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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In May 2013, the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) commissioned a seven-month retrospective evaluation of project GLOT55, a series of global, regional, and national-level activities designed to support selected United Nations (UN) Member States in preventing and combating human trafficking and migrant smuggling, funded by the European Union (EU). The purpose of the evaluation was to assess GLOT55 retrospectively and to draw lessons learned for future projects, particularly those involving partnership with the EU. Guided by the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria, the evaluation sought to document project activities and to assess their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

Background

Implemented between March 2009 and August 2013, GLOT55’s primary objective was to promote the ratification and implementation of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children (Trafficking Protocol), and the Protocol against Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air (Smuggling Protocol), which supplement the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (2000). GLOT55’s primary activities included: (1) assistance to selected states to strengthen their legal frameworks against trafficking in persons (TIP) and smuggling of migrants (SOM); (2) national and regional trainings on criminal justice responses to TIP and SOM; (3) initiatives to improve support for victims of trafficking in persons and smuggled migrants; and (4) support for selected awareness raising activities; as well as the development of standardized training and guidance tools on smuggling of migrants to complement existing tools on trafficking in persons.

Using the DAC Criteria to structure the evaluation, the independent team developed a set of research questions to guide assessment of GLOT55’s results. The team used these questions to develop an evaluation matrix, which included a set of sub-questions to help capture information needed to address the primary questions and a set of data to provide sources of the information. The matrix served as the basis for developing (1) a set of analytic codes to organize and assess GLOT55 documents and materials and original data, (2) interview protocols to guide interviews with study respondents, and (3) a detailed survey instrument in three languages to collect information from a global set of respondents.

Using these instruments, the team (1) collected, reviewed, coded and analysed 166 global and field GLOT55 documents and materials; (2) conducted 39 telephone and in-person interviews with UNODC staff and partners; (3) completed field visits to Colombia, Moldova, Senegal and UNODC Headquarters in Austria; and (4) administered a global online survey of approximately 320 UNODC and partner organization staff involved in GLOT55 implementation.

---

1 The full title of GLOT55 is “Promoting the implementation of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children, and the Protocol against Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, both supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.”

2 The DAC criteria were developed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in 1991. More information about the criteria can be found at http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm
Data were collected between May and November 2013, analysed and developed into a set of evidence-backed findings and recommendations. These analytical results informed the drafting of the evaluation report. UNODC’s Independent Evaluation Unit, GLOT55 project staff and EU donors then reviewed and commented on the draft report. Guided by resulting feedback, the team revised the draft and submitted this final report.

The evaluation findings have some key limitations. These include the request for a retrospective evaluation, which precludes establishing a baseline and marking progress against it; the lack of a comparison group, which prevents assessment of results in the absence of GLOT55; and the use of a convenience sample of interview and survey respondents, which prohibits generalization of findings to the larger population from which respondents were drawn. During the evaluation, low response rates (~20 percent) to the online survey introduced a significant non-response bias. Although the survey data supported the findings of the analysis of documents and interviews, the low response rate led the team to exclude these data from the main body of the report (see Annex V). Despite these limitations, the research yielded compelling data from which to draw findings and develop recommendations about the implementation and perceived results of GLOT55.

Evaluation Findings

GLOT55 served as a “breakthrough” project for UNODC. Among GLOT55’s most significant results was its contribution to UNODC’s position as a key actor in the fight against trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. GLOT55 was instrumental in helping UNODC (1) build internal capacity to respond to these global problems, particularly in the area of migrant smuggling, (2) consolidate its management approach to developing and deploying responses, and (3) institutionalize learning across all of the organization’s counter-trafficking and counter-smuggling activities. Through the implementation of GLOT55 activities, UNODC established or re-established its position as a key organization in the human trafficking and migrant smuggling sectors at country and regional level. GLOT55 demonstrated UNODC’s content expertise, ability to convene stakeholders across countries and regions, develop cross-sectoral partnerships, and galvanize institutional and financial resources to respond to human trafficking and migrant smuggling.

Among its greatest strengths, GLOT55’s flexible project design allowed UNODC to initiate activities in more than 50 countries, often partnering with those governments most willing to develop national-level responses to human trafficking and migrant smuggling. This helped UNODC build local ownership of these issues and local responses to them. It also helped generate costs savings, which in turn supported the implementation of more activities than initially envisaged and promoted sustainability of some of the mechanisms after GLOT55 end. After a slow start, the flexible design also contributed to the introduction of administrative changes that helped accelerate implementation in the second half of the project.

GLOT55’s primary limitations included (1) limited consultation with national offices and partners about local needs, activities eligible for support, and adaptation to the local context, (2) lack of follow-up activities to institutionalize and sustain progress made, and (3) short timeframe, insufficient to achieve planned objectives. For example, although GLOT55 supported 24 legal assessments of counter-trafficking or counter-smuggling legislation in 18 countries, no country had implemented legislative changes by project end. Respondents also pointed to the inadequacy of single, one-time only training activities on complex topics that require more time to understand and to develop responses, and raised expectations about generating meaningful responses but that were unachievable with GLOT55’s resources and timeline.
Another weakness involved the failure to develop a logical framework that reflected achievable objectives. The logic model included outcomes that were not possible to achieve in the implementation timeline. Among these outcomes were national level Protocol ratification, legislative changes and increases in the number of investigations. Measured against the initial log-frames, GLOT55 has not achieved its objectives. Both EU and UNODC staff recognized the shortcomings of GLOT55’s initial log-frames and collaborated at the project midpoint to revise project indicators. The changes did not, however, result in the full alignment of project activities with the intended outcomes or results.

The revised log-frame also did not capture several key project strengths, including flexibility, responsiveness and catalysing of new initiatives at the country level. The latter was a particularly important strategy for addressing one-time nature of project activities that lacked needed follow up. UNODC and its partners were able to leverage the outputs of several GLOT55 activities to develop and fund several important follow up activities. At the time of this writing, UNODC had secured country or international donor support for follow-up projects or activities in at least 16 countries and was pursuing several additional follow-up projects.

Overall, GLOT55’s results appear to be strongest in relation to legislative development and capacity building in the criminal justice system. Diverse study respondents identified these two areas as best aligned with UNODC’s mandate, strengths and comparative advantage. Stakeholders diverged in their view of victim support and awareness raising activities – areas where GLOT55 achieved more modest results. For example, despite implementation of well-regarded awareness raising activities in Colombia and Moldova, several respondents identified these as beyond UNODC’s core expertise and ability to add value. The area of victim support is more complex, given that identification mechanisms and services for victims effect criminal justice responses more directly. In this regard, GLOT55’s partnering with IOM in Colombia and short-term, collaboration with a well-established NGO in India suggest collaboration with local partners as an alternative means of pursuing victim support initiatives.

The Summary Matrix of Findings, Evidence and Recommendations summarises the assessment’s recommendations and the relevant associated findings. Given the retrospective nature of this assessment, the research team focused on recommendations with implications beyond GLOT55. Going forward, UNODC plans to pursue efforts to combat trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants through a single united global programme. Recommendations take this into account and focus on supporting UNODC’s plan to employ a flexible, GLOT55-informed technical strategy in providing technical assistance, capacity building activities, and in the development of tools, policy, and partnerships.

---

3 There is not a direct match between individual recommendations and individual findings, due to the retrospective nature of the evaluation and the non-continuation of GLOT55.
### SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings: problems and issues identified</th>
<th>Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLOT55 addressed clearly defined and demonstrated global, regional and national needs for strategies and resources to combat trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. GLOT55 made notable contributions to UNODC’s new consolidated approach to combating human trafficking and smuggling of migrant. GLOT55 contributed to the development and consolidation of knowledge about human trafficking and migrant smuggling as well as legislative and criminal justice strategies for combating them. UNODC and some national partners are pursuing selected GLOT55 follow-up activities at the global and local levels.</td>
<td>Interviews with UNODC staff and non-UNODC stakeholders; desk review</td>
<td>1. UNODC should consider further consolidation of its counter-trafficking and counter-smuggling expertise and activities under a common global programme, including through ongoing development of its programme database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GLOT55 logical framework did not clearly articulate the relationship between project inputs, planned activities or outputs, and desired outcomes. UNODC, in consultation with EU, introduced changes to the GLOT55 project design during implementation to improve efficiency and streamline reporting.</td>
<td>Interviews with UNODC staff; desk review</td>
<td>2. UNODC should consider developing clear and detailed logic models for the overall work of the Human Trafficking and Migrant Smuggling Section, one for trafficking in persons and one for smuggling of migrants. 5. For each project on trafficking in persons and/or smuggling of migrants, UNODC should consider developing clear and robust, project-specific logic models and an articulated theory of change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOT55 was well aligned with UNODC’s mission, particularly in providing legal assistance and supporting law enforcement capacity building activities. GLOT55 helped UNODC establish itself as an organization with the expertise and resources necessary to combat human trafficking and the smuggling of migrants. GLOT55 produced and disseminated a number of self-sustaining tools and resources for combating trafficking in persons and smuggling</td>
<td>Interviews with UNODC staff and non-UNODC stakeholders; desk review</td>
<td>3. As part of the evolution of a section-specific theory of change and logic model, UNODC should consider developing additional strategies to affirm a leading role in the global criminal justice response to trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 A finding uses evidence from data collection to allow for a factual statement. 
5 Recommendations are aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of a project/programme; at redesigning the objectives; and/or at the reallocation of resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;: problems and issues identified</th>
<th>Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)</th>
<th>Recommendations&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of migrants. Respondents highlighted UNODC’s experience, relationships and materials as contributing to the efficiency of programme implementation.</td>
<td>Interviews with UNODC staff and non-UNODC stakeholders; desk review</td>
<td>4. UNODC should review its role in the areas of victim support and awareness raising, and consider engaging in these areas only where they relate directly to its criminal justice related goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC planned and successfully implemented a number of activities in Clusters 1 and 2. UNODC planned and implemented many fewer activities in Clusters 3 and 4</td>
<td>Interviews with UNODC staff and non-UNODC stakeholders</td>
<td>6. UNODC should consider how best to communicate project parameters to regional and country partners to help ensure that participant expectations align with resources available. 7. When developing a menu of project activities, UNODC should consider strengthening the process of consultation with local and regional offices and partners, as well as concerned donors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOT55’s flexible structure constituted an original and oft-cited project strength. Stakeholders report that GLOT55 helped to build regional and national ownership of counter-trafficking and counter-migrant smuggling issues and mechanisms. GLOT55’s global-led design prevented some regional and national partners from adapting counter-trafficking and counter-smuggling activities to align with local needs.</td>
<td>Interviews with UNODC staff and non-UNODC stakeholders</td>
<td>8. UNODC should consider developing a clear strategy for capacity building activities in the areas of trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. 9. UNODC should consider developing an internal definition of the core elements of a training of trainers programme as it relates to counter-trafficking and counter-smuggling. 10. UNODC should consider ways to increase the content and timeline of its capacity-building activities, for example, by developing computer-based training courses as well as materials or strategies for incorporating human trafficking and migrant smuggling topics into police, prosecutorial and judicial training academies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The design of GLOT55 and the primary focus on one-time activities appears to have prevented the project from achieving key objectives. While effective in supporting the development of draft legislation, GLOT55 does not appear to have made demonstrative contributions toward ratification of Protocols or to passage, implementation or operationalization of new laws against trafficking in persons or smuggling or migrants. There is a need for follow-up to support the passage and implementation of counter-TIP and counter-SOM legislation. Despite engendering gains in knowledge and criminal justice sector capacity, there remains a significant need to consolidate these gains through additional training and technical assistance.</td>
<td>Interviews with UNODC staff and non-UNODC stakeholders; desk review</td>
<td>11. UNODC should consider continuing to seek and strengthen opportunities for collaboration with other actors in the counter-trafficking and counter-smuggling fields, particularly in areas where the organization does not have a clear comparative advantage. These would include victim support and awareness raising. 12. UNODC should consider identifying and using appropriate resources developed by other organizations to complement assets and tools produced by the organization itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC created value and contributed to GLOT55’s efficiency by building on existing activities, cooperating with other UNODC projects, and working together with other key stakeholders. GLOT55 contributed to a new UNODC reporting system, designed to support the consolidation of institutional knowledge and learning.</td>
<td>Interviews with UNODC staff and non-UNODC stakeholders; desk review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>5</sup> Findings and recommendations may be used with appropriate citation.
I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents findings from a retrospective evaluation of United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Human Trafficking and Migrant Smuggling Section project GLOT55, a series of global, regional, and national-level activities designed to support selected United Nations (UN) Member States in preventing and combating human trafficking and migrant smuggling, funded by the European Union (EU). Implemented between March 2009 to August 2013, GLOT55’s primary objective was to promote the ratification and implementation of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children (Trafficking Protocol), and the Protocol against Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air (Smuggling Protocol), which supplement the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (2000) (“the Protocols”). GLOT55’s primary activities included (1) assistance to selected states in strengthening their legal frameworks against trafficking in persons (TIP) and smuggling of migrants (SOM); (2) national and regional trainings on criminal justice responses to TIP and SOM; (3) initiatives to improve support for victims of trafficking in persons and smuggled migrants; and (4) support for selected awareness raising activities; as well as the development of standardised training and guidance tools on smuggling of migrants, complementing existing tools on trafficking in persons.

