIAP COs, is now supporting governments to development national SOPs that are in-line with international standards; progress is

---

[3] Communication here is interpreted broadly so as to encompass outreach and relationship-building efforts, as well as administrative communication.

generally slow. PPC 6 (Preventive Measures; see Section 5.1.6) features training on, and nationalisation of, regional migrant recruitment guidelines in selected countries. This has been hindered by the closure of the ILO TICW regional programme. Under PPC 7 (Cooperation with Tourism Sector; see Section 5.1.7), a 2007 regional workshop hosted by the Thai government drew on research supported by UNIAP and resulted in the drafting of a regional strategy on trafficking and the tourism sector. The focus since has been at the national level. An important element of PPC 8 is the annual Senior Officials' Meeting (SOM), which is a useful forum in which to exchange experiences and clearly plays a role in injecting elements of competition and accountability.

Under Objective 2, UNIAP is being only partially effective in maximising the UN's contribution to the overall counter-trafficking response, largely because of the challenges involved in facilitating improved UN agency coordination. The reality is that a UN agency, at the level of the institution, tends to view things through its own lens and promote its own interests. This has been a consistent challenge through all phases of UNIAP and has yet to be satisfactorily resolved. The ending of various UN projects related to trafficking in the GMS has provided an additional challenge to coordination. UNIAP's effectiveness in facilitating improved coordination between agencies varies significantly between countries (see Section 3.3.2.1), with its efforts in Cambodia probably being the most effective. Though there are probably numerous reasons for this, including the personality and capacity of key individuals, one factor that may be replicable in some other countries is the formation of a special "Advisory Group" composed of a small number of major agencies that meets early in the annual planning process and comes to an agreement concerning their agencies' activities for the coming year. The Group's agreed plan is then fed into the formal planning process for COMMIT and helps shape the outcome.

It is worth making the point here that Objective 2 is extremely relevant to the challenge of translating the rhetoric of "One UN" into practice, presenting a means by which to facilitate the coordination of a whole-of-UN response to a thematic development challenge in a sub-region. This has the potential to provide the UN with a window of opportunity to demonstrate its ability to realise "One UN" to donors and government partners.

Under Objective 3, the Project is certainly providing some high-quality services, but the extent to which these are actually facilitating optimal allocation and targeting of anti-trafficking resources is hard to assess; given the lag in response caused by donor funding cycles, it may be too early to judge (see Section 3.3.3.1). However, the Project's achievement in rapidly obtaining funding to respond to the global economic downturn does represent a success. There is some evidence that certain donors are aligning – or at least intending to align – their contributions more closely with National Plans of Action.

SIREN succeeds in its aim of making up-to-date research and analysis available in easily-digestible form, though this inevitably means some stakeholders find its contents not technical or specific enough. There are clearly challenges related to the dissemination of its products. Other information services are run by UNIAP and are appreciated by stakeholders, but UNIAP needs to investigate more innovative ways of delivering such information. UNIAP's Trafficking Estimates Initiative, which involved a competition to develop practical methodologies for estimating the number of trafficked persons in a specified locality and/or sector, is an excellent example of an innovative approach being used to fill a research and information gap, build linkages and capacity and raise awareness of related issues.

Regarding Objective 4, the Project is definitely succeeding in identifying and supporting special projects to address new and emerging issues and opportunities, though it needs to become more effective at supporting the institutionalisation of successful models that emerge from such projects (see Section 3.3.4). The Worst Offenders Project has driven forward 11 cases thus far, with a partnership with the Thai Department of Special

Investigation (DSI) taking shape. The Support to Underserved Victim Populations Project has been working effectively with the NGOs LICADHO and Tenaganita in Cambodia and Malaysia respectively, as regards the identification, repatriation and reintegration of Cambodian men trafficked onto fishing boats. The Shelter Self-Improvement Project, somewhat delayed but due to start in the first half of 2009, represents an innovative approach to boosting the improvement of shelter standards, while the Cross-Regional Linkages Project is developing links with countries outside the GMS that are destinations for GMS trafficking victims. Under the Ethics and Human Rights in Counter-trafficking Project, a *Guide to Ethics and Human Rights in Counter-trafficking* has been developed and published. However, the Project's ultimate aim under this Objective of supporting the 'eventual consolidation and institutionalisation of successful approaches' is clearly the most challenging part of the task, and it is the area that UNIAP should focus on improving through working more effectively with international agency and government partners.

UNIAP has helped to get gender into a higher position on the agenda of the counter-trafficking community, but the evaluators' overall impression is that gender is still dealt with at a fairly basic level. There was also only limited evidence amongst stakeholders of a more sophisticated understanding of how gender intersects with other axes of marginalisation (such as ethnicity, age and disability) and how this should be addressed in programmatic responses. There are opportunities for UNIAP to make more use of existing UN gender expertise in line with the wider UN gender mainstreaming mandate and the UN Secretary General's UNITE to End Violence Against Women Campaign.

Sustainability of Project achievements
The COMMIT MoU guarantees a certain minimum level of ownership – a key facet of sustainability – on the part of each government. Phase III has built on this foundation by supporting the development of a more focused Sub-regional Plan of Action, with targets and timelines that bind member states more firmly to the prescribed aims. The relative levels of ownership of COMMIT by the participating states are not easy to assess, but certainly vary (see Section 3.4). Levels of ownership also vary significantly within governments, and increasing levels of ownership within key agencies (such as those responsible for labour issues) should be a key priority for the Project.

Recommendations

Project management
- Take steps to hire an M&E specialist (as mentioned in the original PDD) on a full or part-time basis, to be based in the PMO (see Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.4).
- Establish clear lines of responsibility and accountability for M&E amongst UNIAP staff (see Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.4).
- Invest in M&E capacity building of UNIAP staff and partners (e.g. through regional and national training programmes), drawing on the expertise of partner agencies as appropriate (see Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.4).
- Although UNIAP's Finance/Operations Specialist and her team have already made major improvements to the Project's financial management systems, any possibilities for further streamlining should be explored (see Section 3.2.6).
- The Project should continue to work together with donors to harmonise reporting requirements as much as possible, to reduce the load on Project management (see Section 3.2.6). Clearly, donors have a major responsibility in this regard.
- The Project should explore the possibility of drawing more upon human resources available at national and regional level to fill core staff positions currently occupied by short-term expatriate staff (see Section 3.2.4).

Project governance

- The relationship of UNIAP with the UNRCs needs to be clarified and formalised (see Section 3.2.3), for example through the drafting of ToR drawing on past examples of good practice. The role of the UNRC in conducting high-level advocacy at national level on UNIAP's behalf should be specified.
- The possibility of locating UNIAP under the UNDP Regional Centre should be explored as an option for Phase IV, as this would provide a clearer apex to the organisational structure as well as a regional UN voice for advocacy (see Section 3.2.3).
- The role and membership of UNIAP's Management Board need to be clarified through discussion with, and then clearly communicated to, all major stakeholders (see Section 3.2.3). Transparency should be increased, with full minutes being circulated to all stakeholders, and the NGO seat should be held by a recognised NGO representative, if at all possible.[4]

Communication[5]

External communication

- The Project, particularly Project management, needs to place more emphasis on communication with stakeholders while not allowing the very significant technical gains made in Phase III to slip away (see Section 3.2.1). Communication needs to be more cohesive and systematic, and be linked to the M&E system so that its effectiveness can be assessed.
- Particular emphasis should be placed on more clearly communicating the rationale behind Project Objectives 2, 3 and 4 (See Sections 3.3.2, 3.3.3 and 3.3.4), especially to stakeholders in government, the UN and other international agencies.
- UNIAP's draft communication strategy appears to a non-specialist to be somewhat theoretical in nature, so attention will need to be paid to its operationalisation, especially at CO level (see Section 3.3.2).
- More innovative approaches should be adopted for disseminating information. For example, rather than just a newsletter, more impact could be achieved through occasional well-focused OpEd pieces in local newspapers (see Section 3.3.3.1).
- More Project documentation should be translated into national languages (see Section 3.3.3.1). This applies not only to SIREN reports and the like, but also to important planning documents and progress reports.
- There is an urgent need to raise the levels of awareness and understanding of many senior decision- and policy-makers regarding human trafficking (see Section 3.3.1.1). An opportunistic approach must be taken in order to reach them with appropriate messages, for example by including well-designed awareness-raising sessions in the SOMs.

Internal communication

- The next UNIAP staff retreat should discuss issues related to communication within the Project (see Section 3.2.5). The involvement of an external facilitator may be of assistance.
- The roles and responsibilities of PMO staff, particularly their authority to approve requests, should be more clearly communicated to CO staff (see Section 3.2.5).

---

[4] The evaluators acknowledge that there are a very limited number of NGOs working in the counter-trafficking sector that have sub-regional reach. However, even if the NGO represented on the Board works in only one country, it could still bring valuable perspective to meetings.
[5] Communication here is interpreted broadly so as to encompass outreach and relationship-building efforts, as well as administrative communication.

- The PMO should ensure that all CO staff have a consistent understanding of the Project and its approach (see Section 3.2.1). Orientation for new staff should be improved (see Section 3.2.5).
- The PMO should keep COs better-informed on the overall context and status (financial, programmatic and strategic) of the Project (see Section 3.2.5).
- Administrative communication procedures and "etiquette" should be clarified (for example, some CO staff noted that it would be useful for the PMO to acknowledge all email messages and, where action has been requested by the CO, set a date by which action will be taken; see Section 3.2.5).

Project Objectives

Objective 1
- The practice of allocating the same amount of money to each COMMIT member state in support of COMMIT activities is understandable in diplomatic terms, but fund allocations should logically be made on the basis of relative need, linked also to ongoing country performance in meeting specified targets in order to provide an appropriate incentive (Section 3.2.6).
- Regarding PPC 1 (Training and Capacity Building), the ongoing Training Needs Assessment should provide detailed recommendations. Pending the release of the TNA, the evaluators would make the following general recommendations (see Section 3.3.1.1):
    - Structural constraints also need to be addressed, with UNIAP's role being to identify key constraints and then engage suitable partners with the capacity to address them.
    - There is a need for regular training on basic human trafficking topics for government officials holding relevant positions, as turnover is often high.
    - Short courses and in-service training options are the only realistic option for many hard-pressed government staff.
    - There is in general a need for more in-house training and on-the-job mentoring, especially in areas such as social work.
    - Counter-trafficking modules should be included in generic pre- and in-service training courses, such as those attended by civil servants and police officers, as this would be an effective approach to institutionalising training capacity and reaching those who are, or will become, decision-makers.
    - There needs to be an increased focus on supporting the governments in rolling out training programmes at sub-national levels, not just national level.
    - Government agencies with responsibility for labour issues are, for a variety of reasons, generally less engaged in training and capacity-building activities than their peers. Efforts to engage such agencies need to be redoubled.
    - Where possible, CSOs should also be invited to participate in training events.
    - There should be much more evaluation of training impact and follow-up of trainees, in order to assess effectiveness.
- Regarding PPC 6 (Preventive Measures; see Section 3.3.1.6), evaluation of the impact of preventive measures has been lacking sector-wide (with a few notable exceptions, such as ILO's region-wide impact assessment in 2008). The Project should explore whether the impact assessment methodologies being employed by MTV Exit and its subcontractors would be of relevance to the wider counter-trafficking community.
- The Senior Officials' Meetings (SOMs) should address the issue of non-completion of commitments under annual work plans (Section 3.3.1.8). Linking financial support to a clear, time-bound plan would be both equitable and provide support to NPCs as they strive to engage governments.

Objective 2
- The Project needs to explore, in consultation with stakeholders, ways to make regional and national quarterly inter-agency working group meetings more effective (for example, through the use of more focused agendas or more specific themes) (see Section 3.3.2.1).
- The relevance to other countries of the approach used by UNIAP Cambodia and its partners to improve coordination should be explored (see Section 3.3.2.1).
- UNIAP and its UN agency partners should strive to adopt an integrated, joint approach to donors, which would be a radical contribution towards a more harmonised approach overall (see Section 3.3.3.2).

Objective 3
- Regarding SIREN (see Section 3.3.3.1), governments should be informed in advance of the release of potentially sensitive reports, as should other counter-trafficking agencies or projects whose work may also be affected, without compromising the report content.
- Dissemination of SIREN in hard copy is likely to be more effective for the many government staff who have limited internet access (see Section 3.3.3.1). As much relevant SIREN material as possible should be translated into national languages, otherwise its impact amongst both government and non-government staff will be limited.
- Reactions to the redesigned website should be evaluated, as the old version received lukewarm reviews from most stakeholders and needs to be significantly improved (see Section 3.3.3.1).

Objective 4
- The Project's ultimate aim under this Objective of supporting the 'eventual consolidation and institutionalisation of successful approaches' is an area that UNIAP should focus on improving through working more effectively with international agency and government partners (see Section 3.3.4).

Gender and Human Rights
- Gender sensitivity training is recommended for CO staff, with a special focus on its relevance to human trafficking issues (see Section 3.3.5).
- The mainstreaming of gender perspectives into the curriculum of the Regional Training Programme and into national training programmes should be improved (see Section 3.3.5).
- UNIAP should make use of existing UN gender expertise, through strengthening partnerships with UNIFEM at sub-regional level and/or seeking gender advisory input from the UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok (see Section 3.3.5).
- UNIAP should continue with its efforts to increase research into issues facing ethnic minority groups in the GMS, and draw on such research to inform programming (see Section 3.3.4.5).

Phase IV
- A strong case can be made for a fourth phase of three to four years' duration, the design of which should include serious consideration of a realistic exit strategy for the Project (see Section 3.4).
- The design process for Phase IV should be carefully planned and adequately funded. A wide range of stakeholders should be involved in a well-structured manner, as this will provide an opportunity to address and resolve (at least for Phase IV) many of the issues raised in this report regarding UNIAP's role, mandate and approach.

- The Phase IV design should be more tightly focused; however, given that it is still likely to be broad, the use of nested logframes should be considered. A sound M&E framework should form part of the Project Design Document (see Section 3.1.2).
- The entire duration of Phase IV should be fully budgeted for, from the outset (see Section 3.2.6).
- Core staff positions should be properly budgeted for and occupied by long-term staff (Section 3.2.4).

1.   Introduction to the Project

Human trafficking[6] is a global phenomenon that is widely believed to be growing rapidly, stimulated by the uneven effects of globalisation[7]. The member states of the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS) exhibit a range of different trafficking patterns – both within and between states – as a result of variation in attributes such as level of economic and human development, demography, governance system and geographic location. Men, women and children are also trafficked from the GMS to destinations further afield, including countries in Asia, Africa and Europe. A wide range of 'push' and 'pull' factors can encourage people to migrate, and though migration is not synonymous with trafficking (being an important livelihood strategy in its own right), traffickers do 'fish from the migration pond' as the UN Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women put it. However, it should be stressed that although there may be many factors that increase people's vulnerability to human trafficking, it ultimately involves the gross abuse of basic human rights.

Since the turn of the millennium, the GMS countries have made significant progress in combating human trafficking. However, there remain some fundamental issues to be addressed, such as the fact that not all of the GMS countries currently have anti-trafficking laws in place that comply with international standards. Questions have also arisen over the efficacy of many counter-trafficking initiatives that, while often improving matters at local level, are not capable of addressing the national or regional level problems that must be resolved. Indeed, there remain fundamental methodological challenges to even measuring the incidence of human trafficking and the impact of counter-trafficking responses, leaving many programmes resting on unproven assumptions. Many counter-trafficking initiatives have focused on the points of origin of trafficked persons, while relatively few have tackled the exploitation that occurs at points of destination. Mechanisms for victim identification remain limited, as does the extent to which information is shared amongst counter-trafficking agencies to assist in better programming.

It was in response to these needs – to facilitate better ways of working together amongst agencies, supported by improved information on trafficking trends and the efficacy of responses – that the United Nations Inter-Agency Project on Human Trafficking in the Greater-Mekong Sub-region (UNIAP) was established in 2000. The aim of the first phase (2000-2003) was to create an 'overarching mechanism' for coordination of anti-trafficking initiatives. The Phase III Project Design Document (PDD, p. 5) notes that this aim was quickly recognised as being overambitious at that time, given the newness of the sector and the rapidly growing array of actors involved. Consequently, the first phase actually concentrated on promoting critical analysis, building linkages between various counter-trafficking organisations and supporting small-scale pilot initiatives to address emerging issues.

Phase II (2003-2006) initially aimed to consolidate the achievements of Phase I, but eventually greatly exceeded this goal by facilitating the development of a sub-regional Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the governments of the six GMS states (Cambodia, China, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam), accompanied by a Sub-regional Plan of Action (SPA I) to operationalise the agreement. This process, known as the Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Trafficking (COMMIT), provides a sub-regional institutional framework for counter-trafficking initiatives that has high-level political backing. UNIAP plays the role of COMMIT Secretariat, providing technical assistance to facilitate implementation of the SPA, acting as focal point for reporting and supporting coordination and resource mobilisation activities.

---

[6] Human trafficking is explicitly defined in relevant international agreements, but essentially involves the recruitment, transport, receipt and harbouring of people for the purpose of exploiting their labour.
[7] This section draws on UNIAP background documentation in addition to documents cited in the text.

According to the Phase III PDD, Phase III (January 2007 – November 2010) essentially aims at further consolidation and institutionalisation of existing initiatives (notably COMMIT, support to the development of National Plans of Action and training programmes), complemented by a 'research and development' role. This latter role, in the words of the PDD (p. 5), will involve

> 'the developing and testing of new ideas and approaches, identification and addressing of gaps and opportunities, and strengthening of monitoring and evaluation throughout the sector. In turn, as new information, knowledge and insights are gained, the Project will work to ensure that these are brought to bear in programming across the anti-trafficking sector. All this work will be underpinned by the Project's ongoing role in creating opportunities for better coordination and information-sharing between its many Government, UN and non-government partners'.

The PDD specifies four main objectives, as follows:

Objective 1: Services to Governments. To support Governments in the institutionalization of effective multi-sectoral approaches to combat trafficking.

Objective 2: Services to UN Partners. To maximize the UN's contribution to the overall anti-trafficking response, including the COMMIT process.

Objective 3: Services to the anti-trafficking sector in general, including donors. To facilitate optimal allocation and targeting of anti-trafficking resources.

Objective 4: Special Projects. To continue to play a catalytic role in the anti-trafficking response by identifying and supporting special projects to address new and emerging issues and opportunities.

UNIAP is managed from a Project Management Office (PMO) in Bangkok, with Country Offices (COs) in the capitals of Cambodia, China, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam. It is a UN inter-agency project (the only body of its kind within the UN system focusing on human trafficking), receiving its own multilateral and bilateral funding rather than funding from UN agencies, allowing it to retain a neutral position within the UN. UNIAP does, however, collaborate with UN agencies to jointly fund collaborative programmes. Overall funding proposed for Phase III is USD 9 million[8], of which USD 7.7 million has been committed to date by some 15 different donors, whose contributions range from USD 2,300 to USD 2.9 million in size. USD 1.3 million thus remains to be raised by the Project, though additional funding above this sum could be readily utilised to improve and augment current programming, both by addressing some of the resource constraints identified in this report (see Sections 3.2.4 and 3.2.6) and by scaling up certain Project activities, notably under Objective 4.

---

[8] Though the Project is seeking, and has begun to secure, additional funding to respond to the impacts of the global financial crisis.

2. Evaluation objectives, scope and methodology

2.1 Objectives and scope

The objectives of the Mid-Term Evaluation are to systematically assess how effectively the four objectives of Phase III of UNIAP are being fulfilled and to offer concrete recommendations, where appropriate, for improving Project performance. The MTE is thus an expression of UNIAP's efforts to remain accountable to all its stakeholders, as well as to practise continuous learning. The period formally evaluated runs from December 2006 to the time of the evaluation (February 2009), though some consideration has been given to earlier phases of the project in order to place the evaluated period in context.