Following the OECD’s Development Assistance Criteria (DAC), the report presents a set of findings about GLOT55’s (1) Relevance, (2) Effectiveness, (3) Efficiency, (4) Impact and (5) Sustainability. These findings were derived from a retrospective analysis of two primary data sources: (1) 166 global and field program documents and materials, and (2) 39 telephone and in-person interviews with UNODC staff and partners engaged in the development and implementation of GLOT55-funded activities. At UNODC’s request, a research team of independent consultants designed a framework for and then collected, coded,}

---

6 When the project was initially drafted the department of UNODC that managed the project was called the Anti-Human Trafficking and Migrant Smuggling Unit, part of the Anti-Trafficking Section of the Division for Operations. With the re-structuring of UNODC, the Unit level disappeared and the staff working on trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants became part of the Implementation Support Section of the Organized Crime and Illicit Trafficking Branch of the Division for Treaty Affairs in 2010. The Human Trafficking and Migrant Smuggling Section was established on 1 April 2012 as part of the Organized Crime and Illicit Trafficking Branch of the Division for Treaty Affairs as a result of the adoption of the Comprehensive Strategy to combat trafficking in persons and the smuggling of migrants in December 2011.

7 The full title of GLOT55 is “Promoting the implementation of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children, and the Protocol against Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, both supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.”

8 For the interviews, we targeted a convenience sample of UNODC field staff and partners in countries where UNODC used GLOT55 resources to fund multiple activities. We excluded countries in which GLOT55 supported only a single activity.

9 The original evaluation design included a third data source: a global survey of a cohort of approximately 320 UNODC and partner organization staff involved in GLOT55 implementation. The survey was fielded online, in three languages, and in countries in which more than one GLOT55 activity was implemented. Low response rates (~20 percent) introduced a significant non-response bias into these data, which led to the exclusion of the survey data from the primary summative analysis. The general results of these data can be found in Annex E.
and analysed these data in the period May to December 2013. The research team used the study findings to develop a succinct set of lessons learned and incipient recommendations for UNODC and the EU (as GLOT55’s primary donor) to consider in future efforts that pursue legislative and criminal justice responses to trafficking in persons and the smuggling of migrants.

The rest of this report is organized into the following sections: Section II includes the primary findings of the assessment, organized by the DAC. Each study research question appears numbered and in bold font. They are followed by the findings that address the question, set off with a bullet point and in italics to distinguish their status as a finding. To clarify and contextualize the finding, we follow each bullet point with a discussion of the data supporting it, including illustrative quotations collected during telephone interviews and field visits. The number of findings and amount of supporting discussion differ by thematic area and finding. This variation reflects the depth and detail of responses provided during data collection and identified in analysis. In Section III, we offer a set of summative conclusions and lessons learned based on the study findings. The report concludes with Section IV, which provides a set of lessons learned and recommendations to inform future responses to trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. Annex I details the study’s research methodology and its limitations. Annexes II-IV, VI and VII contain the study instruments developed for the assessment and the original Terms of Reference. Annex V contains the results of the online survey.

Background and Context – GLOT55

GLOT55 Structure

Funded by the EU at 90.23%, GLOT55 employed an innovative approach to support implementation of the TIP and SOM Protocols. Rather than specify individual countries or target groups, the project design allowed UNODC flexibility in responding to member state requests for assistance addressing trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. It was not, however, designed to support detailed follow-up activities at country level. Specifically, UNODC, in consultation with the EU, developed a set of activities that States could request to help them improve especially their relevant legal frameworks and criminal justice responses, with some limited resources for victim assistance and raising awareness of trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants.

GLOT55 Objectives

As distinct institutions, UNODC and the EU use different log-frames and outcome indicator templates. UNODC staff initially developed a project log-frame in EU format, along with the project document, workplan and budget. These documents were then translated into the UNODC framework, resulting in two parallel log-frames, two activity categorisations, and two sets of performance indicators. The EU utilized the following four “activity clusters:”

- **Activity Cluster 1:** Promoting Ratification of the Protocols and their transposition into domestic law (including legal assessments to assist countries to bring their legislation into line with the requirements of the two protocols).
**INTRODUCTION**

- *Activity Cluster 2*: Improving the skills of criminal justice system actors (through national and regional training workshops\(^\text{10}\)).
- *Activity Cluster 3*: Improving assistance and protection to trafficking in persons and/or smuggled migrants through fostering criminal justice actors/civil society cooperation.
- *Activity Cluster 4*: Awareness-raising among the general public, in particular vulnerable groups and groups prone to migration.

UNODC structured their indicators around the following four outcomes:

- *Outcome 1*: Beneficiary countries increase the compliance of domestic legislation with the Protocols.
- *Outcome 2*: Criminal justice actors in beneficiary countries become more effective in handling cases of human trafficking and/or smuggling of migrants, including through international cooperation.
- *Outcome 3*: Criminal justice actors in beneficiary countries enhance cooperation with civil society to strengthen protection of trafficked victims and smuggled migrants.
- *Outcome 4*: The general public, and in particular vulnerable groups identified in beneficiary countries, become less prone to victimization as a result of human trafficking and/or migrant smuggling.

The evaluation team’s first review of project documentation suggested that the initial GLOT55 logical framework neither clearly hypothesized nor documented the relationship or link between project inputs, planned activities or outputs, and desired outcomes. It also did not include clear and appropriate indicators of progress related to outputs and outcomes. Interviews with project stakeholders elaborated that the partners agreed that the log-frames (1) had been developed very quickly, (2) had not been afforded the needed priority by either organization to ensure a strong and logical project framework, and (3) did not conceptualize or establish clear anticipated links between planned activities, outputs, and outcomes or appropriate indicators. The lack of an agreed and illustrative log-frame and indicators prevented the evaluation team from assessing the strength of the program model and the potential for planned activities and outputs to lead to desired outcomes.

UNODC staff advised that a EU results oriented monitoring in mid-2012 identified the lack of a clear and heuristic log-frame and the lack of clear measurement indicators as a main project concern. This led to a revision of the project log-frame being proposed to the EU in October 2012 and approved in 2003. Because the revision occurred mid-project, however, the two partners focused on ensuring that the log-frame reflected what UNODC would be able to implement and realize, rather than on linkages or

\(^{10}\) For the purposes of the evaluation, we will use the EU Activity Cluster categorisations. This follows the format of project documentation, which is organized according to Activity Clusters 1-4. It does not reflect a judgement on the relative merits of the two formats. We have further divided Cluster 2 training activities into the following three categories: (1) international cooperation (10 workshops); (2) legal drafting (five workshops); and (3) other activities, ranging from training on victim identification and support to training of trainers to training of magistrates (six workshops).
indicators of outcomes within the log-frame itself. The UNODC implementation team then focused the remaining 18 months of the project on implementing planned activities to help support project goals.

**Evaluation methodology**

In May 2013, UNODC commissioned an independent research team to conduct a retrospective assessment of GLOT55. This study focused on how UNODC headquarters and field offices used GLOT55 funds to develop and implement activities aimed at helping Member States (1) develop and implement national legislation aligned with the Palermo protocols, (2) build national criminal justice sector capacity to combat trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants, (3) assess the cooperation between law enforcement and civil society and develop NGO capacity to assist and protect victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants, especially through legal processes, and (4) raise awareness about the problems of trafficking in persons and/or smuggling of migrants.

The evaluation team developed a set of research questions designed to examine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of GLOT55. The team then developed both a set of sub-questions aimed at collecting information able to address the primary questions and a set of data sources with the capacity to address each question and sub-question. The team organized these key elements into an evaluation matrix. Following endorsement by UNODC of this matrix, along with the proposed scope of the evaluation, it served as the basis for developing (1) a set of analytic codes to organize and assess project documents and materials, (2) interview protocols to guide interviews with study respondents, and (3) a detailed survey instrument in three languages to collect information from a global set of respondents. The team collected these data between May and November 2013; analysed program documents and telephone and in-person interviews from 11 countries, the European Union in Brussels and at UNODC headquarters using qualitative data analysis software; and developed a set of findings and recommendations based on the analysis of these data.

**Research Questions**

The purpose of this assessment was to evaluate GLOT55 retrospectively and to draw lessons learned for future projects, particularly those involving partnership with the EU. The evaluation sought to provide accountability to donors by documenting (1) primary project objectives, (2) activities undertaken in each substantive area, (3) how activities were implemented, (4) which objectives were met and what results were achieved, and (5) what plans for sustaining activities and results have been made.

We developed an evaluation matrix or framework to guide the evaluation design and data collection and analysis activities (Annex II). We first developed a set of research questions based on the evaluation purpose from the TOR (see Annex VII) and the five OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. We used the research questions to organize the evaluation matrix and develop data collection questions or measures. We assembled the measures into the appropriate data collection and analysis instruments, including an interview guide, stakeholder survey, and analysis coding structure for GLOT55 documents. We conducted the study’s key data collection activities including telephone and in-person interviews of a sample of GLOT55 staff and stakeholders; a web-based survey of a larger sample of staff and stakeholders involved with GLOT55 in three languages; and a structured

---

11 See footnote 5 for a discussion of the outcomes of the survey.
12 India, Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova, Columbia, Mexico, El Salvador, Kenya, Senegal, Benin, Togo and Guinea.
review of project documents. The qualitative data were systematically analysed using qualitative data analysis software (QDAS) and the survey data, using descriptive statistics. We examined all data relationally to identify emergent trends, patterns, and themes in the data, triangulating across data types to identify key findings and lessons learned. This report documents the results of this retrospective assessment.\textsuperscript{13}

Evaluation Matrix

The evaluation matrix that guided this retrospective assessment of GLOT55 can be found in Annex II. It includes (1) the primary research questions the study addressed, as aligned with the OECD-DAC criteria, (2) adaptations of these questions for use in data collection instruments to measure GLOT55 implementation and results, and (3) the data sources consulted to determine responses to the measures. This matrix guided all evaluation activities, allowing us to document GLOT55 activities, assess GLOT55 achievements, and identify lessons learned for use in future efforts aimed at promoting adoption and implementation of the Protocols, building criminal justice capacity to address human trafficking and migrant smuggling, providing assistance and protection of its victims, and raising awareness of these issues.

Study Limitations

The evaluation design and methods had a number of important limitations. These include the following:

- The entirely retrospective nature of the evaluation, as commissioned by UNODC, requires a research design that precludes comprehensive pre/post assessments of the implementation and achievements of GLOT55. This prevents the assessment from attributing change or results to GLOT55 activities directly or exclusively.
- The lack of a comparison group precludes assessment of the results in the absence of GLOT55. For example, we cannot say definitively whether, in the absence of GLOT55, similar or different results to those documented in the evaluation would have been achieved.
- Convenience sampling for interviews and the survey preclude generalization of findings to the larger populations from which the samples were drawn. For example, we cannot assume that the perspectives of the UNODC and partner organization staff that were interviewed represent the perspectives of all UNODC and partner organization staff in each country in which GLOT55 was implemented or in any region as a whole.
- A low survey response rate precluded generalization of the survey findings to the larger population of staff from which respondents were drawn.

In addition, many GLOT55 activities occurred only once; approximately half were completed more than two years prior to the evaluation. This limited respondents’ ability to recall the specific activities, structure, focus, and outcomes of GLOT55 and to provide detailed answers to some questions. Further, feedback from study respondents indicated that changes of government and staffing made it difficult to locate the appropriate respondents.

\textsuperscript{13} Additional information about the research methodology and its limitations can be found in Annex A.
A further challenge, for any evaluation in which respondents participate voluntarily, is self-selection bias. It is possible that persons who chose to participate in the evaluation differ in important ways from those who did not. For example, those who agreed to participate may have had stronger positive or negative feelings about GLOT55 than those who did not. Finally, any evaluation that includes self-reported data has the potential challenge of a social desirability bias – the tendency for evaluation participants to respond in a way that they believe will be pleasing to others, for example, exaggerating the positive aspects of a project to please project staff.

In spite of these limitations, the available data yielded multiple, robust findings concerning challenges, results, and lessons learned from the design, implementation and results of GLOT55.
II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

In this section, we describe the primary findings from this retrospective assessment of GLOT55. The findings discuss – and are organized by – the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of GLOT55 activities and outcomes. They are then organized by the research questions driving the evaluation. The findings do not cover each question asked or topic raised during data collection. Instead, they focus on the issues (1) most frequently cited by respondents and in documents, (2) to which respondents and documents devoted the most time or space discussing, and (3) that were most often identified as salient across respondent types and in project and organizational documents. Where respondents and documents differed in their views on the substance or characteristics of an issue, we describe each differing point of view offered. As discussed above, the study findings are set off by a bullet point and appear in italics to indicate their status as a finding. The section concludes with a table summarizing all study findings by DAC criteria and data source.

Relevance

In this section, we address the three research questions relating to GLOT55 programme relevance, defined by DAC as the extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor. The findings focus on cross-cutting issues, emergent in multiple countries and documents and from diverse and differently-situated respondents.

1. To what extent did the objectives of GLOT55 – to support ratification and implementation of the Palermo Protocols – address a clearly defined need?

- GLOT55 addressed clearly defined and demonstrated global, regional and national needs for strategies and resources to combat trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants.

The Overall Objective of GLOT55 was to prevent and combat human trafficking and migrant smuggling by promoting the ratification and implementation of the UN Protocols on Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants (the Palermo Protocols). The specific objectives were (1) supporting member

---

14 Throughout the discussion, we do not quantify qualitative data or always provide the number of respondents giving a particular response. With qualitative data collected using nonstandard response categories and that are non-representative or non-universal, we use sometimes provide the number of respondents but more often use such terms as some, a few, many, most, and even all to indicate the relative frequency of the response. We use these terms consistently, relative to the number of times an issue is raised by each respondent and across respondents. The methodological Annex further explains data sources and context for this type of descriptive summary of the data findings.

states in ratification and adoption of legislation in alignment with the Protocols and (2) strengthening the
capacity of governments/criminal justice systems to address human trafficking and migrant smuggling
while assisting and protecting victims and protecting the rights of smuggled migrants. The project design
documents clearly outline the needs these objectives were designed to meet, including a description of the
overall problem and a description of the need each cluster was intended to address, as well as how the
different elements of its execution work to address the need. Specific issues identified as leading to the
development of the program included:

- Inadequate anti-trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants legislation
- Ineffective criminal justice responses and weak institutional capacity, including a lack of
  knowledge and specialized skills related to trafficking in persons and migrant smuggling, and
  weak legal/institutional frameworks
- Limited victim identification, protection, and referral, and the need for improvements in the
  working relationship between law enforcement and NGOs
- Limited awareness on trafficking in persons and migrant smuggling issues.

GLOT55’s four activity clusters align with this description of the problem and resulting needs. Under
Activity-Cluster 1, Promoting ratification of the Protocols and their transposition into domestic law,
GLOT55 supported the assessment of existing laws on smuggling of migrants in 16 countries across East
Africa (Kenya, Tanzania, Djibouti, Ethiopia), West Africa (Benin, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Côte d’Ivoire),
Central Asia (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan), Central America
(Guatemala and El Salvador) and Colombia. In addition, the smuggling legislation of nine other
countries was assessed as part of a regional desk review. (These were Burundi, Comoros, Eritrea, Madagascar,
Somalia, Mauritius, Uganda, Rwanda and Seychelles). TIP assessments were carried out in eight
countries in West Africa (Benin, Togo, Guinea) and Central Asia (as above).

Both the TIP and SOM assessments identified gaps in the legislation across all countries assessed. In
terms of trafficking in persons, these gaps included: lack of or partial definitions of trafficking; omission
of a specific definition of child trafficking; lack of victim identification measures; lack of special
provisions for child victims; no mechanism to release trafficked persons from criminal liability; and
limited attention to the financial aspects of the crime, with no or inadequate provisions for confiscation
and seizure of criminal proceeds in relation to human trafficking offences.

With regard to smuggling of migrants, the assessments found that, in most countries studied, the law
failed to draw sufficient distinction between those responsible for the smuggling and the migrants
themselves, or between crimes committed for financial or other material benefit, as opposed to family or
humanitarian purposes. In other words, the laws tend to focus on crimes that might be committed in the
migration process by the migrants themselves (i.e. illegal entry, illegal residence), with very few laws
including any element of “financial or other material benefit”. Further, actions that endanger, or are likely
to endanger, the lives or safety of the smuggled migrants, or that entail inhuman treatment, including for
exploitation, of such migrants were not treated as aggravating circumstances.

Transnational Organized Crime. The Convention opened for signature by Member States at a High-level Political
In terms of the remaining Activity Clusters concerning capacity, victim support and prevention, available information supports the assessment of ineffective criminal justice responses and limited victim identification. For example, against ILO estimates that 14.2 million people are in situations of forced labour and 4.5 million in forced sexual exploitation, the US State Department’s Trafficking in Persons Report states that just 42,291 trafficking victims were assisted in 2011 and that there were 7,909 prosecutions of which 3,969 were successful. Most strikingly, there were only 278 successful prosecutions for forced labour (out of a total of 456 such prosecutions). Although these statistics are not directly comparable – not all people in forced labour were trafficked into this situation and some perpetrators are prosecuted for other crimes – they are indicative of a major gap between the size of the problem and the effectiveness of the response.

Less information is available on existing levels of awareness of TIP and SOM and the relationship between awareness levels and vulnerability to these two issues. The limited data available does not show a correlation between increased awareness and reduced vulnerability, despite emerging evidence that there are certain protective behaviours that migrants can take, suggesting that awareness raising activities to date have largely been ineffective and/or misdirected.\(^\text{16}\)

Study respondents in West Africa and Central America emphasised the importance of GLOT55 counter-smuggling activities in helping stakeholders understand the role of criminal networks in these activities. In West Africa, respondents also noted that while previous discussions of migrants had contributed to an adversarial relationship between origin and destination countries, GLOT55’s focus on criminal networks increased understanding of the need for cooperation between sending and receiving countries, allowing them to see this as a ‘shared problem’.

Several respondents noted the relevance and efficiency of addressing trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants together. This is because many of the same stakeholders are involved in identifying, assisting, and protecting these groups as well as investigating and prosecuting their traffickers and smugglers. There is also considerable confusion between trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants among key actors and stakeholders. Respondents found that addressing the two issues together through GLOT55 helped them clarify the different concepts, activities, and victim and smuggled migrant needs, as well as the relationship between trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants.

Respondents also highlighted the value of GLOT55 in helping UNODC develop its own capacity to combat migrant smuggling, noting that while the organization had amassed extensive experience combating human trafficking, their work on migrant smuggling was less developed. GLOT55 allowed UNODC to improve internal knowledge of migrant smuggling, develop strategies and capacities to address it, and produce new resources dedicated to understanding and combating it.

Overall, stakeholders found the project to be highly relevant at global and regional levels, due to the need to bring legal frameworks into line with the Palermo Protocols, the importance of specialized training for the criminal justice sector, low levels of victim identification and limited awareness of SOM issues in particular.

---

\(^\text{16}\) A recent literature review found little evidence of a relationship between an individual’s level of awareness and their likelihood of being trafficked, for example (Marshall, P. and D. Kuhnle, forthcoming).
2. **How does GLOT55 align with UNODC’s mission?**

- *GLOT55 was well aligned with UNODC’s mission, particularly in providing legal assistance and supporting law enforcement capacity building activities.*

UNODC staff frequently describe UNODC’s role as the guardian of UN Convention on Transnational Organised Crime and its supplementing Protocols. Although the Palermo Protocols contain provisions on protection of victims of trafficking in persons and of the rights of smuggled migrants, as well as provisions on prevention (including mass media campaigns and social and economic initiatives), they are predominantly seen as a criminal justice instruments, in keeping with the parent Convention’s focus on organized crime. UNODC’s mandate, as described on its website, is also very much focused on the criminal justice dimensions of trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants.