Two evaluators contributed to the MTE: Mr Paul Cunnington, an independent consultant with over 10 years' experience in the Greater Mekong Sub-region (assigned overall responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation, with a contract length of 30 working-days), and a donor observer, Ms Samantha Hung (Gender Advisor, NZAID), who contributed to the evaluation design, participated in stakeholder interviews in Thailand and at the beginning of the Cambodia visit, provided analytical insights and contributed to the evaluation report. The evaluators' TOR are attached as Annex 1. Documentary review began in January 2009, evaluation field work was conducted in February, the draft report was submitted for comment in mid-March and feedback was subsequently incorporated into the final report in April 2009.

The evaluators gratefully acknowledge the time devoted by informants from governments, local and international NGOs, UN and other international agencies, as well as UNIAP itself, to sharing their knowledge and experiences with them. Particular thanks are due to PMO and CO staff for arranging so efficiently the evaluators' tightly-packed schedule. Project and CO managers should be commended for their transparency and for their efforts to facilitate the consultants' work.

2.2 Methodology

The methodology applied is in-line with current good practice, as laid out in, for example, the *DAC Evaluation Quality Standards[9]* and the *Standards for Evaluation in the UN System[10]*. A draft of the methodology was shared with UNIAP Project Management Office (PMO) and Country Office (CO) staff at an early stage in order to elicit their feedback.

A review of relevant project documentation was the evaluators' first action, including the Phase III Project Proposal, the Phase II Final Evaluation Report (particularly its recommendations and the Project's response to these), Semi-Annual Project Progress Reports, specially commissioned reports on particular project components (e.g. the report on the Regional Training Programme Evaluation), Project outputs (e.g. Strategic Information Response Network (SIREN) reports and the UNIAP website) and selected Project Management Office (PMO) and Country Office (CO) progress reports (see Annex 2 for a full list of documents consulted).

Through discussion with the PMO team, and in light of budgetary and time constraints, it was decided that the evaluators would visit the capitals of three of the six GMS states involved to interview PMO / CO staff and stakeholders. Thailand, Cambodia and the Lao PDR were selected, on the grounds that they are broadly representative of the wide range of operating environments encountered by UNIAP, as they vary significantly as regards relevant criteria (including level of economic and human development, governance system, geographic location and whether the country is an origin and/or source and/or destination for human trafficking). For the three countries not visited by the evaluators, the CO's National Project

---

[9] Available from: http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork
[10] Available from: http://www.uneval.org/documentdownload?doc_id=22&file_id=128

Coordinator (NPC) was sent by email a list of questions developed for CO (and PMO) staff (see Annex 5), though in the case of Myanmar, Paul Cunnington was able to conduct an opportunistic face-to-face interview with the NPC in the course of another assignment. Key stakeholders in countries visited by the evaluators who were unavailable for interview during the evaluators' time in-country were also consulted by means of tailored lists of questions sent by email, as were individuals who have been involved with the project in some way but live outside the region. All six COs and the PMO were requested to complete a form designed to rapidly assess the current status of project implementation, as well as identify problems and unexpected outcomes (see Annex 4). Responses to this form helped the evaluators identify issues to follow up on in individual interviews.

Stakeholder interviews were conducted individually (in almost all cases) and on the basis of anonymity, with the evaluation report containing no attributions to any specific source. Key stakeholders for each of the various Project objectives and activities were listed by the COs concerned, and the evaluators then proposed a short-list of stakeholders to actually meet with, ensuring that all the main stakeholder types would be represented and that all Project objectives would be covered. As issues emerged in the course of field work, additional informants were identified by the evaluators. A full list of persons consulted is attached as Annex 9. Semi-structured interview guidelines were developed for stakeholder interviews (see Annex 3), with reference to the PDD as well as the Sub-Regional Plan of Action (SPA) II Targets. The guidelines provided a consistent framework within which the evaluators were able to focus on issues most relevant to each particular stakeholder. Interviews generally lasted around one hour, sometimes longer in the case of stakeholders that are very heavily involved with the Project. Themes emerging from stakeholder interviews were discussed on an ongoing basis by the evaluators amongst themselves (often whilst travelling between meetings or at the end of the day), as well as with PMO and CO staff in order to contextualize interview data and seek feedback.

At the beginning of the field work, a meeting was held with the PMO management team in order for the consultants to be briefed on the Project and for final discussions on methodological issues to take place. This also presented the evaluators with an initial opportunity to interview PMO staff as a group, with individual interviews being conducted with all PMO staff as opportunities arose during the evaluators' stay in Thailand. At the end of the evaluators' stay, an initial debriefing meeting was held with PMO staff to discuss emerging findings and elicit feedback. A similar process was followed with the staff of each CO: the National Project Coordinator was interviewed individually, as were more experienced staff members when time permitted (when time was too tight, staff were interviewed as a small group). Interviews of PMO and CO staff followed the aforementioned guideline attached as Annex 5. Informants' views were triangulated to minimize informant bias and develop a balanced analysis. All data (in both electronic and hard formats) remained confidential, being shared only between the evaluators themselves.

The basic analytical framework was provided by the aforementioned *DAC Evaluation Quality Standards*, particularly the five DAC Evaluation Criteria. However, it was agreed with Project management that given the limited time available for the study, the huge challenges presented by the issue of attribution and the fact that the study is a mid-term rather than final evaluation, no formal attempt to assess the DAC criterion of Impact would be made. To ensure that concerns regarding aid effectiveness were given due attention, the DAC criteria were complemented by considering relevant elements of the five principles contained in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, including aspects that were assigned particular emphasis under the Accra Agenda for Action that aims to accelerate and deepen implementation of the Paris Declaration.

As discussed in more detail in Section 3.2.1, weaknesses in the original Project Design Document raised some challenges for the evaluation in terms of clear targets or indicators

against which to evaluate progress. This was not such an issue for Objective 1, as the second Sub-regional Plan of Action (SPA II) that forms the core of this Objective and that was an early achievement of Phase III contains agreed targets and timelines. As regards Objectives 2, 3 and 4, however, Project management appears to have dealt with the problem of the broad, ambitious Outputs and poorly defined indicators and targets in the PDD by developing annual work plans with more concise, focused activities and targets that aim to reach the same Objectives. This represents a good operational solution, but it also means that progress towards the Objectives cannot in general be tracked using the targets and indicators included in the original Results and Resources Framework, which has not been revised. Evaluation of Project effectiveness in Section 3.3 therefore focuses on assessing the extent to which the overall Objectives have been achieved through the implementation of the revised sets of activities.

In accordance with good practice, which demands that stakeholders be given the opportunity to comment on an evaluation's findings and recommendations, the draft evaluation report was presented by Paul Cunnington at a regional inter-agency meeting in Bangkok in April 2009. The draft report was also disseminated electronically to all stakeholders (including all persons consulted by the evaluators) to further seek feedback prior to preparation of the final evaluation report. It is proposed that the report findings be formally considered by the Management Board and the national COMMIT taskforces, and that they subsequently respond to, and monitor implementation of, the report's recommendations.

2.3   Constraints and potential sources of bias

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.

After substantial discussion with the PMO team, as well as some of the CO staff concerned, it was decided to use UNIAP staff as interpreters in stakeholder meetings when required. This decision was based on the conclusion that the benefits stemming from this approach (including UNIAP staff members' intimate familiarity with the Project and its specialised technical vocabulary) would outweigh the biases it could potentially introduce, such as concealment of negative feedback from interviewees (though this was considered unlikely) or causing interviewees to be more guarded in their responses.

The short timeframe assigned for the evaluation of a complex project with broad geographical and thematic scope, as well as a multitude of partners, inevitably limited the quantity of data collected and the depth of analysis. The fact that the evaluators were able to visit only three of the six GMS countries involved significantly reduced their understanding of the situation in the countries not visited (particularly China and Vietnam) and hence the coverage of those countries in the evaluation report. Coverage of Vietnam was further limited by the fact that very little data was submitted by the CO to the evaluators.

Paul Cunnington was engaged on a 30 working-day contract by UNIAP to conduct a Training Needs Analysis in Thailand, the Lao PDR and Myanmar during the period October 2008 – March 2009. This assignment is not seen as a likely source of bias, but is mentioned here in the interests of full disclosure.

3.   Analysis of Findings

3.1 Relevance of the Project
The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.[11]

After noting that the Phase II Final Evaluation recommended an additional phase, the UNIAP Phase III Project Design Document (PDD) finalised in November 2006 gives few specific details of the Phase III formulation process, simply stating that the Document draws on the experience of previous phases and is 'based on extensive consultations with a wide range of stakeholders'. The PDD explicitly states that the 'core purpose of UNIAP during Phase III will be to ensure that COMMIT can move forward and realise its full potential', though it adds that in order to achieve this, UNIAP must ensure that COMMIT 'takes account of and responds to new developments within the sector'.

The PDD anticipates that, for administrative purposes, around 70% of the Project's time and effort will be devoted to the COMMIT role and around 30% to other constituencies. It observes – correctly – that there are many linkages and synergies between these roles. Current Project management notes that COMMIT provides the overall framework within which to operate and to engage with national governments (as well as an umbrella for enhanced cooperation between other development partners), while other components enable the Project to address emerging issues as well as to inform policy and strategy. The evaluators concur with this logic and feel that UNIAP has currently got the balance between its COMMIT and "non-COMMIT"[12] roles about right. There is some variation between COs, however, with certain COs (such as Cambodia) being more involved with "non-COMMIT" components than others (such as Laos). It is important for UNIAP to retain an appropriate balance in this respect, as it would be easy for Project staff time and resources to be consumed by activities focused on "non-COMMIT" activities.

Feedback from stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation frequently suggested that the purposes of UNIAP's work related to 'other constituencies' (largely captured under Objectives 3 and 4) is not fully understood and/or accepted by a significant proportion of both government and non-government stakeholders, even though the quality of many of the initiatives implemented under Objectives 3 and 4 is high (as discussed further in Sections 3.3.3 and 3.3.4). For example, one lead government partner told the evaluators that UNIAP 'should work according to plan more', i.e. focus more on its role as COMMIT Secretariat. A major regional stakeholder that otherwise held positive views on the Project told the evaluators that Objective 4 is a 'mistake', as it's confusing regarding UNIAP's role: 'are you helping others to do, or are you doing yourself?', as they put it. A related issue here is some stakeholders' concern that UNIAP is playing too active an 'implementation role', rather than focusing on coordination and gap filling (though this concern is likely due in some cases to competition for donor funding and the desire to preserve an agency's "turf"). In part these issues arise due to the fact that communication between the Project and its stakeholders could be improved in a number of ways, an issue that is touched on in a number of sections of this report (including Sections 3.2.1, 3.3.2 and 3.3.4) and is the subject of a number of recommendations in Section 4. Clarifying with stakeholders the rationale behind Objectives 3 and 4 and, in particular, their relevance to COMMIT, would also go some way to addressing the concerns raised by some stakeholders, mainly governmental, over the allocation of resources between UNIAP's different roles.

---

[11] Definition given in *DAC Summary of key norms and standards*, available from: www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork.
[12] The use of quotation marks here emphasises the fact that many UNIAP activities not formally under the COMMIT process are in fact highly relevant to it.

3.1.1 Did the project design correctly identify real needs?

This section discusses the extent to which the project design correctly identified real needs to be met within the anti-trafficking sector. The efficiency and effectiveness of the project in attempting to meet these needs is then discussed in Sections 3.2 and 3.3.

The broad rationale put forward in UNIAP documentation (described in Section 1) for the Project in general, and for Phase III in particular, is convincing. With regard to the four main Objectives that constitute Phase III, there is little doubt that activities under Objective 1 in support of governments and the COMMIT process, including UNIAP's Secretariat role, are meeting real needs. The vast majority of informants recognised UNIAP's key role in this regard, as reflected by the following comments from very senior officials in two COMMIT member states, followed by a comment from a UN agency partner: 'without UNIAP, the government would not be able to coordinate [the COMMIT process] effectively'; 'without COMMIT and UNIAP, we would not have close cooperation between the countries in the GMS [to counter trafficking]'; 'things are a lot better than if it [UNIAP] didn't exist, and there's nothing that can really replace it'. UNIAP's support to the COMMIT process represents an important contribution to the Paris Declaration principles of government ownership and alignment.

Few would dispute the need for better coordination amongst UN and other international agencies. However, UNIAP's role with regard to the provision of services to UN partners under Objective 2 is much less well-recognised amongst UN and other international agencies than UNIAP's role related to COMMIT. For many informants from these agencies, UNIAP's role in providing services – including the facilitation of coordination – is not clearly defined, with some informants questioning UNIAP's mandate to play this role. This is particularly prevalent at the regional level, generally less so at the national level (though there is significant variation between countries, as discussed in Section 3.3.2). A small number of such informants offered quite harsh criticism, going on to explain that they feel that human trafficking issues are better addressed now within UN processes (such as the UN Development Assistance Frameworks and Common Country Assessments) and government structures. These are not new issues, having been discussed in the Phase II Final Evaluation, but they have obviously yet to be resolved. Section 3.3.2 contains further discussion of these issues. It is worth making the point here that Objective 2 is extremely relevant to the challenge of translating the rhetoric of "One UN" into practice, presenting a means by which to facilitate the coordination of a whole-of-UN response to a thematic development challenge in a sub-region. This has the potential to provide the UN with a window of opportunity to demonstrate its ability to realise "One UN" to donors and government partners.

Objective 3 (Services to the anti-trafficking sector in general, including donors) involves four main areas of activity. The first of these – facilitating access for anti-trafficking practitioners to the latest information and analysis – is clearly a pressing need, with many informants noting the paucity of reliable information in the sector. However, informants' responses raised a number of issues concerning UNIAP's activities in this area, notably as regards the purpose, target audience(s) and dissemination of the project's flagship initiative, the Strategic Information Response Network (SIREN) (discussed further in Section 3.3.1). The first activity area under Objective 3 links to the second (as well as other Project components) – strengthening monitoring and evaluation (M&E) 'throughout the anti-trafficking sector' – in that the availability of accurate information, together with appropriate systems, are both required for effective M&E. Again, the need for improvement was confirmed by many informants, particularly in regard to the enormous challenge for the sector of demonstrating impact. One regional level informant spoke of the sector suffering from a 'crisis of confidence' as a result of the inability to reliably determine which interventions are effective and which are not. The third activity area – contributing to improved coordination amongst all

development partners, including donors and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) – also addresses clear needs, confirmed by informants' responses and, on a broader level, by agreements such as the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action. The fourth activity area – providing opportunities for partnership creation – is in line with the efforts being made by many development actors and donors to develop partnerships in order to maximise impact and sustainability.

Objective 4 (Special projects) envisages UNIAP playing a 'catalytic role' in the anti-trafficking sector through 'generally small-scale initiatives' that are aimed at 'bridging gaps, exploring new approaches, bringing in new actors and building new linkages, particularly across borders.' The intention is that such initiatives will then be adopted by partner agencies with relevant technical specialisations, 'with a view to eventual consolidation and institutionalisation of successful approaches'. Though the PDD states that special projects had been a successful feature of earlier phases, this Objective is the least well-understood by stakeholders, with some being completely unaware of its existence. The logic behind the Objective is sound and elicited very positive comments from some informants who are aware of it, such as the individual who said: 'I very much like the fact that they [UNIAP] seem to be getting involved in real cases and real issues.... Also the focus on worst offenders – those actually causing the trafficking'. Some special projects (such as the Support to Under-served Victim Populations Project (see Section 3.3.4.2) and the rapid response to the global financial crisis (see Section 3.4.2)) are responding to pressing needs with a speed that other development partners cannot match. The special project to develop a *Guide to Ethics and Human Rights in Counter-trafficking* has attracted funds from the Thai Department of Special Investigation to support the costs of translating, printing and distributing 8,000 copies nationwide, indicating high levels of government ownership in some instances. Despite such successes, however, UNIAP needs to better communicate the rationale underlying this Objective to many stakeholders, as well as improve its approach to institutionalising successful approaches (see Section 3.3.4).

3.1.2   Overall quality of the project design
The overall rationale behind, and strategy proposed for, Phase III of UNIAP are clearly described in the PDD prepared under the previous management regime, and are placed in the broader context of the anti-trafficking sector as a whole. The Project's Objectives are clearly stated and are logically consistent. However, the Results and Resources Framework (Annex 6) that also lays out Project Outputs and Activities does not do so in a consistent and logical manner, problems compounded by the fact that the framework does not use standard logframe layout or terminology. There are no indicators specified at Objective level, while the indicators specified at Output level are generally not SMART[13]. There is no M&E plan indicating data required, sources or means and frequency of data collection. Many of the Project's initiatives are difficult to monitor and evaluate, hence all the more reason that more attention should have been devoted to M&E issues during the design process (as was recommended by the Final Evaluation of Phase II).

The Results and Resources Framework reveals the enormous scope, variety and complexity of the initiatives with which the Project is involved, an issue reflected in the broad nature of many of the Outputs. For example, Output 1.4 is 'To develop an effective, cross-sectoral system to combat trafficking at the national level'. Normally, the achievement of an Output should largely be within the control of project management; this Output clearly depends on factors way beyond project control and could in itself, in other circumstances, represent the Goal of an entire project or even programme. Similarly, one *activity* under Output 4.1 commits the Project to 'Addressing socio-cultural norms and racist and discriminatory attitudes that contribute to use and toleration of trafficked labour', a massive undertaking. Particularly in light of the resources available (see Section 3.2.6), the Project design is

---

[13] Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bound.

extremely ambitious. Proposals for any future phases should be more tightly focused and more realistic in their stated aims.

The PDD section on potential risks is short but does correctly identify two risks that, as will be discussed later in this report, do appear to be materially affecting implementation of Phase III. The first of these risks is a lack of stable funding for the full phase, which the PDD notes would have negative impacts on implementation, diverting time and resources away from key tasks (see Section 3.2.6). The second is that organisations will need to review and possibly amend programmes in the light of agreed priorities, such as the Sub-Regional Plan of Action (SPA), but that internal dynamics sometimes mitigate against this (see Section 3.3.2). A positive aspect of the design is that it is relatively flexible, an attribute that enabled the current Project management team in the PMO to adapt and re-orient Project components when implementation began, for example (see Section 3.2.1). Certain cross-cutting aspects of the design, such as the application of gender and human rights perspectives (see Sections 3.3.5 and 3.3.4.5, respectively), are highly relevant to the Accra Agenda for Action.

3.2   Efficiency of the Project
Efficiency measures the outputs – qualitative and quantitative – in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which is used to assess the extent to which aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.[14]

A cost-benefit analysis is well beyond the scope of this evaluation, but an assessment follows of the quality of day-to-day management (including monitoring, an issue highlighted in the evaluators' TOR), as well as organisational, governance, personnel and finance issues.

3.2.1   Project management
The appointment of the current Project management team (Regional Project Manager, Chief Technical Advisor and Finance/Operations Specialist) in 2007 clearly marked a significant shift in terms of management culture and technical approach. The transition created significant ill-feeling in some quarters, and though it is not the task of the evaluators to delve into such issues, this should be noted by way of salient background information as it was regularly raised by stakeholders. The new management team thus initially faced more resistance on the part of some stakeholders and within some Country Offices (COs) than would normally be the case.

Inheriting the PDD, the shortcomings of which are discussed in Section 3.1.2, Project management took on the challenge of developing a realistic approach to implementation. With regard to Objective 1, the main focus initially was on developing the second Sub-regional Plan of Action (SPA II) to succeed SPA I, which a number of informants suggested was rather poor and did not really take advantage of the then recently signed COMMIT MoU. The same informants noted that SPA II represents a considerable improvement, providing countries with the flexibility to select the most relevant activities for their context while maintaining a consistent overall framework across all six states. For the first time, SPA II also contains agreed targets and timelines (see Annex 7), against which progress is tracked.

As regards Objectives 2, 3 and 4, Project management appears to have dealt with the problem of the broad, ambitious Outputs and poorly defined indicators and targets in the PDD by developing annual work plans with more concise, focused activities and targets that aim to reach the same Objectives (an extract from the 2008 work plan is attached as Annex

---

[14]   Definition given in *DAC Summary of key norms and standards*, available from: www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork.

8). This represents a good operational solution, but it also means that progress towards the Objectives cannot in general be tracked using the targets and indicators included in the original Results and Resources Framework. This represents a challenge for evaluation, in that the original Results and Resources Framework has not been revised[15] (and with only around 18 months to run until the end of Phase III, it is probably not worth the time and effort required to make these revisions now). Evaluation of Project effectiveness in Section 3.3 will therefore focus on assessing the extent to which the overall Objectives have been achieved through the implementation of the revised sets of activities. These changes in the way the PDD is being interpreted also seem to have raised some communication challenges in ensuring that all the COs have a consistent understanding of the Project and its approach. As one CO staff member noted, 'I think the project has been changing, so the project document needs to be amended'.

When the current Project management team took over, little was apparently in place in terms of planning, monitoring and management systems, with regard to both technical and financial aspects of the Project. Project management concluded that the challenge was to develop such systems to support the operationalisation of COMMIT, so as to exploit the opportunities it presents to the full. Project management have clearly made very significant improvements in this regard, with a number of CO staff and government counterparts who have been working with the Project since at least Phase II noting the development of improved systems during Phase III. This phase of the Project is thus contributing more towards *Managing for results* and providing the necessary information for enhanced *Mutual Accountability*[16]. That said, there is still room for further improvement, notably as regards M&E (see below).

The shift in management culture referred to above was commented on by three informants who have been familiar with the Project for a long period of time. Prior to Phase III, these informants felt that the Project was very focused – perhaps too focused – on communication[17] or, as one of them put it, 'political' aspects, and did not give sufficient attention to technical matters. (One informant qualified this by noting that in the earlier phases, building relationships was an essential prerequisite, with Project efforts culminating in the groundbreaking COMMIT MoU.) These informants felt that during Phase III, the Project has to some extent 'over-corrected', emphasizing technical aspects and not paying sufficient attention to communication with stakeholders. Both aspects of the Project are crucial, and striking a perfect balance is probably impossible, though it would be desirable for the Project to place more emphasis on communication (thus addressing issues raised in various sections of this report, notably Sections 3.3.2, 3.3.3 and 3.3.4) while not allowing the very significant technical gains to slip away. It should be noted that Project management have enormous workloads due to resource constraints (see Sections 3.2.4 and 3.2.6), thus the reduced emphasis on communication in Phase III is likely due, at least in part, to the imperative for management to prioritise tasks. It should also be emphasized that Project management's overall performance has been impressive, in providing leadership and vision as well as technical guidance.

---

[15] A logframe – or Results and Resources Framework – should ideally be viewed as a flexible management tool, being updated in response to changes in the operating environment or project approach. However, the evaluators acknowledge that this is often not possible due to restrictive donor or organisational regulations. It is not known whether such restrictions affect UNIAP.

[16] *Managing for Results* and *Mutual Accountability* are two of the five principles laid out under the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

[17] Communication here is interpreted broadly so as to encompass outreach and relationship-building efforts, as well as administrative communication.

3.2.2 Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)

The Phase II Final Evaluation (p. 3) notes that 'since UNIAP's inception the project documents have been prepared without a clear definition as to what the situation at the end of the project phase should be. There are no parameters against which to appraise progress...'. Although the Phase III Project Design Document does make efforts to address these issues, it is still weak in this regard, as discussed in Section 3.1.2. There are no indicators specified at Objective level, while the indicators specified at Output level are generally not SMART[18]. Neither is there an M&E plan indicating data required, sources or means and frequency of data collection.

As mentioned above, to its credit Project management has worked to address these design weaknesses that it inherited, as well as to improve Project M&E as part of the general improvement of management systems. As one experienced researcher interviewed by the evaluators put it, the Regional Project Manager and Chief Technical Advisor 'brought with them an appreciation of the importance of data' when they joined the Project. The SPA II developed with UNIAP support contains agreed targets and timelines against which progress (largely linked to Objective 1) can be tracked, a major improvement on SPA I. Project management has also overseen the introduction of annual work plans with more concise, focused activities and targets that aim to reach Objectives 2, 3 and 4. Outcome indicators are still generally lacking, however; for example, the SPA II targets are mostly pitched at Output level.

The system established by Project management across all COs for approval, monitoring and reporting at Activity level is a rigorous one. Prior to the commencement of any activity, the relevant CO has to complete a pre-requisition form containing an activity summary and budget, which must be approved by the PMO before implementation can begin. COs submit monthly reports summarising progress on each activity, which are consolidated by the PMO and shared with a range of government and non-government stakeholders. The monthly reports are also used as the basis for quarterly or semi-annual reports to donors and other stakeholders.

The original Results and Resources Framework should have been formally revised to reflect the improvements made by Project management; the fact that it was not means that it is of very limited utility in assessing progress towards Project Objectives. Given that much of what UNIAP does is "invisible" and behind-the-scenes, it is all the more important that the Project develop systems to monitor Project performance against stated Objectives in order to demonstrate Outcomes. Project management is acutely aware of this and, as mentioned, have made significant progress in improving systems compared to Phase II; the fact that they have not yet been able to achieve more in this regard is largely because they and their staff are so stretched due to resource constraints.

As regards working to improve M&E in the broader counter-trafficking sector, the project has made some significant progress in certain areas. In addition to the targets and timelines developed for SPA II, UNIAP has been working with government partners to develop M&E frameworks for the National Plans of Action (though government informants in two countries indicated that they saw monitoring of NPA implementation as UNIAP's responsibility rather than the government's, suggesting a rather low level of ownership on the part of these individuals). The implementation review of SPA I released in December 2007 (*The COMMIT Sub-regional Plan of Action (COMMIT SPA): Achievements in Combating Human Trafficking in the Greater Mekong Sub-region, 2005-2007*) represents an important effort to take stock of progress in a transparent manner; a similar report covering the first year of SPA II is due to be released in 2009. Such reports contribute significantly to mutual accountability between the Project, governments, donors and other stakeholders. More technically, the highly

---

[18] Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bound.

innovative Trafficking Estimates Competition (see Section 3.3.3.1) represents a very creative means of stimulating the development of methodologies to estimate the number of trafficked persons in a particular locality and/or sector, a prerequisite to the development of a capacity to track trafficking trends and evaluate the impact of counter-trafficking interventions. The SIREN initiative (see Section 3.3.3.1) also delivers data and analysis relevant to M&E.

Despite the above initiatives, few informants met by the evaluators were aware of any activity on the part of UNIAP to strengthen M&E – particularly M&E *systems* – beyond M&E of the Project itself. This may, again, be partly due to communication constraints. However, it was notable that many such informants, particularly within government, did not appear to assign a high priority to this area of work (though there were a few notable exceptions). For the Project to further improve internal M&E and, in particular, to achieve its aims of strengthening M&E in the broader counter-trafficking sector, it is essential that the position of M&E Specialist envisaged in the PDD be filled, on either a full- or part-time basis (as discussed in Section 3.2.4). The time and resources devoted by ARTIP to developing their M&E framework focusing on one specialised area of counter-trafficking provides an indication of the resource allocation and level of prioritisation required for UNIAP to attain its aims of improving M&E within the broader counter-trafficking sector. Ensuring that responsibility for M&E is clearly demarcated in UNIAP personnel's TORs, investing in M&E capacity-building for Project staff and partners, and seeking effective partnerships are all likely to be keys to success.

3.2.3   Project governance

UNIAP Country Offices (COs), as well as the Project Management Office (PMO) in Bangkok, are administratively located under their respective UN Resident Coordinators (UNRCs). This means that each CO, although managed in operational terms by the PMO, also has a relationship with the relevant UNRC. The relationship between CO and UNRC has not been formally defined in consistent terms and consequently varies from country to country and with time, depending upon the individual UNRCs and their preferences and priorities. In the past, for example, some UNRCs have been more willing than others to advocate on sensitive issues on the CO's behalf (a role that the evaluators believe to be an important one, as discussed in Section 3.2.5). Lines of communication are not always clear, for example as to whether it should be the CO, PMO or UNRC Thailand who briefs other UNRCs on regional developments. Though UNRCs are often supportive of UNIAP COs (and, indeed, the PMO), the relationship of UNIAP with the UNRCs needs to be formalised, for example through the drafting of ToR drawing on past examples of good practice. It is understood that an effort to clarify the UNRC-UNIAP relationship has been initiated but seems to have stalled; it should be restarted and concluded.

At the sub-regional level, the UNRC Thailand plays the role of Principal Project Representative (PPR). A number of informants observed that, in terms of management structure, it would in many ways be more logical for UNIAP to be located under the UNDP Regional Centre, as this would provide a clearer apex to the management structure (given that all six UNRCs are peers, with no one UNRC possessing any mandate to direct the others). The UNDP Regional Centre may also provide a regional UN voice for advocacy. Although the evaluators acknowledge that their understanding of UNDP regional structures and governance processes is limited and that this option is probably not feasible for the current phase, it should be explored as an option for future phases. Also at the sub-regional level, a Project Steering Committee (PSC) composed of government, UN and civil society representatives meets once a year, though the precise role and responsibilities of this committee were not entirely clear to the evaluators.

UNIAP is governed by a Management Board, chaired by the UNRC Thailand as PPR. The stated role of the Board has changed over the life of Phase III, but the most recent ToR indicate that its current role is to provide strategic direction, monitor progress, review and

approve staff appointments and approve the budget. Its roles in fundraising and in assisting the Regional Project Manager (RPM) in working with Project partners, both envisaged in the PDD, are not mentioned. The current composition of the Board is as follows, with the RPM holding observer status:

- Principal Project Representative – UNRC Thailand (Chair);
- Five UN representatives (some on a rotational basis);
- One UNCT Representative from the countries involved in the Project;
- Two donor representatives;
- Two COMMIT Government representatives (rotated on an annual basis according to alphabetical order); and
- One representative from an NGO working on trafficking sub-regionally.

The ToR state that no more than one third of the members should rotate on an annual basis and that five key agencies 'that play a more critical role in regards to UNIAP work' should have permanent representation, namely: UNDP (the Resident Coordinator), UNICEF, IOM, ILO and UNODC. Counter-trafficking experts may be invited to attend specific meetings.

A clear finding from the evaluation is that the role and membership of the Board need to be clarified through discussion with, and then clearly communicated to, stakeholders. Many stakeholders, even at senior and/or regional levels, have not heard of the Board or, if they have, do not understand its role. This can have negative repercussions, in that some informants expressed the view – whether justified or not – that the Board was rather exclusionary and its workings opaque. Some stakeholders see the board primarily as a mechanism to control information, while others see it as failing to provide direction: 'I may be naive ... but it seems that the Management Board has no real decision-making role; it seems that things have been pre-arranged'. COs generally do not understand the Board's role and do not receive reports on its discussions. It is very much in UNIAP's own interest that the Board's role be clarified with stakeholders, if only to avoid misperceptions. Transparency should be increased, with full minutes being circulated to all stakeholders; currently, it is understood that the proceedings of Board meetings are not formally communicated beyond Board members. The NGO seat should be held by a representative from a recognised NGO, whereas at present this seat is held by ARTIP (an experienced and valued UNIAP partner, but certainly not an NGO). The evaluators understand that the number of NGOs with regional coverage and an appropriate technical focus is limited, but feel that it is important that this issue is resolved.

3.2.4 Personnel
The vast majority of UNIAP staff, in both the PMO and the COs, are exceptionally dedicated and hard-working. The PMO was described by one major stakeholder as 'very creative' and hence 'always fun to work with'. The PMO's innovative approach was noted by the evaluators, as was its habit of trying whenever possible to inject an element of competitiveness into activities to improve results (the Trafficking Estimates Competition being a prime example). The PMO's responsiveness has recently been demonstrated by its rapid reaction to the global financial crisis, which saw the PMO prepare a briefing paper, circulate it to potential donors and secure funds within the space of a few months. At a CO level, UNIAP Myanmar and its local partners promptly organised a series of initiatives, including awareness raising and training on human trafficking, for areas affected by Cyclone Nargis.

In Section 3.1.2 it was suggested that the Project design is extremely ambitious, given available resources, and one result is that staff in the PMO and all COs are stretched to the limit (to an extent that is obvious to stakeholders, as evidenced by comments made by informants). This has a range of detrimental impacts on the Project: for example, PMO staff (especially when travelling) are sometimes unable to respond to requests for approval from

COs promptly, which is a particular problem given that COs often need to respond quickly to government and partner requests. Some CO staff noted that their lack of time limits the extent to which they can engage in the analytical work which, they argued, adds most value.

Budget constraints have meant that key positions envisaged in the PDD have not been filled, most notably that of M&E Specialist, the lack of whom has contributed to the Project's falling short of its aims in this regard (as discussed above). There is a real need for an in-house specialist with the technical skills and, critically, the time to support staff in further strengthening M&E within the Project and in working with partners to strengthen M&E in relation to the SPA and National Plans of Action (NPAs), as well as more broadly in the counter-trafficking sector as a whole. Another important staff position that has been left unfilled for significant periods of time (often for reasons beyond the Project's control) is that of Communications Officer, which has contributed to the shortcomings in communication with stakeholders mentioned in various sections of this report.

Insecurity of staff tenure is an issue: all staff are on one-year contracts, at best, and this poses risks to continuity and staff morale (however, it should be stated that Project management has significantly improved the quality of staff contracts in comparison to earlier phases). This issue should have been resolved by Phase III of a project, but the evaluators understand that its persistence is largely due to the nature of UNDP systems, a factor beyond the control of the Project. The professional development of staff is recognised as important by Project management and staff alike, but is hindered by time and, to a lesser extent, financial constraints. The impact thus far on staff motivation appears limited, but this constraint is likely already having consequences for project performance, in that staff are unable to develop skills that they recognise they need (such as advocacy and negotiation skills, advanced IT skills and communication/language skills).

The Project relies quite heavily on Australian Youth Ambassadors for Development (AYADs), volunteers and interns to fill core staff positions, especially in COs. An overreliance on such individuals diminishes the likelihood of sustainability. While AYADs and others can and do bring valuable skills and experience to the project, core staff positions should be properly budgeted for and occupied by long-term staff. A number of informants suggested that the Project could draw more upon human resources available at national and regional level.

3.2.5   Country Offices

The dynamics within each CO, and between each CO and its national partners, are highly specific, as would be expected (further details on country-specific issues with regard to Project Objectives are provided in Section 3.3). There is thus a strong case for empowering COs as much as possible, and there has indeed been a shift of decision-making power to National Project Coordinators (NPCs) during Phase III (as confirmed by some of the NPCs), for which Project management should be credited. An important general point is that great responsibility lies on the shoulders of each CO's NPC, who has to advocate and negotiate with a wide range of stakeholders to chart a course forward. NPCs have a very delicate balancing act to perform: on the one hand, many stakeholders (particularly NGOs) expect them to advocate forcefully on relevant issues, whilst on the other hand, NPCs must maintain effective working relationships with government partners. Some NPCs understand, and perform, their role better than others. High-level advocacy – possibly behind-the-scenes – with government, particularly on very sensitive issues, is an area where the UN Resident Coordinators should play an important role. This would enable UNIAP to indirectly conduct high-level advocacy at national level, thus protecting the NPC's relations with government. This is a role that should be considered when clarifying and formalising the relationship between the UNRCs and UNIAP, as discussed in Section 3.2.3.

CO staff made note of the fact that Phase III has seen COs being given more autonomy, which was generally viewed as a positive step. Improved management systems were also mentioned as an improvement on earlier phases. Communication could be further improved with COs in various respects, though this appears to be less of an issue in the Thai office, probably because of the fact that they are situated in the same building as the PMO. For example, COs would appreciate being better informed about the 'big picture', such as the current overall financial status of the project (important in order for the NPC to know what kind of forward commitments can be made with partners), ongoing fundraising strategies (with perhaps more CO involvement in proposal development), advance notice of new special projects and donor reporting (COs do not appear to receive reports to donors prepared by the PMO, which as one NPC noted might be embarrassing if a donor visited and received information from a CO contrary to that contained in the donor report).

The three country offices visited by the evaluation team all acknowledged the technical prowess of PMO staff, and attributed a significant proportion of the communication problems experienced to the fact that both PMO and CO staff are fully stretched, as mentioned above. However, certain issues were identified as requiring further clarification. The demarcation of roles and responsibilities within the PMO is still not clear to some CO staff, particularly with regard to who holds what level of authority (to provide technical approval for an activity, for example). The period within which a response can be expected from the PMO as regards providing feedback or granting approval was also raised as an issue, with some CO staff noting that although they appreciate PMO personnel's busy travel schedules, an initial acknowledgement of a request, accompanied by a commitment to provide a full response by a given date, would help the CO in meeting its commitments to partners.

Some CO staff said that they felt a bit 'isolated' from the project as a whole and suggested the need for more interaction between COs (one suggestion being a quarterly NPC teleconference, though it is understood that this practice has already been started). The staff retreat is appreciated by participants; the issue of communication has been discussed at the last two retreats, but clearly there is a need for further discussion. The involvement of an external facilitator, if not already tried, may be of assistance. Some COs noted that, at times, they would appreciate further guidance from the PMO but that they realise the PMO's time and resources are limited: 'We don't want to bother the PMO as they get 500 emails a day anyway'.

Document translation takes up a great deal of time in all three of the COs visited, as many government counterparts read little or no English and hence it is essential that documents be made available in the local language. This applies to planning documents as well as to UNIAP's various information products, such as SIREN. Budgetary constraints mean that engaging an external translator is often not feasible, thus senior CO staff have to devote time to translation, detracting from the time they can devote to their core tasks.

3.2.6 Financial issues
As noted in Section 3.1.2, the PDD identified as a risk a lack of stable funding for the full phase, as this would have negative impacts on implementation, diverting time and resources away from key tasks. This risk has materialised, in that the Project is currently facing an overall shortfall in funding to the end of the Project of around USD 1.3 million. Project management has to spend very significant amounts of time on fundraising activities, which is diverting them from other tasks, increasing the load upon other Project staff and exacerbating many of the other management challenges discussed in Section 3.2. Project funds are tightly managed, with expenditure kept under a tight rein. A significant proportion of the costs of the PMO are due to expatriate salaries, which are completely justifiable due to the need to attract and retain experienced specialists. In the longer term, a move could be made towards more use of regional or national experts, though these are currently in short supply. In its current form, the Project represents good value for money.

Commitments under the Paris Declaration apparently notwithstanding, one informant (well-placed to judge such matters) noted that in recent years, it seems that donors have been becoming more specific in terms of the activities for which they wish to earmark contributions (with the Netherlands – a relatively minor donor to the Project – and New Zealand governments being amongst the exceptions). UNIAP management is currently working with 15 donors that vary greatly in size and reporting requirements, further adding to the demands on management's time. The importance of the availability of core/un-earmarked funding is critical; ideally, the Project should try to shift to selling the 'whole package' to donors, who will contribute to one holistic programme through multi-year funding rounds, with reporting requirements streamlined and harmonised as much as possible. This, of course, requires donor cooperation.

Informants noted that although financial management systems have improved significantly during Phase III (in large part due to the efforts of the Finance/Operations Specialist and her team), they still remain cumbersome and rather slow (which appears to be a result of the overall UNDP system rather than the Project itself). Some COs noted that this has a significant negative impact on their ability to respond quickly and flexibly to changing circumstances, which is one of the main perceived strengths of the Project. The practice of allocating the same amount of money to each COMMIT member state in support of COMMIT activities is understandable in diplomatic terms, but fund allocations should logically be made on the basis of relative need, linked also to ongoing country performance in meeting specified targets in order to provide an appropriate incentive.