EU staff, UNODC staff and consultants and project partners all considered that the project aligned closely with this mandate, widely expressing the view that GLOT55, with its focus on the ratification and implementation of the Protocols, is “core to UNODC’s mission.” Both UNODC and external interviewees cited the organisation’s in-depth knowledge of the two Protocols, and, highlighted the unique mandate of UNODC to address trafficking in persons in particular.

Interviewees were in agreement on the strong reputation of UNODC within partner countries as a “knowledge provider”, noting a reputation for legitimacy and neutrality. Additionally, it is seen as having the “pull” of an international organization with funds and resources. This presence through previous work, existing resources, and established relationships facilitated effective implementation of GLOT55 activities. The EU Results Oriented Mission (ROM) global report in 2012 concluded that GLOT55 was “instrumental for the overall work of the UNODC on TIP and SOM”, reflecting the alignment between the goals of the project and the overall work of UNODC.

Respondents at multiple levels highlighted the development of awareness raising activities (Activity Cluster 4) as a possible exception to the alignment of GLOT55 with the mission of UNODC, with one noting that UNODC is not as expert in awareness raising as in other areas of counter-TIP and counter-SOM. Another respondent elaborated, that UNODC is “clear about what we can do well, with working level practitioners and developing frameworks with policy makers.” Unlike with the development of conforming legislation or criminal justice sector capacity training, HTMSS does not have in-house specialists in the awareness raising and communication campaigns. As discussed further in Section II.C.1, GLOT55 implemented activities in Cluster 4 in Moldova and Colombia, as well as developed a counter-smuggling in migrants training film and 60-second video clip on ways and means involved in migrant smuggling. The Cluster 4 activities occurred, however, only in the last few months of the project. Multiple stakeholders viewed the Moldova awareness campaign, in particular, as rushed and without sufficient time to develop and complete project activities. The activities in Moldova are discussed further in Section II.C.1.

---

17 EU Monitoring Report, MR-144983.01, 21 August 2012, p.4.
18 UNODC includes a small Advocacy Section but, although one staff member participated in the recruitment of the production company for the training film and public service announcement on migrant smuggling, the Section does not routinely participate in awareness raising activities.
With regard to Activity Cluster 3 on victim support, there is a clear linkage between the appropriateness of victim support systems and the effectiveness of criminal justice responses, which generally remain heavily dependent on victims as witnesses. This is reflected in the inclusion of a victim support component in GLOT55, project documentation noting that “it is of utmost importance to institutionalise the working relationship between the police and NGOs with a view to better assist victims of trafficking and smuggled migrants and create an environment in which they feel safe and secure to participate in the criminal investigation.” One interviewee, however, questioned the inclusion of victim protection activities in the project, stating that UNODC was not specialized in this area.

Overall, Activity Clusters 1 and 2 appear to align consistently with UNODC’s mission to support the capacity of the criminal justice sector to combat trafficking and migrant smuggling. Not all respondents agreed, however, that Activity Clusters 3 and 4 (that is, victim support and awareness raising components) were as well aligned with UNODC’s mission.

3. How did the project design and the project stakeholders conceptualize the link between planned activities and desired outcomes?

- *The GLOT55 logical framework did not clearly articulate the relationship between project inputs, planned activities or outputs, and desired outcomes.*

UNODC and the EU use different log-frames and outcomes indicators templates. UNODC staff initially developed a project log-frame in EU format, along with the project document, workplan and budget. These documents were then translated into the UNODC framework, resulting in two parallel log-frames, two activity categorisations, and two sets of performance indicators. In the EU format the activities are categorized under four “activity clusters”, while in the UNODC format, activities are grouped under four corresponding outcomes.

The evaluation team’s review of project documentation suggests that the initial GLOT55 logical frameworks neither clearly hypothesized nor documented the relationship or link between project inputs, planned activities or outputs, and desired outcomes. They also did not include clear and appropriate indicators of progress related to outputs and outcomes. Interviews with project stakeholders elaborated that the partners agreed that the log-frames (1) had been developed very quickly, (2) had not been afforded the needed priority by either organization to ensure a strong and logical project framework, and (3) did not conceptualize or establish clear anticipated links between planned activities, outputs, and outcomes or appropriate indicators.

Project documents and interview responses confirmed that project targets, in particular an increase in ratification of the Palermo Protocols and the harmonization of domestic legislation with the Protocols, were not only unlikely within the project timeframe but also inconsistent with planned programme activities. For example, the majority of project activities took place in countries that had already ratified the Protocols. Further, although multiple respondents highlighted that the “seeding” or catalysing of new activities was both an objective and a strength of the project, the log-frames did not allow them to capture achievements in this area. UNODC staff and the ROM mission recognized these limitations and in 2012, revised the project log-frames in an attempt to overcome them.

The GLOT55 project design also appeared to lack a strong connection between its four activity areas. As designed, the activities on victim support and, in particular, awareness-raising were somewhat independent of those relating to legislative development and capacity building for the criminal justice
system. During implementation of the pilot awareness-raising project in Moldova, UNODC staff sought to address this gap by associating the campaign with an existing criminal justice project (discussed further in Section II.C.1).

In practice, neither the UNODC nor EU GLOT55 logical framework clearly identified how project inputs and activities link to and reinforce one another. Nor did they effectively articulate or hypothesize how these inputs and activities could achieve interim and longer-term outcomes. Thus from its initial conceptualization, it was never clear how GLOT55 could achieve desired results – from encouraging Protocol ratification (EU log-frame), to strengthening compliance of domestic legislation with the Protocols (EU and UNODC log-frames), to increasing the number of investigations, prosecutions and convictions of human trafficking and migrant smuggling cases (UNODC log-frame).

- **GLOT55’s flexible structure constituted an original and oft-cited project strength.**

Project documentation and multiple respondents frequently referred to the flexibility and responsiveness of the GLOT55 project structure as a key project strength. These terms were used to refer to a variety of components of the project’s design: the ways in which staff were able to choose which countries and regions to target, the activities funded in each country and region, and the ways in which they were carried out. Staff appreciated the ability to use GLOT55 resources to respond to Member State requests and adapt and customize project activities in response to local needs. They were not forced to target a pre-determined set of countries or regions nor to implement the same activities in the same format everywhere. Instead, GLOT55 allowed headquarters, field staff and local partners to determine areas of greatest need in relation to counter-trafficking and smuggling. As discussed below, field staff did not always find GLOT55 as flexible or as able to adapt to local needs as they might have liked. A number of respondents felt, however, that the opportunity to adjust and attune project activities at all constituted a key feature of GLOT55 that contributed to project effectiveness.

Respondents also highlighted the flexibility of GLOT55 funding. For example, GLOT55 resources were able to substitute funds from other UNODC projects at short notice. In one case, UNODC staff were unable to convince a donor to modify a regional workshop design to render it more appropriate to a local context. They were able to substitute GLOT55 funds for this workshop and to meet regional needs. In another instance, a national training workshop for law enforcement officers was stalled due to the partner government’s inability to meet the procedural requirements for use of other funds. Staff used GLOT55 funds to support for this workshop and meet local needs for capacity building.

Another example of GLOT55 flexibility was the project’s response to problems in the organisation of a regional legal drafting workshop involving Benin, Togo and Guinea. In order to ensure an efficient use of resources and support continuation of the legislative drafting process, UNODC reframed the workshop to focus on how to pursue ratification of appropriate legislation. They invited Niger and Cape Verde, both of which had passed counter-trafficking legislation, to participate – Cape Verde hosted the meeting – and encouraged them to share their experiences with the ratification process. Interviewed participants expressed strong appreciation for the opportunity to learn from real world practices. In this case, the opportunity to restructure a GLOT55 activity midcourse allowed staff to ensure full participation and information sharing relevant to project goals.

- **GLOT55’s global-led design prevented some national partners from adapting counter-trafficking and counter-smuggling activities to align with local needs.**
According to several respondents, UNODC staff designed GLOT55 as a global project, one aimed at achieving overarching goals related to developing and ratifying appropriate legislation and building criminal justice sector capacity through a menu of activities. As Member States or field offices in consultation with EU staff made requests for technical assistance, UNODC responded by circulating the menu of options. Field offices then had an opportunity to identify which activities they felt could best meet local needs. Field offices were limited to the menu of choices, and could not reallocate funds among and between activities once chosen. The development of GLOT55 as a global project thus limited the type and amount of adaptation that could be done in the field. Many respondents considered this a barrier to implementation and a limit on project efficiency.

Both global and national-level respondents expressed concern about the degree to which GLOT55 required regional and national-level activities to conform to what they regarded as pre-determined, fairly narrow formats – legal assessment or legislative drafting workshops, criminal justice sector capacity building training, grants to NGOs for direct assistance, or awareness raising campaigns. In several cases, respondents indicated that these formats did not align or strongly align with local needs. In India, for example, several respondents noted that there was local need for and benefit from border guard trainings, but less benefit to be derived from a one-time grant to an NGO providing legal assistance. While the NGO grant was helpful for its eight-month duration, it was of limited scope and duration and could not be sustained after GLOT55 funding. Several respondents would have liked to use funds for additional border guard trainings, where the need for capacity building to combat trafficking was seen as greatest. Further, the Indian government provided resources to the one border guard training provided, reducing the amount of GLOT55 funds needed. The GLOT55 structure, however, disallowed local partners from using the remaining GLOT55 funds to provide, combined with additional government resources, additional trainings.

Kenya experienced some similar misalignment between the structure of GLOT55 and local needs. Respondents and documents suggest that had there been more opportunity for regional and field offices to participate in program design, they would have preferred to participate in determining the focus and structure of activities to ensure alignment with local needs. Some respondents felt that there should have been “more dialogue between the regions and countries with headquarters to ensure that the activities funded [were] relevant and needed.” One suggested that they were implementing “a random bunch of activities and it is left up to you make some sense of them.” In particular, the NGO grant program provided minimal funding that seemed to local stakeholders as if it “would not lead to anything . . . it was too small to be worthwhile.” Some local partners felt that had they been able to direct GLOT55 funds to the greatest regional and local need – capacity building on what is and how to combat migrant smuggling – GLOT55 funds would have been better able to address local situations and ultimately, “might have been more effective.”

In Latin America, however, some respondents reported that it was in fact GLOT55’s focus on local needs that helped the program achieve key results. One respondent noted, for example, that the local government helped determine the agenda of GLOT55’s legislative mission. In practice, this allowed them to focus on migrant smuggling as the topic of greatest interest to local government officials.

**Effectiveness**

This section addresses the two evaluation research questions aimed at assessing GLOT55’s programme effectiveness, or following the DAC definition, the extent to which GLOT55 was able to meet objectives
included in the programme log-frame. The findings focus on cross-cutting issues, emergent in multiple countries and documents and from diverse and differently-situated respondents.

4. How do key stakeholders understand the extent to which projects objectives have been achieved / are likely to be achieved?