3.3 Effectiveness of the Project
A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.[19]

As discussed in more detail in Section 2.2, weaknesses in the original Project Design Document raised some challenges for the evaluation in terms of clear targets or indicators against which to evaluate progress. Evaluation of Project effectiveness in this section therefore focuses on assessing the extent to which the overall Objectives have been achieved through the implementation of the revised and refined sets of activities developed by Project management early on in Phase III.

3.3.1 Objective 1: Services to Governments
To support Governments in the institutionalization of effective multi-sectoral approaches to combat trafficking.

This section discusses Project progress to date across Country Offices (COs) and the sub-region as a whole in implementing planned activities related to the eight Project Proposal Concepts (PPCs) that constitute the second Sub-regional Plan of Action (SPA II), supporting which is the core focus of Objective 1. Coverage of Vietnam is limited due to the fact that very little data was submitted by the CO to the evaluators (as discussed in Section 2.3).

3.3.1.1 PPC 1: Training & Capacity Building
PPC 1 is one of the two PPCs in which UNIAP plays a leading direct delivery role (PPC 8 being the other). Activities at the sub-regional level are proceeding to schedule, including the ongoing Regional Training Programme (RTP) and Training Needs Assessment (TNA) (discussed further below). Cambodia is ahead of schedule (having developed a national training curriculum that draws on the RTP, established a team of core trainers and supported the delivery of three trainings), China is on schedule and Laos somewhat behind schedule (the government having taken a significant period of time to check the translation of the RTP

---

[19] Definition given in *DAC Summary of key norms and standards*, available from: www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork.

and identify the lead agency responsible for the training programme). The government is now planning a workshop on the adaptation of the RTP curriculum to the Lao context, but has agreed with the NPC that this should be postponed until the TNA has been completed. Myanmar has also not yet developed a national curriculum, but the CO is intending to work with its government and international partners on this once the TNA has been finalised. Training has been taking place nevertheless, with TIP content having been integrated into both police and teachers' training programmes, for example. Thailand is on track, the UNIAP CO having provided significant support to the development of the recently-finalised national training curriculum. In Vietnam, the view of a well-informed observer is that the 'COMMIT process has greatly assisted the capacity building process. The Vietnamese government created a core training team and worked with UNIAP to create a National Training Manual. This is a strong structure that can be tapped into to provide comprehensive training at all levels if the funding exists.'

A key component of this PPC is the Regional Training Programme (RTP), developed under SPA I as a comprehensive eight-day English language course held at the Mekhong Institute in Khon Kaen, North-East Thailand. By the end of 2007, around 200 participants had completed the course, the vast majority of whom were mid- to senior-level government officials. Feedback from numerous past participants in the Regional Training Programme was very positive, indicating that the Programme is highly valued, both for its pedagogic aspect and for the opportunities it presents for the exchange of experience and the building of networks. The RTP is recognised and respected regionally as a major success. The degree to which participants apply and /or pass on their newly-acquired knowledge when they return home varies, however: some participants have been engaged in building the capacity of national colleagues whereas others have clearly not. The RTP curriculum has also informed the development of national training curricula in the six GMS countries.

SPA II, the drafting of which was supported by UNIAP, mandated an evaluation of the RTP to investigate the potential for further improvement, and based on the evaluation results a number of changes have been made to the RTP format. These include shortening the training to 5.5 days, revising the content to improve conceptual clarity and relevance, and making the training methods more interactive. This initiative demonstrates a very positive feature of UNIAP's Project management, namely its emphasis on continual learning and improvement. In a similar vein, PPC 1 also specifies that a Training Needs Assessment (TNA) should be carried out, to: investigate what training is currently being conducted and who is receiving it; identify gaps, i.e. those who require training but are not receiving it, and outline an approach to filling these gaps. The TNA was underway at the time of writing and is due to be finalised in April.

The RTP has clearly raised awareness amongst the senior officials who attended it, but feedback from informants strongly indicated that there is an urgent need to raise the awareness and understanding of many other senior decision- and policy-makers. If such individuals do not understand the issues involved, it is highly unlikely that the ministries or agencies that they control will provide front-line officials with the support or mandate they need to do their jobs effectively, no matter how much training the latter may have received. Given how busy such individuals are, UNIAP needs to take an opportunistic approach in order to reach them with appropriate messages: including well-designed awareness-raising sessions in the SOMs would be one way, as would including modified versions of such sessions in major public events, which are often attended by senior officials.

Other general themes regarding training and capacity building that emerged from the Mid-Term Evaluation include the following:
- Structural constraints also need to be addressed, with UNIAP's role being to identify key constraints and then engage suitable partners with the capacity to address them. For example, in Laos there is an almost complete lack of qualified social workers.

The National University of Laos (NUOL) does now have a social work module in its sociology curriculum, but this is insufficient. Save the Children Norway is reportedly supporting two NUOL lecturers undertaking relevant Masters training in Thailand, and is also working with NUOL to improve the curriculum. In a similar vein, UNIAP has plans to work together with UNESCO and NUOL to develop social science research capacity in the country through a learning-by-doing approach. More such innovative ventures are required, particularly in order to augment sustainability.

- There is a need for regular training on basic topics for government officials holding relevant positions, as turnover is often high (particularly in certain agencies, such as the police).
- Staff in some government agencies told the evaluators that they simply do not have enough time to attend training courses, even though they acknowledge that capacity-building is much needed. Short courses and in-service training options should thus be explored for such staff.
- There is in general a need for more in-house training and on-the-job mentoring, especially in areas such as social work.
- Counter-trafficking modules should be included in generic pre- and in-service training courses, such as those attended by civil servants and police officers, as this would be an effective approach to institutionalising training capacity.
- There needs to be an increased focus on supporting the governments in rolling out training programmes at sub-national levels, not just national level.
- Government agencies with responsibility for labour issues are, for a variety of reasons, generally less engaged in training and capacity-building activities than their peers. Efforts to engage such agencies need to be redoubled, despite the major challenges involved.
- Where possible, CSOs should also be invited to participate in training events (though the evaluators understand that in some countries this has to be carefully negotiated with government).
- There should be much more evaluation of training impact and follow-up of trainees, in order to assess effectiveness.

3.3.1.2   PPC 2: National Plans of Action
The NPAs represent a key step towards the institutionalisation of counter-trafficking approaches. Responsibility for supporting the development and approval of NPAs is largely focused at the CO level. All six countries have NPAs in place, with the exception of Laos. In Cambodia, a 2nd NPA has not yet been approved, as some decision-makers wanted the document (reviewed by UNIAP) to contain more narrative background as well as an action plan; the draft will be revised and resubmitted with UNIAP's assistance. In China, the NPA is reportedly weak, using a definition of human trafficking that is not in accordance with the UN definition that is mandated by the COMMIT MoU. In Laos, the NPA is awaiting approval from the Prime Minister, though some agencies are already planning and implementing activities in line with the contents of the NPA, e.g. ARTIP. Myanmar finalised a five-year NPA ahead of schedule in 2007; implementation is ongoing. It emerged during the evaluation that at least two donors are very attracted by the NPAs, which therefore certainly appear to have the potential to contribute to improved alignment of donor policies with government plans.

3.3.1.3   PPC 3: Multilateral & Bilateral Partnerships
Responsibility for supporting the development of bilateral partnerships largely sits with the COs. In Cambodia, bilateral relations with Vietnam are developing, but are stalled with Thailand due to the tense bilateral political situation. In China, two Border Liaison Offices have opened on the China-Myanmar border in Yunnan and a China-Myanmar MoU is due to be signed in April 2009. Laos is now waiting for approval of the 2009 budget so that the second phase of the highly successful Thai-Lao Cross-border Cooperation (THALACC) project, long delayed by a lengthy government approval process, can start. Action is also

planned between Laos and China (with UNICEF in the lead) and Laos and Vietnam (involving the Lao Women's Union). UNIAP Myanmar and UNIAP Thailand provided regular support to ensure the safe and timely repatriation of Myanmar victims of the Ranya Paew case (see box below). The Myanmar-Thai MoU is behind schedule due to the political uncertainties prevalent in Thailand over the past two years; it is due to be signed in April 2009, however. In summary, this is an area where UNIAP clearly fills a unique niche and is appreciated by governments for doing so.

The Ranya Paew case
'Samut Sakhon is a key destination of migrant workers in Thailand, particularly from Myanmar. With limited opportunities in Myanmar, many make the journey to Thailand with the assistance of informal brokers. As family, friend, or stranger, the broker might be working as facilitator, exploiter, or trafficker. With brokers sourcing and arranging migrants' work, sometimes as sub-contractors for specific employers, migrants must pay brokers for all "services provided," even if the destination is exploitative or hazardous working conditions prevail – thus making them victims of human trafficking.

The September 2006 raid of Ranya Paew seafood-processing factory exposed a case of trafficking for labour exploitation in Samut Sakhon. Sixty-six workers at the factory were taken to a government shelter for trafficking victims, yet the factory remains in operation. Further investigation of practices at the factory in April-May 2007 reveals that some brokers clearly deceive workers and are complicit in their abuse.'

Source: UNIAP SIREN Report TH-01 (June 2007)

3.3.1.4 PPC 4: Legal Frameworks, Law Enforcement & Justice
Again, the onus for providing support rests with the COs, though the PMO's work on SIREN and certain special projects is also relevant. ARTIP provides much of the technical assistance in this area across the sub-region. In Cambodia, a new anti-human trafficking law was endorsed in early 2008 but various issues have since arisen around its implementation due to limited legislative clarity; UNICEF and UNIAP are now working together to develop a commentary on the law to try to address these issues. In Laos progress has been delayed and there appeared to be something of a lack of clarity over plans. In Myanmar, the Ministry of Home Affairs has assigned high priority to elements of this PPC, and Myanmar has identified 'cooperation on judicial and prosecutorial response' (especially with neighbouring countries) as one of its priorities. UNIAP Thailand has worked with the Department of Special Investigation (DSI) to design and finalize a project entitled "Strengthening collaboration mechanism to fight against human trafficking: Combining the Human Rights Perspective." Progress in developing legislation that is in line with international standards is reportedly slow in China and Vietnam, though in the former UNIAP cooperated with World Vision to hold a high-level seminar on UNTOC and China's Criminal Laws.

3.3.1.5 PPC 5: Victim Identification, Protection, Recovery & Reintegration
In December 2007, the six GMS governments agreed to the COMMIT regional guiding principles on victim protection that had been drafted by technical teams composed of both government and non-government members, supported by the PMO. Governments are committed to using these guidelines as a reference for the creation of national standard operating procedures (SOPs) for victim protection that are in line with international standards. IOM is taking the lead in providing support, with additional support from UNIAP COs. The development of the SOPs is generally moving slowly.

In Cambodia, much of the CO's work under this PPC has been linked to cases of Cambodian men trafficked onto fishing boats who have needed to be repatriated from Malaysia (these efforts are also related to activities under Objectives 3 and 4, discussed in more detail below). UNIAP Myanmar has collaborated with IOM, World Vision and Save the

Children to carry out a series of case management meetings on repatriation between Myanmar and Thailand. The outcomes of the meeting helped both governments to better standardize operation procedures on repatriation between the two countries. Myanmar is also working closely with the Chinese government on victim repatriation. In 2008, UNIAP Thailand and the PMO provided the Government of Thailand with technical support on how to improve the National Victim Identification Guideline and Checklist in light of the new anti-human trafficking legislation, which was subsequently disseminated to local officials. Also in 2008, UNIAP Vietnam and IOM sponsored the first workshop on victim identification hosted by the Department of Immigration.

3.3.1.6 PPC 6: Preventive Measures

Training on, and nationalisation of, the regional migrant recruitment guidelines in selected countries has been hindered by the closure of the ILO TICW regional program. Beyond this component, the UNIAP PMO has developed an innovative partnership with *Music Television – End Exploitation and Trafficking* (MTV Exit, funded by USAID), which aims to provide young people with practical counter trafficking messages through multi-media approaches, including documentaries and live concerts. UNIAP Cambodia has conducted a series of radio talk shows on a range of human trafficking topics. UNIAP China is cooperating with the Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security to hold a national training workshop for workplace owners. In Laos, activity under this PPC has been limited to occasional events, although a radio programme is planned in collaboration with the Lao Women's Union. In Thailand, planned activities were delayed as the CO had to wait for the passage of the new anti-human trafficking law. The CO instead co-organized the "STOP! Human Trafficking" awareness-raising event at TK Park, Central World in September 2008 with the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security, MTV EXIT, World Vision Foundation of Thailand and TK Park. Also in 2008, UNIAP Vietnam worked with Government and UN partners to draft a labour brokering assessment framework to provide relevant agencies with a better understanding of the recruitment procedures and processes involved in sending migrant workers overseas. As is generally the case sector-wide, evaluation of the impact of preventive measures has been lacking.

3.3.1.7 PPC 7: Cooperation with Tourism Sector

A regional workshop was held in November 2007 in Bangkok, hosted by the Royal Thai Government, with support from ECPAT, World Vision and UNIAP. Regional research on trafficking into the tourism sector in the GMS, conducted with support from UNIAP, was the basis for recommendations that were discussed, which then were taken into consideration in the drafting of a regional strategy on trafficking and the tourism sector. COs are now involved in working with national governments and other partners to operationalise the strategy at national level. In Cambodia, the ILO and other partners have very much been taking the lead on this issue. In China, there is no activity on this PPC as the CO has no partner agency. In 2008, UNIAP Laos carried out a workshop for stakeholders from the tourism and related sectors (including the Lao National Tourism Authority, NGO staff, taxi drivers, hotel and guest house staff members and tourist police) to discuss issues negatively affecting children in the tourism sector. The LNTA representative emphasised how useful the opportunities presented by UNIAP for learning from other GMS countries are, notably from Cambodia on approaches to countering child sex tourism. This PPC has not been assigned high priority in Myanmar, though the government is undertaking measures to counter CSEC and child sex tourism together with UNICEF, Save the Children, World Vision and Child Wise.

3.3.1.8 PPC 8: Management: Coordination, Monitoring & Evaluation

As mentioned above, the PMO has primary responsibility for PPC 8. Monitoring and evaluation issues are discussed in Section 3.2.2, while coordination aspects are discussed under Objectives 2 and 3 below.

The annual Senior Officials' Meeting (SOM) is a well-regarded institution in the eyes of most government informants, who appreciate the opportunity it presents to exchange experiences and learn about other countries' efforts. A number of CO, UN and INGO informants noted that the inter-country peer pressure and competition that the SOMs instil is a useful incentive for improved performance. UNIAP has a delicate role to play at SOMs, in that it needs to ensure that necessary business is completed and concrete outcomes obtained whilst avoiding driving proceedings in too direct a manner. Of SOM 6 (2008), it was reported to the evaluators by an independent observer that some governmental and international agency partners had commented that it 'seemed like Matt [the RPM] took over the meeting from the governments'. But as another informant commented, 'If it wasn't for him [the RPM], I doubt much would have come out of it [the meeting]'.

The open sessions that can be attended by CSOs and donor observers are a positive innovation, though a number of informants noted that observer contributions to discussions were somewhat constrained due to the high-level nature of the forum. Some INGO informants suggested that pre-SOM preparation meetings involving UNIAP and international organisations would be useful. Another favourably-viewed innovation is the allotment of the last day of the Meeting for bilateral meetings between countries that wish to have them; there has been high uptake by countries. A small number of informants suggested that SOMs have suffered on occasion from poor translation.

A number of government informants suggested that the SOM could be more effective if it featured more concrete action planning and full budget disclosure for each country, rather than spending much of the time on country report-back sessions. SOM does not appear to address the issue of non-completion of commitments under annual work plans, but should do so. All three of these suggestions would significantly improve *Mutual Accountability* and *Management for Results*, key principles under the Paris Declaration. A number of informants in different countries noted that the process of developing national plans for support to COMMIT is constrained by a tight timeframe that restricts the extent of consultation with stakeholders.

3.3.1.9 Other issues
As noted in Section 3.1.1, the vast majority of informants recognised UNIAP's key role in supporting governments to institutionalise counter-trafficking initiatives, largely through the COMMIT process and the implementation of the SPAs. As one international project representative put it, 'I firmly believe that the COMMIT Process is a unique one in the sense that it has managed to pull together diverse countries with different politico-social systems towards a common stand against HT in the region.'

As mentioned in Section 3.3.1.1, a key challenge for UNIAP is to reach senior decision-makers and policy-makers in order to raise their awareness of trafficking issues and to identify and support champions within government who can drive through the changes required. In some countries, notably Laos, UNIAP needs to more closely engage senior decision makers in systematic planning and review processes. A number of Lao stakeholders acknowledged that technical staff were being engaged, but noted that senior decision makers need to be involved in regular meetings. This would help develop a sustainable national organisational structure, as well as ensure that high-level policy makers are well-informed of developments, which in turn might facilitate the passage of important policy documents (notably the Lao National Plan of Action, development of which has taken much longer than in other COMMIT member states and which is still awaiting approval from the Prime Minister's office). The Lao UNIAP CO has been making efforts to engage high-level decision-makers, but clearly this challenge requires renewed efforts from both UNIAP and government.

As would be expected, UNIAP faces significant challenges in terms of the institutional structures with which it engages. In Thailand, for example, the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS) is the lead agency, but as a country that is primarily a trafficking destination (at least within the GMS), law enforcement also should play a key role (with an emphasis on attacking exploitative practices, for example). In response, the PMO and, in particular, the Thai CO have been working to engage law enforcement agencies more, for example by providing advice to the Department for Special Investigation (DSI). Inter-ministerial and inter-departmental coordination within governments can also be lacking, as became evident during numerous interviews during the evaluation. There are also regional challenges: for example, the MSDHS is a very different type of institution to the lead counter-trafficking agency in Myanmar (the Ministry of Home Affairs), which means that additional efforts are required to build a working relationship.

The political situation in Thailand has had an impact on various aspects of COMMIT over the past 1-2 years, notably giving rise to delays in the signing of bilateral MoUs. The hope is that the new Thai administration will move forward on these and other issues. Levels of funding for government counter-trafficking initiatives have reportedly been higher in the past, so it is also to be desired that this issue will be addressed.

The relative levels of ownership of COMMIT by the participating states are not easy to assess but certainly vary, although in principal the COMMIT process exemplifies government ownership. In the case of Thailand, where government counter-trafficking capacity and resources are in many senses greater than those of the other COMMIT members, the government is in many respects very much leading the process, though with outcomes of variable quality. Ownership could thus be said to be relatively high, though it also varies significantly between ministries and agencies (it is higher in the MSDHS than in the Ministry of Labour, for example). At the other end of the spectrum would probably be Laos, where ownership is lower for a number of reasons, including government capacity constraints and the fact, as two informants put it, that COMMIT activities tend to be viewed as a project and not as an integral part of ministries' own plans and budgets.

3.3.2   Objective 2: Services to UN Partners
To maximize the UN's contribution to the overall anti-trafficking response, including the COMMIT process.

This Objective involves three main activity areas: coordination for COMMIT SPA II, the Regional Training Programme and the provision of direct technical assistance.

3.3.2.1   Coordination for COMMIT SPA II
UNIAP, in its role as COMMIT Secretariat, aims to coordinate inter-agency collaboration with UN and civil society partners related to COMMIT SPA II. One of the main vehicles for this is provided by inter-agency working group meetings (the precise name of which varies somewhat between countries), which are generally held on a quarterly basis at CO level and with variable frequency at regional level.

At both regional and national levels, the inter-agency meetings are seen by most informants as information-sharing fora, with limited substantive discussion of strategy and technical matters. This does not mean that such informants view the meetings as unproductive, but rather that they feel more could be gained from the gatherings if they were more focused. A number of UN agency informants suggested that meetings of the UN agencies only would be useful, in order to discuss issues specific to UN coordination. In Thailand, the meetings are seen by some agencies as being too large, with a need for smaller specialised working groups focusing on specific issues. In Cambodia, the meetings are also large (with 70 – 100 participants) but seem to be still appreciated as a contribution to coordination and networking. One informant made a perceptive observation when they noted that UNIAP has

catalysed the formation of a network amongst individuals at regional level, with the implication that a significant amount of informal coordination goes on within that network (this would also seem to present a possible means by which to strategically influence agencies' decision-making). They also noted that UNIAP has helped to build something of a consensus amongst UN and other international agencies around certain key issues.