- UNODC planned and successfully implemented a number of activities in Clusters 1 and 2. UNODC planned and implemented many fewer activities in Clusters 3 and 4.

UNODC completed the implementation of activities in all four Activity Clusters. In Activity Cluster 1, there was a target of 10 national legal assessments on both trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. Demand was higher for assistance on migrant smuggling legislation and GLOT55 supported 16 national migrant smuggling assessments, as well as one regional assessment in East Africa, briefly covering nine additional countries for which lack of available information prevented a full assessment. Eight assessments of trafficking in persons legislation were implemented, five in Central Asia concurrently with the migrant smuggling assessments. Benin was the only other country to have both a human trafficking and migrant smuggling assessment. For legislative training, against a target of five regional workshops (modified in the project revision to say regional or national), the project supported four regional workshops, and a national workshop in Yemen.

Under Cluster 2 on capacity building, the original plan to develop tailored training curricula and implement TOT programmes in three countries was modified to a wider programme of one-off trainings, involving five national workshops and two regional workshops (Mexico/Central America, involving seven beneficiary countries and the Pacific Islands, covering eight beneficiary countries). In Columbia, GLOT55 supported four mock trial training workshops as part of this Cluster.\(^\text{19}\)

In Cluster 3 on victim support, the project design specified the implementation of five activities in each of three countries. These were selected as Colombia, India and Kenya. However, only two of the three countries participated in each of the activity areas. This included Activity 5, involving the provision of small grants. Plans to provide a grant to an NGO in Kenya to assist victims of trafficking in persons and smuggled migrants were dropped due to the inability of the grantee to provide necessary documentation. As highlighted in Section II.A.3, several respondents considered the NGO grant in India less beneficial than the training activities under Activity Cluster 2. In Colombia, UNODC provided a grant to an NGO to develop a manual for providing legal assistance to victims of trafficking. This manual was presented at a (closed) session of an international conference on trafficking in persons and migrant smuggling in Bogotá. The session was very well attended and staff distributed many copies of the manual through this event. Work continues to disseminate the manual and to provide technical assistance to organizations upon request. The NGO who developed the manual has already received a number of requests for technical assistance.

GLOT55 included only one major Cluster 4 activity – the piloting of an awareness raising campaign. Although GLOT55 supported other activities under this Cluster, including development of a training film and PSA on smuggling of migrants, no progress was made on the awareness raising campaign until the

\(^{19}\) UNODC and the Ministry of the Interior have had an ongoing collaboration to implement mock trials. According to one respondent as of mid-2013, UNODC had collaborated with the Ministry of the Interior on a total of 19 mock trials involving about 700 participants and observers.
final nine months of the project. At this point, UNODC Vienna canvassed national and regional offices with a view to identifying a project that could be designed and implemented at short notice. They were able to identify the opportunity for collaboration with a separate UNODC-implemented project at the national level in Moldova, *Improving Criminal Justice Responses to Trafficking in Persons in South Eastern Europe with a focus on Moldova*. Although the project was focused on strengthening the law enforcement response, the engagement of multiple stakeholders in early project needs assessment activities provided the basis for rapid collaboration on an awareness raising project, and allowed this component to be designed and implemented prior to the end of GLOT55.

The implementation of the campaign itself did not begin until June 2013. Consultants and local stakeholders confirmed that they did not regard the pilot as complete at the end of GLOT55 in August 2013. This was foreseen at the outset of the activities and plans developed for ongoing activities to be taken forward by local organizations. A separate assessment of this activity found that the overall quality of activities was high, with effective participatory and consultative processes but that the contribution to progress against trafficking in persons had been difficult to quantify.\(^{20}\)

The steering committee also decided to use GLOT55 funds to support the following additional awareness raising activities in Colombia:

- **Toma de Ciudades (Capture of Cities)** – a prevention campaign that “bombards” a city with multiple prevention activities for 3-4 days, including:
  - *La Ruleta* (The Roulette) mannequin exhibition: Each mannequin has the story of a victim written on it. Pamphlets on trafficking from the Fundación Marcela Loaiza are given out, and victims are present to talk with the public.
  - A theatre presentation, *Five Women the Same Deal*, in which the actresses are survivors of trafficking.
- **Toma de Colegios (Capture of Schools)**
  - School presentations and the theatre performance *Una Ventana al Infinito* (A Window to Infinity)
  - The song “Tráfico Vecino” by the musical group ID
  - School video forums with an actress from *La Promesa*\(^{21}\)

In overall terms, more GLOT55 activities were implemented than originally planned. UNODC Headquarters staff noted that many workshops came in under budget due to contributions by government partners and considered that this was due to request-based nature of GLOT55 activities. “Governments often met some of the costs or at least made contributions in kind such as training venues, which we have often had to pay for.” For example, the regional office in South Africa generated sufficient savings from organizing the regional workshop in order to respond to requests for national-level capacity-building workshops in Lesotho, Botswana, and Tanzania.

- **GLOT55 produced and disseminated six self-sustaining tools and resources for combating smuggling of migrants.**


\(^{21}\) *La Promesa* (The Promise) is a television drama series supported by UNODC, but not with GLOT55 resources.
Among GLOT55’s most tangible achievements were the production and dissemination of several original tools and resources aimed at combating trafficking in persons and the smuggling of migrants. The original materials produced at the global level focus on combating migrant smuggling and include the following:

- In Depth Training Manual on Investigation and Prosecuting the Smuggling of Migrants (2011)
- Toolkit to Combat the Smuggling of Migrants (2010)
- Model Law against the Smuggling of Migrants (2010)
- Ways and Means – Countering Smuggling of Migrants (Awareness raising video clip, 2011)
- Ways and Means: Training Film for Criminal Justice Officials (2011)
- Assessment Guide to the Criminal Justice Response to the Smuggling of Migrants (2012)

The Model Law against the Smuggling of Migrants, combined with the Model Law against Trafficking in Persons (2009), served as a central resource for GLOT55 legal assessment and drafting workshops. Workshop participants used the model laws for understanding what protective legislation should include. The model laws also served as a basis for examining their own national legislation and determining how best to harmonize it with best practices. GLOT55 also utilized many of UNODC’s existing capacity building training modules, manuals and handbooks for the criminal justice sector (including for members of the judiciary, prosecutors, lawyers, police, and border administration).

According to several documents, GLOT55-supported workshops and other meetings screened the counter-smuggling training film and video clip, Ways And Means. The global ROM mission report (2012) describes these visual resources as “well received and reportedly further disseminated by the attendees to the trainings,” suggesting additional dissemination beyond project end.

UNODC toolkits and needs assessment guides also served as an important resource for, and were further disseminated through, GLOT55. For example, GLOT55-funded activities employed UNODC’s Needs Assessment Toolkit on the Criminal Justice Response to Human Trafficking (2010). Further, the new Assessment Guide to the Criminal Justice Response to the Smuggling of Migrants (2012) drew directly on experience gained from the GLOT55-funded legal assessments. All of these tools are available through UNODC’s website and in multiple languages.

GLOT55 also generated several region- and country-specific resources. UNODC staff developed, for example, a complex case study tailored to the Pacific Islands to support GLOT55 workshops in the region. In Moldova, GLOT55 funded the development of national awareness campaign materials and a case study of lessons learned from the campaign. In Mexico, UNODC developed a Spanish language version of the In-Depth Training Manual on Investigation and Prosecuting the Smuggling of Migrants that was adapted for the Mexico/Central America Region. The adaptation work was carried out through a UNODC-funded activity.

---

22 Distribution of this video is restricted to criminal justice practitioners due to the sensitive nature of the material. It has been used in all technical workshops on smuggling of migrants that UNODC organized under GLOT55, as well as under its Global Programme against the Smuggling of Migrants.

23 GLOT55 activities also utilized UNODC’s International Framework for Action to Implement the Trafficking in Persons Protocol (2010).

24 For example, Training manuals and modules on investigation and prosecution of migrant smuggling (2011) and on Criminal Justice Practitioners (2008).

25 For example, Toolkit to Combat Trafficking in Persons (2nd edition, October 2008); Toolkit to Combat Smuggling of Migrants (2010).
regional conference held in Mexico in January 2012. Also under GLOT55, UNODC Colombia funded an
NGO to produce the *Manual for Legal Representation of the Interests of Victims of Human Trafficking in
Colombia*.

At the global level, GLOT55 activities contributed to several web-based dissemination resources. Featured among them is UNODC’s online Global e-learning Programme and website. Various GLOT55
trainings and activities utilized these resources and encouraged further local dissemination. At the
national level, the Moldovan national awareness raising campaign includes an online portal and reporting
mechanism. GLOT55 also contributed significant data to the UNODC’s Human Trafficking Case Law
Database, which collects information on TIP prosecutions and convictions. Its purpose is to promote
understanding of TIP case law precedent, encourage uniform application of law to TIP cases, and
disseminate knowledge among criminal justice actors, policy-makers and others seeking to understand the
crime of human trafficking.

As the above description suggests, GLOT55 disseminated and contributed to the development of a
number of counter-TIP and counter-SOM resources that remain available and accessible through the
UNODC’s website. Regional and local knowledge of their existence, content, and application through
GLOT55 has the potential to encourage further dissemination, local adaptation, and development of
additional tools and resources.

- **GLOT55 contributed to the development, consolidation, and dissemination of knowledge about
  trafficking in persons and migrant smuggling as well as legislative and criminal justice strategies for
  combating them.**

Across countries, regions, respondents and documents, stakeholders attributed the development of new
knowledge on trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants to GLOT55 trainings and workshops. Although knowledge generation was not a stated objective of GLOT55, reflective of the log-frame
issues described in Section II.A.3, participants reported deepening their understanding in a range of areas. In particular, this included (1) the definition of trafficking in persons and migrant smuggling, (2) the
importance of Palermo-conforming national legislation, and (3) the role of and skills necessary for the
criminal justice sector to combat trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants effectively through
GLOT55 trainings and workshops. The workshops contributed to greater awareness of these phenomena
and to prioritizing or re-prioritizing them on national and regional agendas.

Participants attributed their knowledge acquisition both to the content and format of the workshops.
Formal presentations contributed doctrinal definitions and factual knowledge about strategies for
combating trafficking in persons and developing national laws in line with international standards.
Workshops also featured discussion, questions, and interaction that participants cited as helping them to
consolidate their understanding of the issues. The opportunity to explore the central concepts also helped
participants to apply them to their own regional and local contexts and identify specific barriers they face
at the national and institutional levels. In a Colombia conference, for example, the presence of numerous
regional actors led participants to share their experiences with trafficking in persons and smuggling of
migrants, identify common challenges they face combating them, and develop recommendations for ways
to improve regional cooperation.

Participants in a Mombasa, Kenya training reported that through a GLOT55 legislative workshop they
learned both the definitional distinction between trafficking in persons and migrant smuggling and the
purpose and obligations of the Smuggling of Migrants Protocol. They applied this knowledge to an
analysis of Kenya’s national law, developing recommendations to harmonize it with UNODC’s Model Law against the Smuggling of Migrants.