In terms of the effectiveness of UNIAP in facilitating improved coordination between agencies, there is significant variation between countries. UNIAP Cambodia, despite the large number of UN and NGOs involved, seems to have been the most effective. Though there are probably numerous reasons for this, including the personality and capacity of individuals holding key positions in major agencies, one factor that may be replicable in some other countries is the formation of a special "Advisory Group" composed of ten major agencies (including UNDP, UNICEF, ILO, IOM, WV, UNIFEM and Childwise). This group meets early and late each year to review their current activities, share their draft plans for the future and come to an agreement concerning their agencies' activities for the coming year. These discussions reportedly sometimes take a significant amount of time to complete, requiring follow-up discussions via email and phone, but eventually agreement is reached. The group's agreed plan is then fed into the formal planning process for COMMIT and helps shape the outcome. The various agency informants (and government officials) met by the evaluators in Cambodia were consistent in their view that UNIAP does make a significant contribution to improving coordination across agencies in the counter-trafficking sector.

In other countries, the views of UN agency informants as to the degree to which UNIAP was facilitating coordination varied considerably. Some questioned whether UNIAP was making much of a difference at all, going on to explain that they feel that human trafficking issues are better addressed now within UN processes (such as the UN Development Assistance Framework and Common Country Assessment) and government structures. In Laos it was noted that some UN agencies are much more willing to coordinate than others. At the regional level, views were similarly mixed, with some informants acknowledging UNIAP's efforts while others were quite dismissive (such as the informant who suggested that the inter-agency aspect has become 'increasingly superficial').

Amongst CSOs, viewed were also mixed. Some saw UNIAP as being fairly irrelevant to their work, whilst others were very positive, such as the NGO that observed 'When it comes to networking in other countries, UNIAP is the one channel for us'. One INGO in Cambodia noted that UNIAP has been effective in helping to create space for CSOs. A number of INGOs in Laos spoke of the UNIAP office in very positive terms because of its ability to facilitate their work in what can be a challenging operating environment, one INGO staff member noting that 'If anything is blocked, I have a word with Xoukiet [the National Project Coordinator]'. Another INGO staff member observed that UNIAP Laos is effective 'because they can talk deeply with government... to open the way for us to work. For example, before it was difficult for us to talk with the police; now we can contact both the central and provincial police'.

The degree to which UN and other international agencies are actively aligning their activities with COMMIT and SPA II is questionable. SPA II is very broad, so many agencies' activities can be said to be in line with it, but SPA II seems to be having little impact in informing UN agencies' strategising and planning at national level. Even in Cambodia, where coordination is relatively good, there are limits to the extent to which agencies are influenced by SPA II. In another country, one UN agency informant said that their agency's bilateral relationship with the government was the relevant one, adding that they viewed COMMIT as relevant only to UNIAP's own discussions with government. In contrast, a UN informant in a third country noted that it is critical that someone takes the lead in coordination and that this is UNIAP's major contribution. Even so, they added, 'our plans are not driven by COMMIT'. At regional level, a Regional Inter-agency Work plan has been developed, but no informants referred to

this when asked about the influence of COMMIT/SPA II upon their agencies' planning. The ending of various UN projects related to trafficking in the GMS has provided an additional challenge for coordination: for example, the UNICEF Regional Office's involvement in counter-trafficking has ended, as has ILO's regional project (TICW).

3.3.2.2 Regional Training Programme

Details of the RTP have been discussed under Objective 1 above. In terms of inter-agency coordination, it is certainly one of the best examples with which the Project has been involved, as it involves the successful collaboration of a range of partners, including ARTIP, IOM, ILO and UNICEF.

3.3.2.3 Direct technical assistance

Although UNIAP provides very extensive technical assistance (TA) and support to government partners, it is difficult from Project documents to gauge the extent to which this is also true with regard to the provision of TA to UN agencies. TA is certainly provided on occasion, with examples including: work with UNDP in Myanmar to develop and implement a field mission protocol to assess trafficking vulnerability; the provision of political, logistical and technical support to ILO-IPEC TICW's regional impact assessment; substantial advocacy support to the Mekong Youth Forum, with partners ILO, Save the Children and World Vision; tracing and networking support to the Cambodian NGO LICADHO as they dealt with case reports of Cambodian citizens trafficked to Thailand and Malaysia. UNIAP also plays a role in coordinating the provision of TA by UN agencies to other development partners.

To sum-up, there is a clear need for improved UN agency coordination. Some government informants specifically informed the evaluators that they would like to see UN and other international agencies coordinate more amongst themselves before approaching government. However, it is clear from the above that UNIAP's role with regard to the provision of services to UN partners under Objective 2 is much less well recognised amongst UN and other international agencies than UNIAP's role related to COMMIT. For many informants from these agencies, UNIAP's role in providing services – including the facilitation of coordination – is not clearly defined, with some informants questioning UNIAP's mandate to play this role. This is particularly prevalent at the regional level, generally less so at the national level. The fact that UNIAP is a project rather than an agency was raised by a small number of informants as a likely constraint on UNIAP's ability to coordinate, suggesting that this long-running issue – mentioned in the Phase II Final Evaluation – is still relevant.

It must be openly acknowledged that achieving improved coordination amongst UN agencies is a major challenge in any context, as evidenced by a remarkably frank speech made last year by the UN Secretary General[20]. The UN's initiative to achieve greater programmatic and operational coordination – "One UN" – has had mixed fortunes to date. The reality is that agencies, at the level of the institution, view things through their own lens and promote their own interests, a tendency probably being exacerbated by the current economic downturn and consequent funding squeeze. As one UN staff member put it, 'You can talk about coordination but at the end of the day, some organisations are going to say "I've got my budget, my strategy, my work plan and I'm going to go ahead with that".' On the other hand, as another informant observed, 'there are people within the organizations who are willing to work together and cooperate and I think that UNIAP has provided a great forum for that'. The presence or absence of such individuals within organisations at any particular time no doubt accounts for some of the variation in agency coordination across countries. As noted in Section 3.1.1, Objective 2 provides a potential lever to help translate the rhetoric of "One UN" into practice, coordinating a whole-of-UN response to a thematic development challenge in a sub-region. UNRCs clearly have a key role to play in this.

---

[20] Available at: http://iseek.un.org/webpgdept1496_4.asp

The importance of communication should again be raised here. Some – though far from all – of the problems discussed above arise from the inadequate communication to partners of UNIAP's aims. As mentioned earlier, three informants with a long association with the Project felt that during Phase III, the Project has to some extent 'over-corrected' previous imbalances, emphasizing technical aspects and not paying sufficient attention to communication[21] with stakeholders. Both aspects of the Project are crucial and it would be desirable for the Project to place more emphasis on communication with partners while not allowing the very significant technical gains to slip away. Communication needs to be more cohesive and systematic, and be linked to the M&E system so that its effectiveness can be assessed. Regular communication with those in key positions is essential, particularly as individuals are frequently posted elsewhere and replaced by other staff who may well have no previous experience of counter-trafficking. UNIAP's draft communication strategy appears to a non-specialist to be somewhat theoretical in nature.

3.3.3   Objective 3: Services to the anti-trafficking sector in general, including donors
To facilitate optimal allocation and targeting of anti-trafficking resources.

The Project Design Document mentions four main areas of activity under this Objective: ensuring that counter-trafficking practitioners have access to the latest in information, analysis and lessons learned (information services); strengthening approaches to M&E throughout the anti-trafficking sector; coordination, notably avoiding overlaps and duplication, and the promotion of partnership creation. M&E activities have already been discussed in Section 3.2.2; the three remaining activity areas are discussed below.

3.3.3.1   Information services
In Phase III, UNIAP sees itself as playing much more of a 'research and development role' vis-à-vis the broader counter-trafficking community. Better coordination of research was identified as a region-wide need by the Phase II Final Evaluation, and UNIAP responded through a broad consensus-seeking exercise to identify research gaps and priorities. This exercise was frequently praised by a wide range of informants during the evaluation. The Strategic Information Response Network (SIREN) is addressing some of the priorities identified, and UNIAP is funding other partners to conduct research.

SIREN is described by recent Project documents as 'essentially a system of streamlined, high quality information gathering, analysis and dissemination at both the national and grassroots levels, done by UNIAP technical staff and NGO staff working in hotspot locations.' The Project aims to provide high quality information in easily-digestible formats to those who need it for programming or policy formulation (including UNIAP itself, which clearly uses SIREN outputs to inform other aspects of its work, such as the Worst Offenders Project – discussed under Objective 4 – and planning for COMMIT). SIREN reports request feedback on their contents, which can be sent to a dedicated email address, and the Project is currently considering ways in which it can provide a forum for debate on the contents of SIREN reports, perhaps on the soon-to-be-released new website. SIREN is also linked to discussion forums and events, such as the *Raids, Rescue and Resolution* technical consultation hosted in August 2008 by UNIAP, ILO and ARTIP.

SIREN has investigated and exposed controversial issues that require responsive action, for which the Project should be commended. Lessons have been learned by UNIAP from the release of the SIREN TH-01 report on brokering practices in Thailand, which stimulated a strong reaction from certain sections of the government (whilst other government agencies reportedly used information in the report to take action against some of the perpetrators

---

[21] Communication here is interpreted broadly so as to encompass outreach and relationship-building efforts, as well as administrative communication.

identified). One such lesson is that some issues are best dealt with through other advocacy channels. It is also suggested by the evaluators that governments should be informed in advance of the release of reports, as should other counter-trafficking agencies or projects whose work may also be affected, without compromising the report content.

SIREN implementation is proceeding according to schedule, though there are clearly challenges related to the dissemination of its products. The majority of informants across all stakeholder types in the countries visited by the evaluators had heard of SIREN, though the proportion of informants who had actually read a SIREN report was undoubtedly substantially less, particularly amongst government staff. (Anecdotal evidence from Vietnam suggested that SIREN has not been promoted very actively by the CO.) Of those informants who were able to offer an opinion on SIREN's contents, the majority saw it as a useful initiative, with a number of INGOs stating that they found the country information sheets very useful for giving background briefings or for distributing at workshops. A number of government informants said that SIREN reports were particularly useful in enabling them to learn about developments in the broader region. A small number of informants raised questions as to SIREN's proposed target audience, noting that the reports are normally quite general in nature and do not address the specific questions that a field practitioner might ask, for instance. This issue could be addressed by posting more detailed information on the UNIAP website, with a notice to that effect being included in the SIREN report. Some informants suggested that SIREN should be disseminated more widely: one requested that it be sent to agencies and individuals in South Asia, while another noted that US immigration attorneys might find it useful.

SIREN demonstrates that various components of UNIAP can undoubtedly combine together in synergistic fashion: for example, SIREN intelligence informs work under the Underserved Victim Populations Project (see Section 3.3.4.2), which in turn has generated outputs that are relevant to numerous PPCs under SPA II (such as PPCs 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8) and will ultimately inform future planning and policy formulation under COMMIT. SIREN then plays a role again in disseminating information on all this to the broader counter-trafficking community. This ability to catalyse and support an integrated response is an undoubted strength of UNIAP.

One informant noted that SIREN often does not focus on completely 'new' issues; this is true but then the aim of SIREN is not necessarily to conduct ground-breaking research but also to make existing research available in user-friendly formats. This may be another example of inadequate communication of the Project's aims. The representative of one government ministry was highly critical of SIREN, stating that some of its reports had damaged their country's image (such views had clearly been influenced by some of the controversial topics that have been tackled).

SIREN has an impact beyond the sub-region. According to UNIAP, the Terre des Hommes Foundation's Childtrafficking.com Digital Library, an important global data source, has indicated that SIREN reports are amongst the most popular articles in their database. SIREN contributors include practitioners from outside the sub-region, including the UK police and Norwegian and Austrian research institutes. SIREN has also helped stimulate increased international media coverage of human trafficking issues, with publications such as *The Economist* and *Le Monde* carrying stories.

The accessibility of SIREN reports to government staff could and should be significantly improved. In some countries, such as Laos, relatively few such staff have access to the internet, thus the dissemination of hard copies of reports is a much more effective way of reaching them. In all countries, as much of the material as possible should be translated into local languages, as many government and local NGO staff do not read English well. Not all reports are translated into all six languages, or even all the languages most relevant to a

particular report. Other information services are run by UNIAP, including weekly news digests and quarterly newsletters at regional and national level. A number of UN informants noted that they already receive many such products, and suggested that UNIAP investigate more innovative ways of delivering such information. One informant also suggested that a few well-written and well-timed OpEd pieces in the local print media (both national language and English language publications) would reach audiences that are generally not exposed to information on human trafficking.

As already mentioned, many government staff have limited internet access, thus fundamentally limiting the utility of UNIAP's website for them. Where access is very limited, UNIAP should consider funding internet access for key partner agencies. From those government staff and other stakeholders with internet access, the website received lukewarm reviews, with informants often saying that information is hard to find, that much of the content is only in English and that the website is not updated frequently. The evaluators understand that, following significant delays, the website is currently undergoing a makeover (due to be completed in March/April 2009), indicating that Project management is already well aware of the need to improve it.

As part of its Trafficking Estimates Initiative, UNIAP held a competition in July and August 2007 to select three proposals that laid out innovative, practical methodologies for estimating the number of trafficked persons in a specified locality and/or sector. The winning proposals, featuring a mix of institutions and individuals from within and beyond the GMS, received funding to implement their methodologies, which at the time of writing was being done. This is an excellent example of an innovative approach being used to fill a gap, build linkages, build capacity (by bringing together academic institutions and grassroots organisations) and raise awareness of human trafficking issues.

UNIAP also runs a Summer Legal Internship Programme, which in 2008 recruited three individuals to work on different projects with PMO and CO staff. Positive feedback was received by the evaluators from those concerned: 'I felt a tremendous sense of accomplishment at the end of my internship, not only did I find that my work contributed to helping victims of trafficking, but I learned a lot from the various people that I had the opportunity to interact with'. The interns contributed to some high quality outputs, including a study on Cambodian deportees from Thailand passing through the Poipet checkpoint.

3.3.3.2   Coordination
Donors are invited to the inter-agency meetings – discussed under Objective 2 above – at regional and national level, and are also represented on the Management Board (discussed in Section 3.2.3). Although two of the donor representatives interviewed expressed strong interest in aligning with National Plans of Action, donor coordination could certainly be further improved; as one experienced observer put it, 'My take is that coordination among donors still needs great improvement. In Vietnam, donors fund HT projects in provinces that they are interested in and along the line of what they think are needed rather than conducting need assessments.' As with the case of UN agency coordination, all parties must make the required effort – it is a mutual responsibility. Some donor representatives interviewed by the evaluators expressed their intention to take a proactive approach to coordination, and UNIAP should take full advantage of this to work together with donors to harmonise approaches (including programmatic and financial reporting).

Ideally, UNIAP and its UN agency partners would coordinate to adopt an integrated, joint approach to donors, which would be a radical contribution towards a more harmonised approach overall. This would link with the COMMIT/SPA structure at sub-regional level and the "One UN" initiative in the inter-agency context. However, due to the intra-UN factors described under Objective 2 above, this has not happened (although one regional level

informant said that they raised the suggestion under SPA I, prior to the period being evaluated).

UNIAP, together with MTV, IOM, UNESCO, ILO and ARTIP, staged a one-day *State of Counter-Trafficking* briefing event for donors in November 2007. A creative approach was adopted, involving audio-visual materials and discussion sessions. A number of informants highlighted the need for more innovative approaches to reaching donors with information, and this briefing event provides a good example of such an approach. Staging similar events at national level should also be considered.

3.3.3.3 Promotion of partnership creation

This is a very broad, ongoing initiative, with UNIAP bringing stakeholders together in a range of fora and facilitating linkages. Specialist groups have been convened on occasion, such as research groups for gap identification and lawyers' groups to discuss challenging cases. The various information services described above are also aimed at stimulating linkages in the counter-trafficking community.

The extent to which the above activities are facilitating optimal allocation and targeting of anti-trafficking resources is hard to assess; given the lag in response caused by donor funding cycles, it may be too early to judge. However, the Project's achievement in rapidly obtaining funding to respond to the global economic downturn does represent a success. There is some evidence that certain donors are aligning – or at least intending to align – their contributions more closely with National Plans of Action. Communication is – once again – a relevant issue as regards Objective 3. The reduced emphasis on communication in Phase III mentioned elsewhere in this report (see Sections 3.2.2 and 3.3.2) was noted by a donor informant, who said that they feel less engaged with the Project than was previously the case, even though they are supportive of the Project management. They noted that outreach to donors is essential for both improved coordination and continued access to funding.

3.3.4 Objective 4: Special Projects

To continue to play a catalytic role in the anti-trafficking response by identifying and supporting special projects to address new and emerging issues and opportunities.

According to the PDD, this Objective will generally involve small-scale initiatives, aimed at 'bridging gaps, exploring new approaches, bringing in new actors and building new linkages, particularly across borders.' The intention is that such initiatives will then be adopted by partner agencies with relevant technical specialisations, 'with a view to eventual consolidation and institutionalisation of successful approaches'. UNIAP's implementation of such initiatives in earlier phases reportedly resulted in significant successes, such as: research relating to ethnic minorities that subsequently obtained ADB funding through UNESCO Bangkok; the Sub-regional Advisory Committee on labour migration/protection issues and trafficking that was initially a joint UNIAP/ILO-IPEC initiative and subsequently became a core component of ILO-IPEC's regional project.

3.3.4.1 Worst Offenders Project

According to UNIAP documentation, UNIAP and multi-sectoral case tracking teams use SIREN intelligence and networks to identify some of the worst traffickers, exploiters, employers and brokers in the sub-region. These teams then employ a 'carrot-and-stick' approach in partnership with law enforcement, migrant labour groups, advocacy groups, the press and other actors to push cases through the criminal justice system to obtain appropriate sentencing, create deterrent examples to others and pressure other exploitative establishments to improve their practices. Project reports indicate that 11 major cases have been driven forward thus far. UNIAP plans to put more effort into encouraging the Thai authorities to investigate cases based on intelligence that UNIAP and its partners have

gathered, and has already developed a working relationship with the Department of Special Investigation (DSI).

3.3.4.2   Support to Under-served Victim Populations
UNIAP plays a role in identifying and mobilising immediate support for underserved victims of trafficking, such as individuals who are not recognised as victims under existing national laws yet would be under international law. For example, men trafficked onto fishing boats often fall into this category as, until very recently, few national legal frameworks in Asia recognised men as trafficking victims. UNIAP works with, and provides small grants to, relevant grass-roots organisations with the understanding and capacity to provide appropriate victim support. UNIAP's comparative advantage in this respect is that it is often able to support a more rapid response than UN or other international agencies. A good example encountered by the evaluators is UNIAP's work with the NGOs LICADHO and Tenaganita in Cambodia and Malaysia, respectively, as regards the identification, repatriation and reintegration of Cambodian men trafficked onto fishing boats. As already discussed in Section 3.3.3.1, this example demonstrates the way in which the various components of UNIAP can undoubtedly combine together in synergistic fashion.

Problems encountered under this special project include the fact that the UNDP system has made the grant-making and contracting processes slow and laborious, somewhat straining relations with some of the grassroots partners. On another level, tensions have arisen in the case of the trafficked Cambodian men mentioned above, partly because of concerns on the part of some IOM staff that there was insufficient focus on the need to build institutional capacity in order to develop a sustainable response system. On the other hand, concerns were expressed by other parties involved about the capacity of some of the government institutions involved to perform their constituted roles, raising the likelihood of trafficking victims being left without timely assistance unless UNIAP stepped in. In such a highly complex situation, good communication between all organisations involved is critical, as is a mutual desire to bring various parties' specialist contributions together in a synergistic manner.

3.3.4.3 Shelter Self-improvement Project
In partnership with IOM and World Vision, this special project (which has been somewhat delayed) aims to stimulate the response to the problem of sub-standard shelters in the sub-region through the formation of national shelter self-improvement groups that will conduct shelter inspections and develop a plan for the allocation of funding to stimulate improvements in the most efficient manner. Shelters that attain specific standards will be recognised as "outstanding", and national workshops will be held to help formulate longer-term plans and engage the donor community. This initiative is due to begin in Cambodia and Vietnam in 2009.

3.3.4.4 Cross-regional Linkages Project
The aim here is to develop linkages with countries outside the GMS that are destinations for GMS trafficking victims. UNIAP works together with other partners (such as IOM) to deal with requests for assistance on such cases from countries such as the UK and Scandinavia. Building on efforts to meet immediate needs, this special project ultimately aims to encourage the development of a coherent response system amongst relevant governments and international partners. There are similarities to the Underserved Victim Populations Project, though the focus is primarily on Europe, where recent events (such as Operation Pentameter in the UK) have underscored the scale of the human trafficking problem.

3.3.4.5 Ethics and Human Rights in Counter-trafficking
Having identified important gaps in the guidance available on ethical issues (such as ethical issues to be considered when interviewing male victims of trafficking or victims who are still working in the harm environment), UNIAP developed the *Guide to Ethics and Human Rights*

in Counter-trafficking, which was published in September 2008. The *Guide* is of high quality, laying out the issues in a very accessible manner whilst avoiding the risk of superficiality. UNIAP aims to complement the *Guide* with training materials, tools and workshops to encourage dissemination and active application of the *Guide's* principles. The *Guide* is currently being translated and will be piloted in Cambodia in March 2009 (including training for NGOs and media); roll-out in other countries will then follow. The response on the part of some government stakeholders has been very positive; for example, the Thai Department of Special Investigation (DSI) has allocated its own funds to translate the *Guide*, following which UNIAP and DSI will share the costs of printing and disseminating 8,000 copies to police and other government officers nationwide. The *Guide* has been shared with the UN Special Rapporteur (UNSR) on Trafficking in Persons, and practitioners in other regions are reportedly encouraging the UNSR to adopt and promote the *Guide* globally. Feedback on this special project elicited directly from informants by the evaluators was limited, though the feedback that was received was positive, with a highly experienced practitioner working in another region of the world stating that the guidelines are 'highly effective' as well as practical, and that the intention is to use them as a model for guidelines tailored to that region.

In some countries, such as Laos, the issues facing ethnic minority groups require much more attention, including research. The evaluators were informed that Lao trafficking victims from ethnic minority groups are being identified with increasing frequency in Bangkok, as part of a broader increase in migration amongst such groups.

3.3.5 Gender
The PDD notes the inseparability of Gender and Rights perspectives and states that these will continue to inform the Project's own work. The PDD also states that the Project will seek to ensure that relevant commitments made under COMMIT and elsewhere are 'now reflected in practice'.

UNIAP has helped to get gender into a higher position on the agenda of the counter-trafficking community, but the evaluators' overall impression is that gender is still dealt with at a fairly basic level. Responses from a range of informants, particularly within government but also including some CO staff, tended to interpret gender in terms of quantitative aspects (numbers of male and female training participants, for example) that, while an important part of the overall picture, are only one part of it. There seems to be limited understanding of the ways in which gender influences trafficking vulnerability, processes and outcomes, and why gender analysis should therefore inform planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of counter-trafficking responses. There was also only limited evidence amongst stakeholders of a more sophisticated understanding of how gender intersects with other axes of marginalisation (such as ethnicity, age and disability) and how this should be addressed in programmatic responses. On a positive note, however, the vast majority of informants were aware that men can also be victims of trafficking – a relatively new recognition within many legal systems in the sub-region – and that there is a need to learn how to work more effectively with men and boys to address human trafficking issues. Many CO staff recognised the need for an increased focus on gender issues, though this is not always reflected in activity plans; for example, gender awareness training by the Lao Women's Union stopped receiving funding from the Project in 2007, though the precise reasons for this were not ascertained. Capacity for gender-responsive strategies can also be developed through improved mainstreaming of gender perspectives into the curriculum of the Regional Training Programme and the roll-out of national training programmes.

There is opportunity for UNIAP to make use of existing UN gender expertise in line with the wider UN gender mainstreaming mandate and the UN Secretary General's UNITE to End Violence Against Women Campaign. This could be done through strengthening partnerships with UNIFEM at sub-regional level and/or seeking gender advisory input from the UNDP

Regional Centre in Bangkok. UNIAP can also more effectively make policy linkages at national and regional levels to highlight its contribution to the realisation of existing partner country gender equality commitments such as the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), which includes a specific article on human trafficking.

In summary, the Project is certainly meetings its aims under Objective 4 as regards 'bridging gaps, exploring new approaches, bringing in new actors and building new linkages, particularly across borders.' However, its ultimate aim under this Objective of supporting the 'eventual consolidation and institutionalisation of successful approaches' is clearly the most challenging part of the task, and it is the area that UNIAP should focus on improving through working more effectively with international agency and government partners.

Objective 4 is the least well-understood by stakeholders, with some being completely unaware of its existence. It was often work related to these projects that caused a minority of UN informants to question UNIAP's role in 'implementation' (i.e. direct involvement in activities), with one informant suggesting that by playing too direct a role, UNIAP risks losing its position as a neutral broker. A similar number of other informants were very supportive of this Objective, however, such as the individual who stated 'I very much like the fact that they seem to be getting involved in real cases and real issues.... Also the focus on worst offenders – those actually causing the trafficking'. Though the logic behind this Objective is, in the evaluators' opinion, sound, UNIAP clearly needs to better communicate to stakeholders the underlying rationale. Some COs were incompletely informed about the full range of special projects, with one having not heard at all about the Worst Offenders Project.

3.4   Sustainability of Project achievements

Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.[22]

Ownership, one of the main principles of the Paris Declaration, is a critical determinant of sustainability. The COMMIT MoU provides a sub-regional institutional framework for counter-trafficking initiatives that has high-level political backing, thus guaranteeing a certain minimum level of ownership on the part of each government. It thus represents an excellent foundation on which to build a truly sustainable counter-trafficking response in the sub-region. Phase III has built on this foundation by supporting the development of a more focused Sub-regional Plan of Action, with targets and timelines that have been agreed by the member states and that thus represent a commitment to achieving the prescribed aims.

As noted in Section 3.3.1.9, the relative levels of ownership of COMMIT by the participating states are not easy to assess, but certainly vary. In the case of Thailand, where government counter-trafficking capacity and resources are in many senses greater than those of the other COMMIT members, ownership is relatively high (though it varies significantly between ministries and agencies, being higher in the MSDHS than in the Ministry of Labour, for example). At the other end of the spectrum would probably be Laos, where ownership is lower for a number of reasons, including government capacity constraints (both technical and managerial) and the fact that COMMIT activities tend to be viewed as part of a project and not as an integral part of ministries' own plans and budgets.

Clearly, the training and capacity building initiatives under PPC 1 are important for sustainability. Likewise, the development of the National Plans of Action marks an important step towards embedding counter-trafficking policies and plans in countries' own policy and

---

[22]   Definition given in *DAC Summary of key norms and standards*, available from: www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork.

planning systems. Some donors expressed interest in aligning with the NPAs, in accordance with Paris Declaration commitments. Having the relevant ministries and agencies actually operationalise plans and commit their own funds is the next step, and here Thailand probably again leads the field, as it does in the degree to which counter-trafficking institutional structures have been established at the sub-national level. The ongoing development of national versions of regional guidelines (on migrant labour recruitment and victim protection, for example) can be a slow process but is important in terms of establishing institutionalised systems.

As regards the Project's "non-COMMIT" initiatives, notably the special projects under Objective 4, UNIAP's ultimate aim of supporting the 'eventual consolidation and institutionalisation of successful approaches' is clearly correct, but achieving it is challenging. The case of the trafficked Cambodian men mentioned in Section 3.3.4.2 provides an example.

Although COMMIT would likely continue in some form if there is no fourth phase of UNIAP, its effectiveness would be significantly reduced, given the key role UNIAP is currently playing (see Section 3.1.1). Significant achievements have been secured through the Project's efforts, but human trafficking is a complex and evolving issue requiring ongoing innovative programming (the current economic crisis being the latest factor that is likely to cause significant changes in trafficking patterns); a short-term exit strategy would therefore not be advisable. There is a strong case to be made on sustainability grounds for a fourth phase, the design of which should include serious consideration of a realistic exit strategy for the Project and should seek long-term commitments from donors. Discussions have already taken place amongst COMMIT member states as to ASEAN's role in relation to COMMIT, though it is understood that COMMIT member states' views differ somewhat on this issue. The possibility of the COMMIT Secretariat function ultimately coming to reside within ASEAN was mentioned by a range of stakeholders. Another option would be a stand-alone Secretariat supported by country contributions. Clearly, there are many issues to be resolved and discussions should be continued during the remainder of Phase III by way of laying the groundwork for more concrete future actions.

4. Recommendations

Recommendations are presented below in bullet point format, together with references to relevant sections of the report.

4.1 Project management
- Take steps to hire an M&E specialist (as mentioned in the original PDD) on a full or part-time basis, to be based in the PMO (see Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.4).
- Establish clear lines of responsibility and accountability for M&E amongst UNIAP staff (see Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.4).
- Invest in M&E capacity building of UNIAP staff and partners (e.g. through regional and national training programmes), drawing on the expertise of partner agencies as appropriate (see Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.4).
- Although UNIAP's Finance/Operations Specialist and her team have already made major improvements to the Project's financial management systems, any possibilities for further streamlining should be explored (see Section 3.2.6).
- The Project should continue to work together with donors to harmonise reporting requirements as much as possible, to reduce the load on Project management (see Section 3.2.6). Clearly, donors have a major responsibility in this regard.
- The Project should explore the possibility of drawing more upon human resources available at national and regional level to fill core staff positions currently occupied by short-term expatriate staff (see Section 3.2.4).

4.2 Project governance
- The relationship of UNIAP with the UNRCs needs to be clarified and formalised (see Section 3.2.3), for example through the drafting of ToR drawing on past examples of good practice. The role of the UNRC in conducting high-level advocacy at national level on UNIAP's behalf should be specified.
- The possibility of locating UNIAP under the UNDP Regional Centre should be explored as an option for Phase IV, as this would provide a clearer apex to the organisational structure as well as a regional UN voice for advocacy (see Section 3.2.3).
- The role and membership of UNIAP's Management Board needs to be clarified through discussion with, and then clearly communicated to, all major stakeholders (see Section 3.2.3). Transparency should be increased, with full minutes being circulated to all stakeholders, and the NGO seat should be held by a recognised NGO representative.

4.3 Communication[23]

External communication
- The Project, particularly Project management, needs to place more emphasis on communication with stakeholders while not allowing the very significant technical gains made in Phase III to slip away (see Section 3.2.1). Communication needs to be more cohesive and systematic, and be linked to the M&E system so that its effectiveness can be assessed.
- Particular emphasis should be placed on more clearly communicating the rationale behind Project Objectives 2, 3 and 4 (See Sections 3.3.2, 3.3.3 and 3.3.4), especially to stakeholders in government, the UN and other international agencies.

---

[23] Communication here is interpreted broadly so as to encompass outreach and relationship-building efforts, as well as administrative communication.

- UNIAP's draft communication strategy appears to a non-specialist to be somewhat theoretical in nature, so attention will need to be paid to its operationalisation, especially at CO level (see Section 3.3.2).
- More innovative approaches should be adopted for disseminating information. For example, rather than just a newsletter, more impact could be achieved through occasional well-focused OpEd pieces in local newspapers (see Section 3.3.3.1).
- More Project documentation should be translated into national languages (see Section 3.3.3.1). This applies not only to SIREN reports and the like, but also to important planning documents and progress reports.
- There is an urgent need to raise the levels of awareness and understanding of many senior decision- and policy-makers regarding human trafficking (see Section 3.3.1.1). An opportunistic approach must be taken in order to reach them with appropriate messages, for example by including well-designed awareness-raising sessions in the SOMs.

Internal communication
- The next UNIAP staff retreat should discuss issues related to communication within the Project (see Section 3.2.5). The involvement of an external facilitator may be of assistance.
- The roles and responsibilities of PMO staff, particularly their authority to approve requests, should be more clearly communicated to CO staff (see Section 3.2.5).
- The PMO should ensure that all CO staff have a consistent understanding of the Project and its approach (see Section 3.2.1). Orientation for new staff should be improved (see Section 3.2.5).
- The PMO should keep COs better-informed on the overall context and status (financial, programmatic and strategic) of the Project (see Section 3.2.5).
- Administrative communication procedures and "etiquette" should be clarified (for example, some CO staff noted that it would be useful for the PMO to acknowledge all email messages and, where action has been requested by the CO, set a date by which action will be taken; see Section 3.2.5).

4.4   Project Objectives

Objective 1
- The practice of allocating the same amount of money to each COMMIT member state in support of COMMIT activities is understandable in diplomatic terms, but fund allocations should logically be made on the basis of relative need, linked also to ongoing country performance in meeting specified targets in order to provide an appropriate incentive (Section 3.2.6).
- Regarding PPC 1 (Training and Capacity Building), the ongoing Training Needs Assessment should provide detailed recommendations. Pending the release of the TNA, the evaluators would make the following general recommendations (see Section 3.3.1.1):
  - Structural constraints also need to be addressed, with UNIAP's role being to identify key constraints and then engage suitable partners with the capacity to address them.
  - There is a need for regular training on basic human trafficking topics for government officials holding relevant positions, as turnover is often high.
  - Short courses and in-service training options are the only realistic option for many hard-pressed government staff.
  - There is in general a need for more in-house training and on-the-job mentoring, especially in areas such as social work.
  - Counter-trafficking modules should be included in generic pre- and in-service training courses, such as those attended by civil servants and police officers,

as this would be an effective approach to institutionalising training capacity and reaching those who are, or will become, decision-makers.
  - There needs to be an increased focus on supporting the governments in rolling out training programmes at sub-national levels, not just national level.
  - Government agencies with responsibility for labour issues are, for a variety of reasons, generally less engaged in training and capacity-building activities than their peers. Efforts to engage such agencies need to be redoubled.
  - Where possible, CSOs should also be invited to participate in training events.
  - There should be much more evaluation of training impact and follow-up of trainees, in order to assess effectiveness.
- Regarding PPC 6 (Preventive Measures; see Section 3.3.1.6), evaluation of the impact of preventive measures has been lacking sector-wide (with a few notable exceptions, such as ILO's region-wide impact assessment in 2008). The Project should explore whether the impact assessment methodologies being employed by MTV Exit and its subcontractors would be of relevance to the wider counter-trafficking community.
- The Senior Officials' Meetings (SOMs) should address the issue of non-completion of commitments under annual work plans (Section 3.3.1.8). Linking financial support to a clear, time-bound plan would be both equitable and provide support to NPCs as they strive to engage governments.

Objective 2

- The Project needs to explore, in consultation with stakeholders, ways to make regional and national quarterly inter-agency working group meetings more effective (for example, through the use of more focused agendas or more specific themes) (see Section 3.3.2.1).
- The relevance to other countries of the approach used by UNIAP Cambodia and its partners to improve coordination should be explored (see Section 3.3.2.1).
- UNIAP and its UN agency partners should strive to adopt an integrated, joint approach to donors, which would be a radical contribution towards a more harmonised approach overall (see Section 3.3.3.2).

Objective 3

- Regarding SIREN (see Section 3.3.3.1), governments should be informed in advance of the release of potentially sensitive reports, as should other counter-trafficking agencies or projects whose work may also be affected, without compromising the report content.
- Dissemination of SIREN in hard copy is likely to be more effective for the many government staff who have limited internet access (see Section 3.3.3.1). As much relevant SIREN material as possible should be translated into national languages, otherwise its impact amongst both government and non-government staff will be limited.
- Reactions to the redesigned website should be evaluated, as the old version received lukewarm reviews from most stakeholders and needs to be significantly improved (see Section 3.3.3.1).

Objective 4

- The Project's ultimate aim under this Objective of supporting the 'eventual consolidation and institutionalisation of successful approaches' is an area that UNIAP should focus on improving through working more effectively with international agency and government partners (see Section 3.3.4).

4.5 Gender and Human Rights

- Gender sensitivity training is recommended for CO staff, with a special focus on its relevance to human trafficking issues (see Section 3.3.5).
- The mainstreaming of gender perspectives into the curriculum of the Regional Training Programme and into national training programmes should be improved (see Section 3.3.5).
- UNIAP should make use of existing UN gender expertise, through strengthening partnerships with UNIFEM at sub-regional level and/or seeking gender advisory input from the UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok (see Section 3.3.5).
- UNIAP should continue with its efforts to increase research into issues facing ethnic minority groups in the GMS (see Section 3.3.4.5), and draw on such research to inform programming.

4.6 Phase IV

- A strong case can be made for a fourth phase of three to four years' duration, the design of which should include serious consideration of a realistic exit strategy for the Project (see Section 3.4).
- The design process for Phase IV should be carefully planned and adequately funded. A wide range of stakeholders should be involved in a well-structured manner, as this will provide an opportunity to address and resolve (at least for Phase IV) many of the issues raised in this report regarding UNIAP's role, mandate and approach.
- The Phase IV design should be more tightly focused; however, given that it is still likely to be broad, the use of nested logframes should be considered. A sound M&E framework should form part of the Project Design Document (see Section 3.1.2).
- The entire duration of Phase IV should be fully budgeted for, from the outset (see Section 3.2.6).
- Core staff positions should be properly budgeted for and occupied by long-term staff (Section 3.2.4).

5. Annexes

5.1   Annex 1: Evaluators' TOR

5.2   Annex 2: Documentation consulted

5.3   Annex 3: Generic interview guidelines for stakeholders

5.4   Annex 4: Implementation status rapid assessment form

5.5   Annex 5: Interview guidelines for PMO and CO staff

5.6   Annex 6: Results and Resources Framework from the Project Design Document

5.7   Annex 7: SPA II targets and timelines

5.8   Annex 8: Extract from the 2008 PMO Annual Work Plan

5.9   Annex 9: Persons consulted

5.1   Annex 1: Evaluators' TOR

**United Nations Inter-Agency Project on Human Trafficking
Phase III: 2007-2011**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE
UNIAP Phase III Mid-Term Evaluation**

Background

The United Nations Inter-Agency Project on Human Trafficking (UNIAP) was established in June 2000 to facilitate a stronger and more coordinated response to human trafficking, in the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS) and beyond. UNIAP is managed by a headquarters in Bangkok, with country project offices in the capitals of Cambodia, China, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam. The seven UNIAP offices have a combined staff of approximately 30. While UNIAP is a UN inter-agency project, UNIAP receives financial support from its own bilateral and multilateral funding and not from UN agencies, allowing it to retain a neutral position within the UN that serves all UN agencies, governments, and NGOs equally. It is the only inter-agency coordinating body on human trafficking of its kind within the United Nations system.

As a core function, UNIAP coordinates the policy and operational response to human trafficking within the GMS in collaboration with its key stakeholders:

- **Government agencies:** GMS governments at central and local levels;

- **United Nations:** UN and international implementing agencies such as ILO, IOM, UNICEF, UNESCO, UNODC, UNFPA, and others; and

- **NGOs:** Local and international non-government organizations (Save the Children, ECPAT, World Vision, the Asia Regional Trafficking in Persons (ARTIP) Project, and many local NGOs).

The four main objectives of UNIAP's Phase III are focused around the Project's key constituencies, as follows:

1. **Objective 1: Services to Governments.** To support Governments in the institutionalization of effective multi-sectoral approaches to combat trafficking.

2. **Objective 2: Services to UN Partners.** To maximize the UN's contribution to the overall anti-trafficking response, including the COMMIT process.