In West Africa, participants similarly attributed acquisition of new knowledge relevant to developing conforming national laws to the GLOT55 workshops. Respondents described the national and regional level workshops as contributing to their understanding of key issues related to counter-TIP and counter-SOM legislation. The workshops also occasioned the sharing of solutions, including with participants from countries with relevant laws already in place (Cape Verde and Niger). Highlighting the capacity building aspect of the overall drafting process one respondent explained, “As well as the draft law, there has been a major increase in knowledge among the team. At the beginning they would not have been able to develop the law.” As this quote suggests, participants valued and believed they would be able to operationalize the information acquired through these workshops and supporting activities.

The opportunity to deepen their understanding also helped raise awareness of the extent and nature of human trafficking and migrant smuggling practices in their own countries, increasing stakeholders’ engagement with and interest in combating them. Workshop reports pointed in particular to increasing stakeholder interest in promoting the ratification of the Protocols or conforming laws in their countries.

Participants described some of the workshops as opening or re-opening a dialogue on trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants in countries where there may have been relatively little public discussion of them. In Bhutan, for example, GLOT55 supported an introductory workshop on trafficking in persons, a practice generally unrecognized as affecting Bhutan. In Latin America, staff described GLOT55 workshops as helping to move human trafficking and migrant smuggling from issues of ‘contemplation’ to “becom[ing] a priority for the Americas.” Respondents credited GLOT55 activities with new Costa Rican governmental interest in developing anti-smuggling legislation and the Panamanian Congress’s ongoing development of a new law on smuggling of migrants. In both Central America and West Africa, respondents explained that GLOT55’s focus on the role of organised crime, rather than on smuggled migrants as irregular migrants, helped develop local understanding of smuggling as a crime and migrants as potential victims of other crimes committed during the smuggling process, facilitating dialogue between sending and receiving countries.

Although not clearly stated as a GLOT55 objective, project participants frequently reported acquiring and valuing new knowledge following GLOT55 activities. Across regions, participants associated the training and cooperation workshops with clarifying key issues related to TIP and SOM, including: reasons for migration; the role of traffickers and smugglers; the purpose and content of the Palermo Protocols; the role of conforming legislation and the criminal justice sector; victim identification; return and reintegration; national and regional projects, cases, and challenges; best practices and cross-border cooperation. The project also disseminated information about legislative and criminal justice strategies, which stakeholders believe has helped to elevate combating these crimes on regional and national agendas.

- **Stakeholders report that GLOT55 helped to build regional and national ownership of counter-trafficking and counter-migrant smuggling issues and mechanisms.**

A number of stakeholders and documents identified increased local prioritization and investment in combating trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants following from GLOT55 activities. They commented on how participation in GLOT55 workshops, needs assessments, meetings, and trainings engendered a commitment to preventing and prosecuting trafficking in persons. Their collaboration both
with UNODC and with local partners to implement GLOT55 activities increased their knowledge of local stakeholders and helped deepen connections among the partners. As a result, respondents expressed hope that local stakeholders would develop and support follow-up activities to operationalize this commitment.

GLOT55 documents describe several instances of local collaboration that have the potential to increase local ownership of counter-TIP and counter–SOM efforts. They emphasize increased awareness of the issues and potential partners with whom they can collaborate following participation in GLOT55 activities. They also note that practical experience implementing counter-TIP and counter-SOM work increased the potential for future collaboration and the sustainability of efforts. In West Africa, for example, nationally appointed counter-TIP focal points coordinated the GLOT55 project and local legal drafting activities. It was this kind of work that helped increase their experience with and commitment to combating trafficking in persons. The staff and drafting committees are thus likely to participate in, or serve as a resource for follow-up activities planned for Benin, Togo and Guinea (discussed further in Section II.C.2 on sustainability).

In Moldova, GLOT55 activities included the establishment of a local stakeholders working group that plans to continue the work of the national awareness raising campaign after the end of the funding period. One respondent noted that even in its early stages, GLOT55 activities in Moldova succeeded in “bringing people together to carry out the work and in developing specific action goals.” This includes plans to document the process for developing the campaign – which stakeholders anticipate will continue through the working group and continued use of the developed materials – and a handbook of lessons learned (referenced above as a case study).

According to study respondents, GLOT55 helped increase local ownership of especially counter-TIP activities in India and Latin America. In India, for example, several respondents noted that the implementation of a GLOT55-funded national assessment, border guard training, and NGO grant helped the UNODC field office re-emerge as a key stakeholder in responding to human trafficking after a period of absence, allowing the office to “reinvigorate relationships with government partners”. The Indian government plans to use training materials developed with GLOT55 resources to implement additional border guard trainings. Respondents in Latin America noted that contacts made at a GLOT55-funded conference contributed to cooperation between Colombia and Guatemala on a specific case, leading to the apprehension of members of international trafficking network on both sides of the border. A workshop in Chile led to multi-regional stakeholders signing a protocol committing to further cross-border cooperation to address trafficking in persons.

As these activities suggest, GLOT55 support helped countries develop regional, cross-border, national and local ownership of efforts to combat human trafficking and migrant smuggling. Local ownership has the potential to sustain and increase activities begun under GLOT55, as well as move toward achieving project objectives. In several cases, and as discussed further below (see Section II.B.2), there is a dearth of follow-on activities planned and the GLOT55 activities alone were insufficient to guarantee that local ownership will continue.

5. What were key barriers and challenges to implementation of project activities? How did these affect project outcomes?

- The design of GLOT55 and the primary focus on one-time activities appears to have prevented the project from achieving key objectives.
As discussed in Section II.A.3, GLOT55 was designed to respond to country or field office requests for technical assistance with counter-TIP and counter-SOM efforts. UNODC and the EU did not design GLOT55 to provide a comprehensive response to overarching needs in a specific country, but rather to respond to ad hoc requests outside of national or regional projects and programmes. It is in this context that GLOT55 developed and implemented several one-time only activities, identified as priorities by partner governments and for which funding was not available from other sources.

Achieving GLOT55’s broad objectives requires consistent, sustained activity over time. As suggested, however, a number of GLOT55 activities occurred only once, by design – legislative drafting workshops, border guard trainings, grants to NGOs were offered only once irrespective of local need or capacity. At the same time, including an Activity Cluster on capacity building suggests that those who designed GLOT55 recognized the need for additional work to implement laws and operationalize them at the local level. UNODC does not appear, however, to have a clear framework to guide these next steps.

Several respondents across regions expressed some concern with the focus on one-off activities. Some respondents were concerned that such activities would raise expectations, galvanize local actors, and start or re-start local counter-TIP and migrant smuggling initiatives without providing follow up or sustaining these efforts. Respondents in one region noted, for example, that conducting a single workshop or training tended to raise expectations among partners. Once partners realized that the activities would occur only one time and that UNODC “cannot help them or provide a means of addressing the need,” they became both sceptical and disillusioned with the project.

While potentially appropriate as one-time only activities themselves, the GLOT55-supported national assessments of trafficking in persons and migrant smuggling situations illuminated the problem with conducting an activity in the absence of planned follow up. This work helped countries to identify key gaps in resources and capacities to combat trafficking and smuggling at the national level. Once these gaps were known, however, partners made requests to UNODC field offices to develop and implement responses to these gaps. GLOT55 did not include any resources or mechanisms to respond to these requests to implement changes. As one respondent commented, “contacts and knowledge generated and a platform for additional resource generation going forward were the benefits [of GLOT55 activities] but for countries where they cannot get funding, the government is mad because we have identified the need but cannot provide follow up activities.” Another explained that the government was in regular contact and was looking to UNODC for both technical and financial assistance but they were not in a position to provide this. GLOT55’s structure, which allowed it to support the identification of needs but deprived it of resources to address needs identified, suggests that the design played a role in preventing it from being effective in achieving its stated objectives.

The ROM mission reports also expressed concerns about GLOT55’s design and lack of potential for follow-up. The Southern African report noted that while the overall project design was demand driven, no follow-on strategy was in place to support requests for assistance. The East Africa report, found that “at the regional level, the project has stimulated interest with national governments who attended the regional workshop (2010) however; a wider impact could have been achieved if a more strategic regional outreach was planned with funds to support follow-on activities in the region.” According to the ROM mission report for Colombia, despite good progress in implementation, the lack of focus made it difficult to achieve results. “Possibly in the future, UNODC Headquarters should avoid covering too many countries in lieu of a more comprehensive intervention.” As this list suggests, GLOT55’s design, which included primarily one-time only legislative workshops, capacity building trainings, national needs assessments, and a single grant to an NGO, formed a primary barrier to project effectiveness.
Despite engendering gains in knowledge and criminal justice sector capacity, there remains a significant need to consolidate these gains through additional training and technical assistance.

Within the overall concerns expressed by the one-off nature of activities, respondents voiced particular concerns about the capacity building components. Multiple respondents and documents across levels, countries and regions consistently expressed concern about the lack of mechanisms to ensure that materials produced, knowledge shared, networks and ownership developed, or skills garnered will be used, continued or applied to combating TIP and SOM.

A number of respondents and documents expressed concern that the benefits and outcomes of one-time GLOT55 trainings, capacity building workshops, and victims assistance grants while helpful, might be lost or significantly attenuated without follow up. One respondent noted, “there is the impression that a project will go out and meet a need. But when we look at indicators, we cannot see a turnaround in investigations [even] in a two-three year project. The changes come over a longer time period. We need sustained support.” Without the built-in ability to sustain knowledge, skills gains, networks, and service providers, respondents felt that stakeholders would not fully invest in, and themselves attempt to continue, the work begun under GLOT55’s guidance.

Respondents wondered how relevant knowledge and attitudes addressed in GLOT55 trainings could be followed-up without additional training. In India, where respondents report criminal justice sector familiarity with trafficking in persons as very low, several respondents noted that the constructive work of cross-national border guard training could not be sustained without additional training for this group. Others focused on the large number of border guards who had not received training. One respondent explained that while useful, “there is limited value in a one-time workshop in a country like India. There are 20 million police officers. We need a longer-term perspective.” Such a large country with sparse understanding of the relevant issues requires much more sustained and expanded efforts to be effective.

Having directly experienced the benefits of training, participants consistently praised the high quality of the GLOT55 workshops. In post-workshop evaluations, they regularly recommended additional follow-up to solidify skills and expand to additional participants. Project documents, however, frequently reported that despite a significant need for additional training and other activities, GLOT55 did not provide it. According to the ROM East Africa report, for example, one GLOT55 regional workshop stimulated wide interest among national government participants, suggesting “a wider impact could have been achieved if a more strategic regional outreach was planned with funds to support follow-on activities in the region.” One respondent described this lack of follow-on as degrading the activities themselves, making them seem “random” and like they “do not have a purpose,” engendering “cynicism” from government and NGO participants and frustrating local staff. In discussing future projects in West Africa, interviewees observed that, “there needs to be a wider strategy of working with training institutes for criminal justice actors, rather than one-off trainings.” Without clear mechanisms to follow up gains made, few stakeholders believed that GLOT55 would be effective.