3. **Objective 3: Services to the broader counter-trafficking sector, including donors.** To facilitate optimal allocation and targeting of anti-trafficking resources.

4. **Objective 4: Services to the broader counter-trafficking sector, including donors (continued).** To continue playing a catalytic role in the anti-trafficking response by identifying and supporting special projects to address new and emerging issues and opportunities.

UNIAP aims to fulfil the four objectives through implementation of several core initiatives such as COMMIT, SIREN, Support to Underserved Victim Populations, Ethics and Human Rights initiative, and inter-agency coordination. The purpose of the Mid-Term Evaluation is to systematically assess how well UNIAP's initiatives are fulfilling the four objectives.

Objectives

The objectives of the UNIAP Phase III mid-term evaluation are to:

1. Analyze and report on the effectiveness of the Project against the four objectives; and

2. Offer concrete recommendations (as appropriate) for improvement of UNIAP's achievement of the four objectives.

Activities

- Develop a plan of action for the Mid-Term Evaluation
- Elaborate an analytical framework to assess the performance of the project and the effectiveness/appropriateness of its monitoring
- Develop data collection and analysis tools from the analytical framework, packaging into an evaluation toolkit
- Implement the evaluation, with fieldwork throughout the region and inter-agency meetings as necessary
- Prepare evaluation reports and summary PowerPoint presentations based on the analyzed data
- Coordinate evaluation efforts throughout the whole process with the UNIAP/Regional team

Project timeline and deliverables

The UNIAP Phase III Mid-Term Evaluation will be conducted by a team during the first quarter of 2009. Deliverables include:

- Evaluation plan and schedule, including field missions
- Mid-Term Evaluation Toolkit
- Draft Mid-Term Evaluation Report, with recommendations
- Final Mid-Term Evaluation Report, with recommendations
- Compile summary PowerPoint presentations, for sharing with stakeholders

5.2 Annex 2: Documentation consulted

Bugnion, Christian (undated – 2006 ?) *External Evaluation of the United Nations Inter-Agency Project (UNIAP) on Human Trafficking in the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS)* (final evaluation of Phase II)

<u>UNIAP documents</u>

COMMIT Sub-Regional Plan of Action (SPA II 2008-2010) (December 2007)

Comparative Expenditure, 2008 (revised)

Global financial woes creating a human crisis in Asia: Action required now – Proposal, November 2008

GTIP – SIREN/Worst Offenders Project Q1 Progress Report: 25 September – 31 December 2008

Olivie, André / UNIAP (2008) *Identifying Cambodian Victims of Human Trafficking Among Deportees from Thailand*

Projections overall: 2009-11

Senior Officials Meeting (SOM) 6: Country Reports (November 2008)

SIREN reports (various)

The COMMIT Sub-regional Plan of Action (COMMIT SPA): Achievements in Combating Human Trafficking in the Greater Mekong Sub-region, 2005-2007 (December 2007)

ToR for: Management Board, Chief Technical Advisor and Field Operations Coordinator

UNIAP (2006) *Human Trafficking in Thailand*

UNIAP (2008) *Guide to Ethics and Human Rights in Counter-trafficking*

UNIAP Communication and Information Dissemination Strategy 2009 (draft)

UNIAP Country Office Monthly Activity Reports (2008)

UNIAP Phase III Project Design Document (November 2006)

UNIAP Phase III Semi-Annual Report (December 2006 – October 2007)

UNIAP Phase III Second Semi-Annual Project Progress Report (July to December, 2007)

UNIAP Phase III Semi-Annual Project Progress Report to New Zealand (November to June 2008)

UNIAP Phase III Semi-Annual Project Progress Report to Norway (July to December, 2008)

UNIAP PMO Work plan (2008)

UNIFEM/UNIAP (undated) *Trafficking in Persons: A Gender and Rights Perspective*

UNIAP Website: www.no-trafficking.org

5.3 Annex 3: Generic interview guidelines for stakeholders

1. How does your work relate to human trafficking? About what percentage of your time is spent on human trafficking (HT) issues?

2.   i. What experience have you had of UNIAP and its activities? *[The answer to this question will determine what other questions are asked]*

      ii. How frequently, and in what way(s), do you interact with UNIAP? Are UNIAP staff easily accessible if you need to coordinate with them/request advice?

3.   i. What are your thoughts on the implementation of the SPA? Are things generally being implemented effectively and on schedule? If not, what are the problem areas?

      ii. What are your thoughts on the COMMIT process overall? Is it achieving its objectives, e.g. strengthening regional cooperation against human trafficking and building national counter-trafficking capacity?

      iii. [When relevant] Within your agency, are COMMIT activities integrated into your agency's strategy, annual work plan and budget, or are they regarded as a distinct "project" or "special activity"?

4. How effectively has UNIAP been able to meet its responsibilities regarding SPA implementation and the COMMIT process? (For example, how effective has UNIAP been in improving coordination between the various agencies (UN, NGO, donor, etc.) working in the anti-HT sector? How often does the COMMIT National Task Force meet, and how effective are its meetings?)

5. What's the status of the National Plan of Action? Does it/will it provide an effective framework for anti-HT efforts? What are the weaknesses?

6.   i. Compared to a few years ago, are donors (and other agencies) providing support in a way that is more in line with Government priorities & plans for anti-HT? If so, is this due to any UNIAP activity? What exactly?

      ii. Are donors in the anti-HT sector coordinating more effectively amongst themselves (e.g. avoiding overlap)? If so, is this due to any UNIAP activity? What exactly?

7. Over the past few years, has there been an improvement in the capacity of Government officials to design and implement anti-HT initiatives? If so, what are the reasons for this improvement?

8. Have you heard of 'SIREN'? If so, could you explain what it is? Is it useful for you and, if so, in what way(s)? How could SIREN be improved?

9. One of UNIAP's four main objectives is to identify and support special projects to address new and emerging issues and opportunities in the counter-trafficking field. Are you aware of any examples of UNIAP doing this? If so, how effective do you feel UNIAP's contribution has been?

10. Is there any evidence of a trend for anti-human trafficking programmes to focus more on destinations rather than sources? If so, do you feel UNIAP has played any role in bringing about this change?

11. Could you explain how your agency applies gender and rights perspectives to its anti-HT work? Has UNIAP provided any support in this regard?

12. Do you feel M&E of anti-HT programmes (both within your agency and in general) is satisfactory? If not, why not? What is UNIAP doing to help address weaknesses? How effective are UNIAP's efforts? How could they be improved?

13. What have been the most significant benefits that have resulted from UNIAP's work during Phase III? How sustainable are these? What could be done to increase the probability of benefits being sustainable?

14. What could UNIAP improve? (e.g. How could it perform its existing roles better? Are there new roles it should start playing? Should it withdraw from certain current roles?)

15. What should UNIAP's priorities be for the remainder of this phase? And beyond?

16. Are there any other issues that you would like to discuss concerning UNIAP's work or this evaluation?

5.4 Annex 4: Implementation status rapid assessment form

UNIAP Phase III: current status by Objectives & major activities

Country Office:

UNIAP Objective / major activity	Status (behind schedule / on schedule / ahead of schedule)	Problems / unexpected issues (positive & negative)	Estimated likelihood of achieving planned results by end of Phase III (0% = impossible; 100% = certain)
Objective 1: Services to Government			
COMMIT *(refer to SPA II)*			
PPC 1: Training & Capacity Building			
PPC 2: National Plans of Action			
PPC 3: Multilateral & Bilateral Partnerships			
PPC 4: Legal Frameworks, Law Enforcement & Justice			
PPC 5: Victim Identification, Protection, Recovery & Reintegration			
PPC 6: Preventive Measures			
PPC 7: Cooperation with Tourism Sector			
PPC 8: Management: Coordination, Monitoring & Evaluation			
Other activities			
Objective 2: Services to UN partners			

COMMIT SPA coordination			
Other inter-agency operational coordination			
Other activities (e.g. global technical support)			
Objective 3: Services to the broader counter-trafficking sector, including donors			
SIREN			
Other activities			
Objective 4: Special projects			
Worst offenders			
Support to under-served victim populations			
Shelter self-improvement project			
Cross-regional linkages project			
Ethics & human rights in counter-trafficking			
Other activities			

5.5   Annex 5: Interview guidelines for PMO and CO staff

Guidelines for PMO and Country Office staff interviews

PMO staff only
1. How was the Project designed? Who participated? What are your views on the original design?

2. Do you feel Phase III is based on a clear strategy (identified as an issue in the Phase II Final Evaluation)? Do you feel clear targets and indicators have been identified for the various Objectives and outputs? Does baseline data exist, against which progress can be tracked? Is an effective monitoring system in place?

3. Could you explain how the annual planning process works?

4. The Phase II Final Evaluation suggested that in some COs, the strategic objectives of the Project were being lost sight of because staff were fully engaged with day-to-day activity implementation. Is this still a concern?

5. All financial resources must be approved from BKK, but in terms of planning and implementation, a significant degree of decentralisation is required. Are there tensions here? Are these being resolved?

6. The Project Proposal describes the strengthening of M&E – both within UNIAP and throughout the sector - as a 'key new focus' and states (p. 19) that an M&E specialist will be recruited (on a part-time or full-time basis, 'as funds allow'). However, the response to the Phase 2 Final Evaluation states that such a position was not considered relevant at that time, but that UNIAP was preparing for aggregate impact assessments in late 2008: what is the status of these? (Was the SPA I achievements assessment part of this?)

7. The response to the Phase II Final Evaluation also states that UNIAP is 'developing an M&E plan of action for the overall HT sector'. What's the current status of this? Does this relate to the Phase II Final Evaluation's recommendation that UNIAP should play the role of M&E focal point, consolidating and managing data on HT and the impact of counter-HT initiatives?

8. The Project Proposal states that UNIAP is to 'develop an M&E plan [that] will be a "living" document, subject to revision at 6-monthly intervals' (p. 26) and will include monitoring of the following:
• Quality and progress of activities and achievement of outputs (results and resource framework);
• Risk and risk management;
• Training and capacity building;
• Sustainability strategies;
• Quality of technical advice;
• Achievement and quality of milestones;
• Any significant changes not captured by existing indicators; and
• Financial monitoring.

What's the current status of this initiative?

9. Better coordination of research was identified as a region-wide need by the Phase II Final Evaluation, and UNIAP responded through a broad consensus-seeking exercise to identify research gaps and priorities. SIREN is addressing some of these priorities, and UNIAP is

funding other partners to conduct research. Is UNIAP satisfied with progress thus far? What are UNIAP's future plans in this area?

10. In relation to the original Project proposal, how have the Project's objectives and activities evolved to date, and how are they likely to continue to evolve during the rest of Phase III? For example, what are the implications for the Project of the COMMIT Taskforce's request that UNIAP engage ASEAN and Malaysia on HT issues?

11. The UNIAP Management Board: how well is this working? And the Project Steering Committee?

12. To what extent do national taskforces have the capacity to assume their role? What are the key constraints? (Resources available? Political will?)

13. Is UNIAP succeeding in its aim of targeting expertise (TA, etc.) more effectively?

14. How effective has the Project been (at regional and national levels) in identifying champions in key government agencies (as discussed in the Phase II Final Evaluation), which is critical if the correct message regarding HT is to work its way down the hierarchies to the operational level?

15. Could you review the state of relations between the PMO / COs and the UNRCs? (COs report to PMO, but also to their respective UNRCs). What's the status of the UNIAP initiative to clarify these relationships?

16. Overall, is UNIAP having a 'tangible & sustained impact on HT in the GMS'?

17. At the end of Phase III, do you feel a further phase will be necessary? If so, could it be viewed as a final phase, marking the satisfactory consolidation and institutionalisation of counter-trafficking initiatives within the six GMS governments, or is it too early to say?

18. Project documentation suggests that funding has been a challenge for UNIAP over the years – is this correct? Could you outline the current funding situation and prognosis? (The UNIAP response to the Phase II Final Evaluation stated that approximately 50% of the funding required to complete Phase III had been secured at that time). The original Proposal had budget of USD 6,854,000 – does this remain unchanged?

19. Has the Project been audited in the past? If so, what were the outcomes and recommendations?

20. To what degree are the various partner agencies (especially UN but also L/INGOs) willing to align their strategies/plans with COMMIT/SPA II? Or is this not so much of an issue because SPA II is so broad?

CO staff (& PMO staff, where relevant)

1.   i. What is your professional background? When did you join UNIAP?
        ii. What is your role? Has this changed over time? Do you feel adequately equipped (in terms of knowledge & skills) to perform this role?

2. What are your views on UNIAP's internal management (personnel, information, budget, coordination with stakeholders, activity planning):
        i. Within the PMO?

ii. Between the PMO and COs? (e.g. Is there a clear mutual understanding between the PMO and COs concerning strategies, plans, etc.? Is there a free two-way flow of ideas and information between the PMO and COs?)

iii. Within the CO?

iv. High staff turnover was noted in the Phase II Final Evaluation as an issue: could you provide further details on this? Has this problem been addressed?

3. What is the function of the UNIAP Management Board? Are you kept informed of the Board's discussions?

4. Is UNIAP's relationship with the UN Resident Coordinator clear? What role does the UNRC play in relation to UNIAP? How does the relationship with the UNRC influence project progress?

5. What are your views on the UNIAP Phase III design? (Logical? Clear? Addresses real needs? Flexible/able to adapt to changing context?)

6.   i. What are your thoughts on the implementation of SPA II? Are things generally being implemented effectively and on schedule? If not, what are the problem areas?

ii. What are your thoughts on the COMMIT process overall? Is it achieving its objectives, e.g. strengthening regional cooperation against human trafficking and building national counter-trafficking capacity? How should COMMIT evolve in the coming years?

iii. What are your thoughts on the possible plan to further empower COMMIT National Taskforces to take on more responsibility for implementation of the overall regional COMMIT process?

iv. Within government agencies, are COMMIT activities normally integrated into agencies' strategies, annual work plans and budgets, or are they regarded as a distinct "project" or "special activity"?

v. What are your feelings on how the PMO and COs should balance their commitments between COMMIT and non-COMMIT activities (with the caveat that there are lots of linkages between the two)? The Phase III proposal suggests a 70:30 split. Do you think that you currently have the balance right?

7. How effectively has UNIAP been able to meet its responsibilities regarding SPA implementation? (For example, how effective has UNIAP been in improving coordination between the various agencies (UN, NGO, donor, etc.) working in the anti-HT sector?)

8. What's the status of the National Plan of Action? Does it/will it provide an effective framework for anti-HT efforts? What are the weaknesses?

9.   i. Compared to a few years ago, are donors (and other agencies) providing support in a way that is more in line with Government priorities & plans for anti-HT? If so, to what extent is this due to any UNIAP activity?

ii. Are donors in the anti-HT sector coordinating more effectively amongst themselves (e.g. avoiding overlap)? If so, to what extent is this due to any UNIAP activity?

10. Over the past few years, has there been an improvement in the capacity of Government officials to design and implement anti-HT initiatives? If so, what are the reasons for this improvement?

11. Do you feel SIREN is being effective in making available up-to-date information to stakeholders who need it? Are stakeholders accessing/using the information that's available on SIREN? What evidence is there for this? If stakeholders are not utilising SIREN, why not? How could SIREN be improved?

12. One of UNIAP's main aims is to identify and address new and emerging issues and opportunities in the counter-trafficking field. Are you aware of any examples of UNIAP doing this? If so, how effective do you feel UNIAP's contribution has been? Do you feel this UNIAP role is understood by other stakeholders (government and non-government), in comparison with UNIAP's role as COMMIT Secretariat?

13. Overall, do you think UNIAP is effectively communicating its role, rationale and approach to other stakeholders (government, UN/international agency and NGOs)?

14. Is there any evidence of a trend for anti-human trafficking programmes to focus more on destinations rather than sources? If so, do you feel UNIAP has played any role in bringing about this change?

15. How effective has UNIAP been in advocating for the active application of gender and rights perspectives? What has UNIAP done in this regard? Examples?

16. Do you feel M&E of anti-HT programmes (both within UNIAP and in the counter-trafficking sector in general) is satisfactory? If not, why not? What is UNIAP doing to help address weaknesses? How effective are UNIAP's efforts? How could they be improved?

17. What have been the most significant benefits that have resulted from UNIAP's work during Phase III? How sustainable are these? What could be done to increase the probability of benefits being sustainable?

18. What could UNIAP improve? (e.g. How could it perform its existing roles better? Are there new roles it should start playing? Should it withdraw from certain current roles?)

19. What should UNIAP's priorities be for the remainder of this phase? And beyond?

20. Are there any other issues that you would like to discuss concerning UNIAP's work or this evaluation?

5.6   Annex 6: Results and Resources Framework from the Project Design Document

Deliverables	Output Targets	Indicative Activities	Responsible parties	Inputs
1) SERVICES TO GOVERNMENTS				
Objective 1: To support Governments in the continued development and institutionalization of effective multi-sectoral approaches to combat trafficking.				
1.1 Timely and effective implementation of the COMMIT Sub-Regional Plan of Action	• Government implementation in line with international standards and practice • COMMIT SPA activities funded, implemented and evaluated • COMMIT SOMs, IMMs, technical working groups, external agency, donor and other meetings organized and fully documented • COMMIT achievements shared within and beyond the GMS region and beyond	• Coordination of the management and administrative aspects of the COMMIT Process. • Serving as Secretariat to each of the national COMMIT Task Forces, and facilitating communication between countries on the COMMIT Process • Monitoring implementation of the COMMIT SPA and evaluating impact of activities • Working closely with external agencies to coordinate their involvement and support to specific aspects of the SPA • Raising funds to support SPA implementation • Ensuring that all COMMIT and development partner reporting requirements are met	• COMMIT taskforces, PMO and all country project offices	**Regional and Country Activities $2,100,000**

Deliverables	Output Targets	Indicative Activities	Responsible parties	Inputs
		• Publicising (through regional and national media etc.) information about COMMIT		
1.2 Greater common understanding of the trafficking problem and the effectiveness of different approaches through the delivery of high quality training programmes at regional and national level	• Finalized regional training programme on trafficking, including curriculum consisting of 5-8 modules and trainers guidebook • Five trainings completed • System developed to monitor ongoing impact • Regional Training Programme (including its participatory methodology) translated, adapted and tested at country level	• Fine-tuning of regional human trafficking curriculum and programme and modification as necessary. • Delivery of five regional anti-trafficking courses to government officials and other anti-trafficking practitioners. • Pre- and post-test evaluations and post-training follow-up • Training of trainers course, drawing on selected past participants • Adaptation and replication of the training nationally • Evaluation of the overall initiative to refine and improve the training	• COMMIT taskforces, PMO and all country project offices • Technical input from expert group and liaising with other technical partners	
1.3 Effective and timely implementation of regular interagency activities	• Documentation of good practices and shared leaning • Update inventory of anti-trafficking activities and interventions and work of Government, UN and NGO partners • Systems put in place to regularly monitor and	• Occasional papers and monographs published and launched • Up-to-date inventories available on UNIAP web-site for easy access • Meetings, symposiums, consultations, joint activities and strategies fully documented	• Organization of expert groups and liaison with technical partners for replication • Input from CPOs for identification	

59

Deliverables	Output Targets	Indicative Activities	Responsible parties	Inputs
	update data on anti-trafficking interventions		of participants and follow-up evaluation	
1.4 To develop an effective, cross-sectoral system to combat trafficking at the national level	• Comprehensive multi-sectoral national plans developed and implemented in each country with clearly defined benchmarks, indicators, targets and well-defined lines of responsibility • Individual government agency plans, where these exist, are consistent with NPAs	• Support for development of comprehensive multi-sectoral National Plans • Support for development of implementation plans for NPAs on trafficking as appropriate • Technical support for agencies/bodies responsible for overseeing/monitoring implementation of national plans	• Input from CPOs for identification of participants and follow-up evaluation	

2) SERVICES TO UNITED NATIONS PARTNERS

<u>Objective 2</u>: To maximize the UN's contribution to the overall anti-trafficking response, including the COMMIT process.

Deliverables	Output Targets	Indicative Activities	Responsible parties	Inputs
2.1 Support for inter-agency collaborative processes and joint priority setting	• Regular quarterly inter-agency working group at regional and national levels • Issues-based technical roundtable meetings/ working group meetings	• Organising and facilitating quarterly IAWG meetings and technical working groups arising as required • Technical advice to UNRC offices on trafficking including for UNDAF and CCA processes	• UN partner agencies, PMO and all country project offices	**Regional and Country Activities $75,000**

Deliverables	Output Targets	Indicative Activities	Responsible parties	Inputs
	discussions facilitated and documented • Initiatives on joint programming documented and framework shared with national partners	• Assist in the development of UN Joint Framework on trafficking (as appropriate) at the country level		
2.2 Facilitation/ development of joint UN positions on key trafficking issues	• UN support to the implementation of SPA and respective NPAs fully documented and collated • Clear areas of engagement on human trafficking within UN agencies identified • Opportunities identified to support implementation of NPAs through both stand-alone programmes on human trafficking and integrated/ mainstreamed responses	• Mapping of UN partner anti-trafficking interventions against SPA and NPAs • Desk review of agencies' mandates and areas of country specific engagement. • Identification of opportunities to integrate human trafficking into existing programmes, where possible, in line with the objectives and activities contained in the NPAs • Discussions with agencies to develop strategies for UN joint activities and interventions	• UN agency anti-trafficking focal points	
2.3 Strengthening the alignment of UN responses with national plans and priorities	• Demonstrated responsiveness to UN system requests for coordination of joint UN responses on key issues	• Regular meetings with UNRC offices at regional and national levels • Coordination of joint UN responses (letters etc.) to respond to urgent and/or emerging issues	• PMO, CPOs • UN agency focal points	

Deliverables	Output Targets	Indicative Activities	Responsible parties	Inputs

3) SERVICES TO ANTI-TRAFFICKING SECTOR IN GENERAL, INCLUDING DONORS

Objective 3: To facilitate optimal allocation and targeting of anti-trafficking resources

Deliverables	Output Targets	Indicative Activities	Responsible parties	Inputs
3.1 Facilitation of inter-agency coordination meetings and networking at the regional and national levels	▪ Partners express satisfaction with range and quality of mechanisms for information-sharing, etc.	• Quarterly inter-agency coordination meetings • Weekly email national news digests disseminated to national anti-trafficking sector partners to share knowledge on experiences, successes and lessons learned • Occasional eminent guest speaker events organised to maximize information-sharing of experts in (or passing through) region	Civil society, UN partner agencies, PMO and all country project offices	**Regional and Country Activities $340,000**
3.2 Development an extensive inventory of GMS anti-human trafficking interventions	▪ Inventory of anti-trafficking interventions completed and disseminated ▪ Up-to-date inventories of anti-trafficking activities, and new information available on UNIAP web-site for easy access	▪ Regularly update inventory of anti-trafficking activities and interventions and work of development partners, INGOs, and NGOs. ▪ Systems put in place to regularly monitor and update data on anti- trafficking interventions of Government partners, UN agencies and programmes, development partners, INGOs and NGOs ▪ New information on activities, interventions and work of all partners uploaded to user-friendly regional website, including direct links	Civil society, UN partner agencies, PMO and all country project offices	

	Deliverables	Output Targets	Indicative Activities	Responsible parties	Inputs
			to their websites and publications		
3.3	Collection and collation of information on trafficking and trafficking responses	▪ Occasional analytical papers and monographs published and launched (SIREN) ▪ Non-confidential information from victims collated, analysed and disseminated to agencies working on prevention ▪ Information from civil society representatives/ NGOs flowing and being used by Government in policies and programming	▪ Documentation of good practices and shared learning ▪ Preparation of monographs on good practice, based on clearly defined criteria. (SIREN)[13] ▪ Supporting regular linkages (between civil society representatives/NGOs and Government partners so that information flows from the ground up into national processes) ▪ Pilot project to collect and collate non-confidential information from victims (Myanmar and one other country, in conjunction with UNICEF and VSAs)	Technical input from technical expert group and liaising with other technical partners	
3.4	Information dissemination and sharing on human trafficking issues and Subregional plan of action	▪ A greater understanding of human trafficking and the COMMIT process amongst development partners	▪ Provide ad hoc briefings on emerging issues		

4) SPECIAL PROJECTS

Deliverables	Output Targets	Indicative Activities	Responsible parties	Inputs
Objective 4: To continue to play a catalytic role in the anti-trafficking response by identifying and supporting special projects to address new and emerging issues and opportunities.				
4.1. Special projects	■ Emerging gaps, issues and opportunities identified and acted upon ■ Special projects developed and implemented to address existing gaps ■ Lessons learned from special projects fully documented ■ Funding and implementing support identified for continuation/expansion of successful small projects as appropriate	■ Piloting of following projects and documentation of outcomes:[14] ■ Safe migration and vulnerability project incorporating integrated interventions at points of origin, transit and destination ■ Trafficking into fisheries ■ Trafficking into domestic servitude ■ Addressing socio-cultural norms and racist and discriminatory attitudes that contribute to use and toleration of trafficked labour ■ Identification and support for other emerging priorities, including targeted action-based research on emerging issues. ■ Impact assessment for the overall sector	UNIAP regional and national staff	**Regional and Country Activities $500,000**

5.7 Annex 7: SPA II targets and timelines

ANNEX C: INTER-AGENCY JOINT TARGETS & TIMELINES				
	ACTIVITY	**SPA I STATUS 2007**	**SPA II TARGETS & TIMELINES 2008 – 2010**	
POLICY & COOPERATION	**PPC 2** National Plans of Action	1: All NPAs completed and passed by the governments, with draft implementation plans.	2: All implementation plans for NPAs completed, adopted, and funded, with functioning coordination and monitoring mechanisms.	4: Coordination mechanisms functioning and integrated into government agency mandates and budgets.
			3: Strengthened alignment between anti-trafficking activities and NPAs, including consistency between NPAs and sectoral/agency implementation plans.	
	PPC 3 Multilateral and bilateral partnerships	1: Regional experience in developing and implementing bilateral cooperation agreements on trafficking documented and shared.	2: Bilateral coordination mechanisms on human trafficking signed where appropriate, with effective implementation and monitoring.	3: Bilateral coordination mechanisms functioning and integrated into government agency mandates and budgets.
			4: Established systems for the collection and exchange of information within and across borders.	
LEGAL FRAMEWORKS, LE, JUSTICE	**PPC 4** Legal frameworks, law enforcement, and justice	1: Strengthened general and specialist LE responses to trafficking.	(1 - Continued) Strengthened general and specialist LE responses to human trafficking.	
		2: Effective multilateral and bilateral cooperation between specialist trafficking units.	(2 - Continued) Effective multilateral, bilateral, and internal cooperation between specialist trafficking units.	
		3: Strategies for prosecuting trafficking under existing legal frameworks developed. 4: Countries have ratified the major international and regional agreements relevant to human trafficking and incorporated key provisions into national law. 5: National legal framework (1) criminalizes trafficking, (2) adequate penalties, (3) protects victims, (4) supports witnesses, and (5) creates widest possible jurisdiction. 6: Extradition and MLATs incorporate trafficking-related crimes; facilitate investigative and judicial cooperation.	7: There is an informed and appropriate judicial and prosecutorial response.	
PROTECTION	**PPC 5** Victim ID, protection, recovery, and reintegration	1: Regional guidelines for victim identification, shelter and recovery, repatriation and reintegration agreed by consensus and adopted by governments.	2: National level operationalization of the regional guidelines on protection fully completed.	
			3: Bilateral and national level policy and procedure changes implemented to address key gaps in capacity building and program infrastructure of victim return.	
			4: Bilateral and national level policy and procedure changes implemented to address current challenges in implementing victim identification guidelines and repatriation guidelines.	
PREVENTIVE MEASURES	**PPC 6** Preventive measures	1: Regional and national guidelines on migrant recruitment practices in the GMS completed.	2: Development and implementation of national operational guidelines and mechanisms for labor recruitment and migrant protection.	4: Training on and systematic monitoring of compliance with regional and national guidelines.
			3: Direct measures to target and reduce vulnerabilities in the migration and recruitment processes, and in workplaces.	
	PPC 7 Cooperation with the private sector	1: Regional strategy on cooperation with the tourism sector developed.	2: Regional strategy adopted on cooperation with the tourism sector to combat human trafficking, and action plan implemented.	
			3: Increase in cooperation with private sector regionally and in all countries, with evidence of tangible progress used as a springboard for further cooperation.	
TECHNICAL, M&E	**PPC 1** Training & capacity building	1: Materials updated, modularized for national training and trainer certification.	2: National level adapted curricula, with a cadre of trainers and targeted operational training provided according to needs assessments. Trainer certification and trainer refresher programs running.	
	PPC 8 Coordination and M&E	1: Inter-agency and inter-governmental monitoring plan functioning, with joint targets and timelines.	2: Annual monitoring reports and final evaluation of SPA II.	
			3: Aggregate impact assessments: multi-agency prevention, protection, and prosecution efforts across the GMS.	

5.8   Annex 8: Extract from the 2008 PMO Work Plan

2008 REGIONAL NON-COMMIT WORKPLAN		
Activity title	**Target**	**Output indicators**
Objective 2. Services to UN Partners.		
Meetings with the UNRC's Office	Increased support of UNIAP by the UNRC system	Meetings carried out
UN inter-agency coordination meetings	Support to COMMIT SPA II coordinated	Meetings carried out, as well as joint UN mission to target hotspot for strategic planning
Technical support to UN programs, events, meetings	Contribution to increased effectiveness of partners at the regional and country level	Support provided to ILO, IOM, UNICEF, UNODC, UNDP, and other UN agencies as requested
Objective 3: Services to the larger counter-trafficking sector.		
Regular IAWG meetings	Consensus on regional research and programmatic priorities, and how to coordinate to meet these needs	Meetings carried out
Donor coordination meetings	Donor briefing on progress and future activities	Meeting carried out
Weekly dissemination of newsletter digest and website updates	Increased quality and frequency of data dissemination	Weekly newsletters disseminated; website updated 2x/week or more
Dissemination and translation of SIREN reports	Analysis of cutting edge issues disseminated to partners, in English and local languages	12 reports completed and disseminated in appropriate languages
SIREN mapping coordination meetings and site visits	Maps released and updated annually; increased consensus and strategy on trafficking flows and linkages to be addressed	UNIAP human trafficking country and regional maps generated and updated annually
SIREN regional initiative: mapping broker/trafficker operations, including documentation of debt bondage mechanisms	Accurate information related to broker operations and debt bondage mechanisms disseminated	Reports disseminated in 2008
Objective 4: Services to the larger counter-trafficking sector. Special projects to address new and emerging issues.		
UNIAP Trafficking Estimates Competition	Successful statistical methods to estimate numbers of trafficked persons disseminated and replicated	Research grants given; meeting in December 2008 carried out; publication disseminated.
Shelter Self-Improvement Project	Measurably improved shelters and increased capacity of shelter workers	Training provided; shelters visited; grants and TA provided; shelters visited 2nd time
Support to Underserved Victim Populations	Increased psychosocial, medical, legal aid for underserved victim populations	RFP released; grantees vetted and selected; grants for victim services provided

5.9   Annex 9: Persons consulted

Date	Location	Name, position & organisation
30 January	Vientiane	Ms Susan Knopke (Project Associate, Counter-Trafficking Unit) & Mr Kolakot Venevankham (Return & Reintegration Officer), IOM Lao PDR
5 February	Bangkok	Mr Matt Friedman, UNIAP Regional Project Manager
5 February	Bangkok	Dr Lisa Rende Taylor, UNIAP Chief Technical Advisor
5 February	Bangkok	Mr Paul Buckley, UNIAP Regional Technical Specialist
5 February	Bangkok	Ms Gwi-Yeop Son, UN Resident Coordinator Thailand
5 February	Bangkok	Dr David Feingold, International Coordinator for HIV/AIDS and Trafficking, Regional Unit for Culture in Asia and the Pacific, UNESCO, Bangkok
5 February	Bangkok	Dr Ratchada Jayagupta, UNIAP Thailand National Project Coordinator
5 February	Bangkok	Ms Suparnee Pongruengphant, UNIAP Thailand Information Analyst
5 February	Bangkok	Ms Baranee Tongboonrawd, Project Assistant, UNIAP Thailand
5 February	Bangkok	Mr. Arongkot Khosshasorn, THALACC Coordinator, UNIAP Thailand
6 February	Bangkok	Ms Oratai Junsuwanarak, Ms Oratai Junsuwanaruk, Anti-Human Trafficking & Advocacy Programme Coordinator, World Vision Foundation of Thailand
6 February	Bangkok	Ms Sophie Pinwill, Deputy Team Leader, ARTIP
6 February	Bangkok	Ms. Sunee Srisangatrakullert & Ms. Jameekorn Pinsuk, NOCHT
9 February	Yangon	Ms Ohnmar Ei Ei Chaw, National Project Coordinator, UNIAP Myanmar
10 February	Bangkok	Dr Suvajee Good, National Chief Technical Advisor, ILO Thailand
10 February	Bangkok	Mr Sompong Srakaew, Director, Labour Rights Protection Network, Thailand
10 February	Bangkok	Ms Pornnipa Buddee, Finance & Operations Specialist, UNIAP PMO
11 February	Bangkok	Police Lt Col Chachvan Bunmee, Director Transnational Crime 1, DSI & Police Lt Col Thakoon Nimsomboon, DSI
11 February	Bangkok	Mr Michael Miner (Regional Director, SEARCH) and Ms Melinda Macdonald (Senior Program Manager, SEARCH)
11 February	Bangkok	Ms Hera Shanaj (Programme Coordinator), Ms Varaporn N. & Mr Lance Bonneau (Senior Regional Programme Development Officer), IOM
11 February	Bangkok	Ms Wassana Kaonoparat, Director of Child Protective Services Unit & Mr Chakkrid Chansang, CPCR
12 February	Bangkok	Ms Kannika Ratanamanee, Director of Child Protection Division & Ms Ratchadaporn Songsuwan, OPP
12 February	Bangkok	Ms Amanda Bissex, UNICEF Thailand
12 February	Bangkok	Ms Kanchanaporn Jitsanga, Head Librarian, Pridi Banomyong Library (Thammasart University HT Resource Centre)
12 February	Bangkok	Ms Yannee Lertkrai, Director BATWC
12 February	Bangkok	Mr Alex Heath, Distribution Manager Asia Pacific & Mr Simon Goff, Campaign Director, MTV Exit
13 February	Bangkok	Mr Chatri Moonstan, Senior Programme Officer, Royal Norwegian Embassy
13 February	Bangkok	Ms Lynn De Silva, NZAID Manager (outgoing) & Mr Phil Hewitt, NZAID Manager (incoming), New Zealand Embassy
16 February	Phnom Penh	Mr Lim Tith, National Project Coordinator, UNIAP Cambodia
16 February	Phnom Penh	Mr Huot Vichheka, Information Analyst, UNIAP Cambodia
16 February	Phnom Penh	Ms Evelyn Klein, Project Officer, UNIAP Cambodia
16 February	Phnom Penh	Ms Rachmany, Project Assistant, UNIAP Cambodia

16 February	Phnom Penh	Mr Ith Rady, Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Justice
16 February	Phnom Penh	Mr Khleang Rim, ILO Creative Industries Support Programme
17 February	Phnom Penh	H.E. San Arun, Secretary of State & Head of COMMIT Task Force, MOWA
17 February	Phnom Penh	H.E. Nhim Vanchankorn, Deputy Inspector General of Inspectorate General, Ministry of Education
17 February	Phnom Penh	Mr. Seng Sakda, Director General, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training
18 February	Phnom Penh	Mr John McGeoghan, Project Coordinator, IOM
18 February	Phnom Penh	Mr Abid Gulzar, RACTP Program Manager, World Vision
18 February	Phnom Penh	Pol. Maj. Gen. Bith Kim Hong, Director of Anti-Human Trafficking and Juvenile Protection Dept., General Commissariat of National Police, Ministry of Interior; Pol. Lt. Colonel Reaksmey Sok, Chief of Adminstration Office, General Commissariat of National Police, Ministry of Interior
19 February	Phnom Penh	Mr Douglas Broderick, UNRC Cambodia
19 February	Phnom Penh	Mr Manfred Hornung, Legal Consultant, LICADHO
19 February	Phnom Penh	Mr Nara Chea, HR Monitor, LICADHO
19 February	Phnom Penh	Mr Kok Sithanit, UNIFEM
19 February	Email communication	Detective Chief Superintendent Richard Berry, Gloucestershire Constabulary, UK Police
19 February	Email communication	Mr Andre Olivie, Seattle School of Law (former UNIAP Legal Intern), USA
20 February	Phnom Penh	Mr Yi Yuth Vireak, ARTIP
20 February	Phnom Penh	Ms Ly Sunlina, Programme Officer, DCA
20 February	Phnom Penh	Mr Hor Sarun, Under Secretary of State, Ministry of Tourism
21 February	Email communication	Dr John Frederick, Consultant
23 February	Vientiane	Dr Xoukiet Panyanouvong, NPC, UNIAP Lao PDR
23 February	Vientiane	Mr Rowan Clusker, Intern, UNIAP Lao PDR
23 February	Vientiane	Mr Phimmasone Thongphataysack, Information Analyst, UNIAP Lao PDR
23 February	Vientiane	Mr Phadsada Chanthavong, Project Assistant, UNIAP Lao PDR
23 February	Vientiane	Ms Wan-Ching Teo, Project Officer, UNIAP Lao PDR
23 February	Vientiane	Dr Didier Bertrand, Country Project Director, AFESIP
23 February	Vientiane	Mr Henrik Schmith, Country Program Manager, NCA
23 February	Email communication	Ms Lisha Li (former UNIAP Legal Intern), USA
24 February	Vientiane	Ms Victoria C. Juat, Chief of Child Protection Section, UNICEF
24 February	Vientiane	Mr Chansamone, SCA
24 February	Vientiane	Mr Sythala Pathammavong, Country Project Coordinator, ARTIP
25 February	Vientiane	Mr Kiengkham Inphengthavong, MoPS (Head of COMMIT Task Force)
25 February	Vientiane	Mr Somxay Khamphavong, Head of Central Library, NUOL
25 February	Vientiane	Ms Rebecca Powell and Dr. Jayampathy Wickramaratne, UNODC
26 February	Vientiane	Ms Nithsa Vongphanakhone (Programme Officer) & Mr Remy Duiven (First Secretary Development and Cooperation), SDC
26 February	Vientiane	Ms Sengsoda Vanthabouvong, Head of Division, LNTA
26 February	Vientiane	Ms Somasanith Keoduangdy, Deputy Chief of Cabinet, LYU
26 February	Vientiane	Mr Saleumxay Kommasith, Director General of International Organisations Dept, MoFA
26 February	Email communication	Dr Dr. Nyunt Nyunt Thane, Child Protection Specialist, UNICEF Myanmar
27 February	Vientiane	Mr Vongkham Phanthanouvong, MLSW
27 February	Vientiane	Mr John Whan Yoon, MDRTS 2 Regional Manager, World Vision
27 February	Email communication	Dr Phil Marshall, Consultant

28 February	Email communication	Ms Jennifer Finnegan, Intern, UNIAP Vietnam
1 March	Email communication	Ms Lily Phan, UNIAP TNA consultant and Trafficking Estimates winner
2 March	Vientiane	Ms Viengvone Kittavong, Deputy Director General, Department of Treaties and Law, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2 March	Email communication	Mr Khin Maung Wynn, Country Project Coordinator, ARTIP Myanmar
3 March	Vientiane	Ms Thoummaly Vongpachan, Director of Counselling and Protection Centre, Lao Women's Union