The lack of follow-up also left GLOT55, according to project documents and multiple respondents, without direct evidence to demonstrate effectiveness. Several respondents observed, for example, that while workshops often helped produce a conforming draft law, GLOT55 did not provide any support to ensure that governments would adopt or implement the legislation. Adopting and implementing new laws requires a significant investment of time and effort and strong political will. The exclusion of strong, consistent follow up from GLOT55’s design meant that project activities were not well aligned with the objective of adopting new legislation and that this objective could not be met.
Efficiency

In this section, we address the two research questions relating to GLOT55 programme efficiency, defined by DAC as a measure of the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs. This addresses questions such as whether the activities were cost-efficient and whether the objectives achieved on time. The findings focus on cross-cutting issues, emergent in multiple countries and documents and from diverse and differently-situated respondents.

6. What factors contributed to the efficiency/inefficiency of project implementation?

- UNODC, in consultation with EU, introduced changes to the GLOT55 project design during implementation to improve efficiency and streamline reporting.

GLOT55 was initially planned as a three-year project and subsequently extended twice on a no-cost basis to 4.5 years. The project was designed as a catalogue of activities for which beneficiary countries would be chosen by UNODC and the relevant divisions of the European Commission, responding flexibly to address requests and actual needs of countries to combat trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. Delays in the decision making process however prevented the strategy from being as responsive as initially envisaged, leading to long delays in handover of funds and an initial inability to deliver the type of assistance foreseen in the programme design.

Both EU and UNODC respondents highlighted inefficiencies that were identified over the course of the project and addressed by the project Steering Committee. One of these was the Steering Committee itself, which initially included representation across several sections of the EU. At one point, the six-monthly Committee meetings involved up to nine people from the EU. After two years, the EU greatly reduced the size of its committee representation, allowing the GLOT55 coordinator to work primarily with two EU counterparts.

At the same time, UNODC and the EU agreed to pre-approve assistance to selected regions, without precluding providing assistance to other regions as needs arose. Prior to this point, each activity had to be developed individually at the country level and then approved by the UNODC and EU. Respondents from several organizations noted that these two decisions – streamlining of the committee and pre-approving countries/regions for assistance – increased the efficiency of project management and activity implementation. It also helped to build trust between the provider and donor, which, as discussed below, led to additional improvements.

Another initial barrier to effective implementation highlighted by respondents was a lack of the necessary staff resources as a contributing factor to the initial delays in the advancement of GLOT55 activities. Some respondents considered this a planning oversight. They noted that the EU was extremely responsive to requests to address this during the project and that the subsequent changes further assisted in accelerating project implementation.

In 2012, the EU Results Oriented Monitoring missions found that the existing project log-frames did not allow measurement of many of the project achievements. “The vagueness in the formulation of Project Purpose and Expected Results and the absence of quantification of the related means of verification and
indicators did not allow for an accurate assessment of the results of the project.”

At the same time, according to three respondents, UNODC as an organization had begun to assess how to improve the quality and relevance of their log-frames. In 2012, several respondents explained that the UNODC and EU cooperated to revise GLOT55’s log-frame to align it with the “reality” of the programme. The goal of the revision was to capture of project achievements more accurately, but with a focus on outputs rather than intended outcomes.

Another example of a design limitation being addressed during implementation was in the area of awareness raising. Initially foreseen as a stand-alone component, UNODC was able to pilot a campaign in Moldova that created linkages with other GLOT55 objectives concerning strengthened law enforcement and improved victim identification. One of the three objectives of the campaign was to encouraging reporting of potential child sexual abuse cases (including child trafficking) and referral to specialized partners (law enforcement or specialized service providers). This was supported by the development of a button on the Sigur Online website allowing reporting of inappropriate content and/or contacts for either parents or children to use. Through a formal partnership established between a local NGO and the Moldovan Centre for Combating Informational Crime, procedures are being developed to respond to these reports.

In Colombia, although awareness-raising activities did not directly involve criminal justice actors, they successfully encouraged the public to call a national hotline to report cases of trafficking in persons. This included instances in which the caller him or herself had experienced trafficking, and cases where the caller knew someone who appeared to have been a victim of trafficking, or that people in their neighbourhood appeared to be subject to slavery-like practices and thus might be trafficking victims.

One significant project inefficiency beyond the scope of the Steering Committee was the different administrative systems of the UNODC and the EU. As noted above, the organisations use different log-frame and indicator formats and have different budget systems. At a budget level, for example, the UNODC records all costs for a workshop under one budget line, while the EU requires a breakdown into flights, per diems and consultancy fees, etc. As a result, UNODC budget reports had to be converted to the EU format manually. Both parties recognise this problem and the EU now allows the UNODC to use its own format for direct agreements.

- **Respondents highlighted UNODC’s experience, relationships and materials as contributing to the efficiency of programme implementation.**

Respondents across all regions highlighted UNODC’s experience, relationships and materials as major strengths contributing to the efficiency of program implementation. Interviewees and EU ROM mission reports observed that UNODC’s prior presence in the country and previous work led to familiarity and “strong legitimacy” in work with stakeholders, which produced efficiencies in carrying out implementation.

Interviewees in all regions praised the level of expertise of UNODC staff and consultants. In Colombia, for example, UNODC is viewed as having strong knowledge, working well with partners and being able to get things done. The Colombia ROM found that “the expertise of UNODC guarantees the quality of the material provided, and the excellent relations it has with institutional stakeholders assured the right people
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attended the workshops organised.” ROM reports, workshop reports and interviews with staff, consultants and partners also praised the high quality of the materials produced and provided by UNODC. One consultant identified access to a wide range of training materials as a major advantage in working with UNODC.

- **UNODC created value and contributed to GLOT55’s efficiency by building on existing activities, cooperating with other UNODC projects, and cooperating with other key stakeholders.**

UNODC added value to GLOT55 activities by building on other, existing UNODC projects in the field and cooperating with key actors with whom they had existing relationships to implement GLOT55 activities. In particular, some countries benefitting from GLOT55 also had concurrent projects related to trafficking and smuggling, which allowed for coordination and leveraging of resources. In the Kyrgyz Republic, for example, GLOT55 was able to fund a follow-up to the TOT workshop for prosecutors, supported by an earlier project (the workshop used a mock trial format similar to that used in Colombia, but based on a local anti-money laundering project). In Guinea, UNODC successfully sought the EU’s agreement to take forward legislative changes on TIP through the latter’s sectoral reform programme with the Ministry of Justice, one respondent noting that “we will absolutely push for the passing of this law.”

According to several respondents, the UNODC and the EU established a productive working relationship, characterized by a willingness to work collaboratively. Respondents highlighted how GLOT55 staff had worked to build relationships with the EU at both global and local levels, emphasizing partnership rather than a donor-recipient relationship. As one respondent explained, “the EU now has more confidence in UNODC and the relationship has rolled over into other [SOM and TIP] projects.”

In addition to productive collaboration between UNODC and EU, GLOT55 also appears to have benefited from cooperation with other key partners and donors. The *Regional Anti-Human Trafficking Training Workshop to the Pacific Islands*, for example, involved close cooperation between UNODC, the Pacific Immigration Directors’ Conference (PIDC) and the Pacific Island Forum Secretariat. Border guard training involving India and Bhutan benefited from the Indian government’s contribution of meeting space and other resources, the government of Bhutan’s identification of participants and support for their participation, and UNODC field office development of curricular training materials and facilitation of capacity building efforts. In Colombia, IOM and UNODC signed an agreement to collaborate on efforts to combat human trafficking.

Only two instances were mentioned where UNODC was not able to coordinate GLOT55 activities with other, relevant efforts in a country. In Uganda, GLOT55 received a request from the government that included activities already covered by an EU project. Although staff made efforts to complement what had been done, the national capacity workshop on trafficking in persons overlapped significantly with one funded by EU the previous year. In Benin, EU project counterparts in the Ministry of Justice were not aware of the counter-human trafficking legislation being developed under GLOT55. This confusion appeared to follow from a lack of clarity regarding responsibility for coordination coming from the head office level.
Finally, UNODC’s core training materials do not include any relevant tools produced by other organizations despite the fact that many such resources exist.\textsuperscript{27} Overall, however, GLOT55 benefited from the support and involvement of multiple donors and partner institutions in developing and implementing a number of its primary activities.

- \textit{GLOT55 contributed to a new UNODC reporting system, designed to support the consolidation of institutional knowledge and learning.}

To provide a structure for institutional learning, UNODC has developed a common trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants monitoring database. The database brings together data across all relevant UNODC activities in a standardized format and can be searched internally by project, country and type of activity, among other variables. The database houses all UNODC resource materials, including training manuals, sample presentations, and the most recent organizational statistics on TIP and SOM. The database also includes a large pool of experts, national focal points, and national contacts and agencies working to combat trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. UNODC further incorporates information about the ratification of the Protocols and passage of new laws in each country in the database as both an internal and an external resource. The database can be used to provide specific, up-to-date information about these issues for UNODC presentations, thus helping to improve their quality and accuracy.\textsuperscript{28}

UNODC has also developed standardized evaluation forms to be used for all human trafficking and migrant smuggling training workshop participants and trainers. These forms were used to collect information from GLOT55 participants during all eight GLOT55-supported workshops held after they were introduced in early 2013. These forms ask participants to suggest a plan of action they will follow after the workshop. UNODC then follow up with participants 6-8 months after the workshop to determine what actions have been taken. The results are stored in the database.

The purpose of the database is to capture and centralize relevant resources to support the development of counter-TIP and counter-SOM efforts. This will help ensure that UNODC has a central location of these resources and support the sustainability of institutional learning. The database also serves as a resource for external partners interested in identifying model legislation, capacity building resources, and other materials to be adapted to local contexts or inform local activities. UNODC also plans to use the database to facilitate and track associations between UNODC activities and developments and outcomes in the field that cannot be captured within the timeframe of an individual project.

As well as its contribution to institutional learning, the new reporting system helps (i) ensure data from all counter-trafficking and counter-smuggling programmes are available in consolidated form and from one

\textsuperscript{27} The Asia Regional Trafficking in Persons Project, for example, lists on its website (http://www.artipproject.org/artip-tip-cjs/resources-guidelines-standards.html) documents on criminal justice responses to trafficking from more than 15 different organizations, including UNODC. They include: training materials; legislative guides and regional and international standards.

\textsuperscript{28} The evaluation team noted some inconsistencies in training materials used by UNODC staff. For example, the presentation to the Bhutan workshop in February 2013, International Framework on Countering Trafficking in Persons, incorrectly states that illicit adoption as a purpose of trafficking in persons (see the travaux préparatoires of the TIP Protocol) and that anyone who transport a trafficked person is a trafficker. Care also needs to be taken with use of data from the UNODC’s Global Trafficking in Persons Report, particularly in the interpretation of the ratio of sex trafficking to labour trafficking.
source; (ii) eliminate the need for individual projects to develop their own data collection instruments; and (iii) provide a central repository for all training materials and other resources, thus saving staff time and helping to reduce the potential for duplication and overlap.

7. Has GLOT55 been able to leverage other resources to advance Palermo ratification and implementation?

- **UNODC and partner organization staff successfully leveraged GLOT55-funded activities to develop a number of follow-on activities supported by partner institutions, national governments and additional donors.**

An indicator of GLOT55 efficiency and effectiveness\(^ {29} \) includes the number of follow-on activities to which GLOT55 contributed. UNODC staff and project partners reported the following examples of GLOT55 funds being used to leverage additional resources:

(a) As a follow-up to the GLOT55 counter-trafficking training for border guards in India and Bhutan, the UNODC field office applied for and received a $550,000 competitive grant from the United States Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons. The grant will support UNODC provision of technical assistance to Bhutan to develop legal counter-TIP frameworks, build criminal justice sector capacity to combat trafficking in persons, and improve victim support services.

(b) In January 2013, UNODC Mexico received a three-year grant from the EU to provide additional legislative assistance concerning migrant smuggling in Central America. This includes legislative missions to Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Honduras, as well as follow-up missions to Guatemala and El Salvador (which had initial legislative missions under GLOT55) and Nicaragua. Training pertaining to migrant smuggling will also be provided to law enforcement and criminal justice officials in the region.

(c) In East Africa, regional UNODC staff leveraged a GLOT55-funded legislative drafting workshop to develop counter-migrant smuggling legislation for Kenya, Tanzania, Djibouti, Ethiopia and Uganda as a basis for a successful application to the EU. UNODC will use EU funds to provide training and technical assistance to Ministry of Justice staff, prosecutors, investigators and judges in Djibouti and Ethiopia to help them develop their capacity to adjudicate cases of migrant smuggling and human trafficking.

(d) In Kenya, the UNODC field office applied for and received US J/TIP funds to support the development of a national referral mechanism. This was a major gap identified during the GLOT55 funded workshop on establishing an adequate system of assistance and protection for people who have experienced trafficking.

(e) In West Africa following GLOT55 support for TIP legal assessments and legal drafting working groups in Benin, Togo and Guinea, France approved support for a UNODC follow-on project to provide assistance to Benin, Togo, and Cote d’Ivoire in implementing legislation on trafficking in persons.\(^ {30} \)

(f) Following multiple GLOT55 activities in Colombia, UNODC and IOM received joint EU funding for a new project, “Strengthening institutional capacities for identification of, and response to, human trafficking.”

\(^ {29} \) Although included as a finding under efficiency, this finding could equally be seen categorized under effectiveness, based on the description of the project by UNODC staff as having a catalyzing role.

\(^ {30} \) Guinea is not included in the new project. By agreement with UNODC, an existing EU project on criminal justice reform project is working to support the passage of TIP legislation.
cases of trafficking in persons occurring between regions of Colombia with high rates of migration to other destinations, Central America and Europe.” The project will commence on 1 January 2014.

These multiple follow-on activities suggest that UNODC and other GLOT55 stakeholders have been able to employ the work done under GLOT55 as a basis for gaining support to continue activities aimed at advancing Palermo ratification and implementation.

**Impact**

This section addresses the impact of the GLOT55 project. According to the DAC criteria, questions of impact seek to track the positive and negative changes intentionally or unintentionally produced by an intervention. As with all non-experimental or non-quasi-experimental evaluations, however, it is not possible to attribute specific changes to GLOT55 or to identify direct causal links between GLOT55 activities and changes in counter-trafficking and smuggling legislation or criminal justice capacity. As is appropriate to a retrospective evaluation, we focus instead on what project stakeholders identified across data sources and locations as the primary achievements and results, both positive and negative, of GLOT55 activities.

8. **What do those who participated in GLOT55 activities regard as their primary achievements?**

- *GLOT55 helped UNODC establish itself as an organization with the expertise and resources necessary to combat human trafficking and the smuggling of migrants.*

The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (2000) gives UNODC jurisdiction over the Convention and its two protocols: the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons and the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air. As such, it is the only international organization with a specific global mandate to combat trafficking in persons and the smuggling of migrants. In practice, however, a number of other international governmental and non-governmental organizations have sought to lead counter-TIP and counter-SOM efforts at the global, regional and national levels, attracting extensive donor support for their work. This has sometimes left UNODC under-resourced in their efforts to support national ratification of the Protocols and advance criminal justice sector capacity to combat these two practices.

Among GLOT55’s most significant impacts was its contribution to UNODC’s position as a key actor in the fight against trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. Through the implementation of GLOT55 activities, UNODC was able to establish or re-establish itself as organization with specific content expertise, capacity to coalesce stakeholders across countries and regions, develop cross-sectoral partnerships, and galvanize institutional and financial resources to combat trafficking and smuggling. Following GLOT55, national governments, external institutional partners and donors have come to regard UNODC as a crucial stakeholder in these efforts.

A number of respondents described how GLOT55 activities helped position UNODC as a crucial resource for combating trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants from the perspective of diverse relevant actors. At the governmental level, for example, several respondents commented that the Indian government was not familiar with UNODC’s counter-TIP expertise and resources. After a UNODC-led and GLOT55-funded national assessment and border guard training, the Indian government has come to regard UNODC’s field office as critical to the development and implementation of counter-trafficking
strategies throughout the country. At the international organizational level, UNODC invited several key partners to participate in GLOT55 activities, including ILO, UNICEF, Frontex, IOM and UNHCR. Many of these organizations contributed speakers and trainers to GLOT55 activities, helping to reduce duplication of efforts, leverage local organizational presence, and garner additional resources for counter-TIP and counter-SOM efforts.

GLOT55 also helped improve UNODC’s profile with donors. Previously somewhat sceptical of UNODC’s capacities, after achieving results with GLOT55, one respondent stated that now, “UNODC is the preferred [EU] partner for this type of programme.” Other respondents noted that GLOT55 “triggered further support from [other] donors.” GLOT55 allowed UNODC to demonstrate to governments, donors, and external partners that it has the capacity to develop and implement projects, convene the right partners, and follow up with other relevant activities focused on combating trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants.

Through GLOT55, UNODC was also able to re-establish a presence in countries from which it had been absent. In East Africa, for example, UNODC had been absent from the counter-TIP landscape for 5-10 years. GLOT55 also gave UNODC “an opportunity to reach to a number of countries” at a time when they needed assistance to develop their laws and capacities but the fiscal climate meant few resources were available. For example, in India one stakeholder noted that “the project allowed UNODC to keep in touch after the completion of the big criminal justice project (in 2009) and stay relevant.” GLOT55 helped building national counter-TIP and counter-SOM capabilities national and regional priorities. Through the GLOT55 process, UNODC has come to be seen as a substantive expert and critical resource in these efforts.

- **GLOT55 made notable contributions to UNODC’s new consolidated approach to combating human trafficking and smuggling of migrants.**

GLOT55 was developed across two divisions in UNODC – the Treaty Affairs Division and the Operations Division. Internally, the project was seen as helping to bring together the ‘normative’ work of Treaty Affairs with the operational work of Operations Division. As part of a restructuring of UNODC, the Anti Human Trafficking Unit (at the time) was moved to the Division for Treaty Affairs in 2009. In March 2012, UNODC adopted a new and Comprehensive Strategy on Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants designed to strengthen the Office’s capacity to respond to the increasing requests for assistance by Member States. The strategy sought to (1) strengthen the complementary nature of UNODC’s work to prevent and respond to human trafficking and migrant smuggling, and (2) develop future institutional responses and directions for engagement and actions on these issues. In order to operationalize the strategy, UNODC established a new section within the Organized Crime and Illicit Trafficking Branch - the Human Trafficking and Migrant Smuggling Section (HTMSS). These changes brought together four projects on trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants: the Global Programme on Trafficking in Persons (GLOT59) and the Global Programme on Smuggling of Migrants (GLOT92); GLOT55; and the UN Global Initiative to Fight Trafficking in Persons (UN.GIFT), which had previously been managed in a different part of the organization.

---

Respondents regarded these changes favourably, emphasizing the advantage of assembling all work relating to human trafficking and migrant smuggling in one section. The reorganization allowed for direct collaboration among staff working on similar issues and encouraged the exchange of information and experience across activities and countries. In practice, GLOT55’s contribution to the consolidation of the four trafficking in persons and migrant smuggling programmes helped (1) develop institutional knowledge about counter-trafficking and smuggling of migrants, (2) consolidate knowledge and experience within the organization, and (3) ensure that this knowledge would be sustained and applied in future work. Previously, respondents describe these efforts as managed separately, overlapping and reduplicative, even “disjointed.” GLOT55, which leveraged a number of other projects in the same topical areas, helped UNODC realize that they could “work better internally by bringing these parts [TIP and SOM projects] together.” This realization encouraged UNODC to develop a consolidated approach to combating trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants.

UNODC will merge management of three separate projects into one global program on trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. Merging global projects will allow UNODC to “follow-up GLOT55 with this new big project” that combines three other, existing counter-TIP and counter-SOM global projects. The new, consolidated programme will, like GLOT55, focus on tools development, technical assistance, and capacity building. The program will be global in scope, employing a GLOT55-informed strategy of providing technical assistance, capacity building activities, and the development of tools, policy, and partnerships through a flexible approach to topics and activities. Respondents credit GLOT55’s flexible and global approach with contributing to the outlines of the consolidated management. Like GLOT55, the global programme will standardize how UNODC collects information, adapts materials, and centralizes knowledge and learning resources, all the time maintaining an openness to implementing what needs to get done rather than dictating a singular focus. Ultimately, they regard the consolidated management approach as supporting institutional learning and adding what one respondent described as “real value” to UNODC’s capacity to work effectively on these issues.

While effective in supporting the development of draft legislation, GLOT55 does not appear to have made demonstrative contributions toward ratification of Protocols or to passage, implementation or operationalization of new laws against trafficking in persons or smuggling or migrants.

Among GLOT55’s primary objectives was the promotion of the ratification of the Protocols and transposition into domestic law. According to UNODC, since the start of GLOT55 in March 2009, 25 countries have ratified the Trafficking in Persons Protocol and 18 countries have ratified the Smuggling of Migrants Protocol (2012). While it is possible that GLOT55 had some influence on these ratifications, there is not strong alignment between the countries in which GLOT55 implemented activities and those that ratified one or both of the Protocols. For example, of the eight countries where GLOT55 supported counter-trafficking legislative development assistance, seven had already ratified the trafficking Protocol. The remaining country, Togo, ratified the Protocol in May 2009 before project activities started in that country. Of the countries that ratified the TIP Protocol during the project period, only India received direct counter-TIP assistance – for a national assessment, border guard training and an NGO grant. In the case of India, it was the government’s ratification of the Trafficking in Persons Protocol that occasioned UNODC implementing GLOT55 activities in India, rather than the activities supporting ratification.

Of the 18 countries that ratified the Smuggling of Migrants Protocol, 12 had already ratified it prior to GLOT55’s start. In Ethiopia, which ratified both the Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants Protocols, GLOT55 activities focused on combating migrant smuggling only. Further, while it is possible that GLOT55 influenced some of the relevant decision-makers and legislative developments, there is no
causal evidence to demonstrate these links. This suggests that while progress has been made on ratification of the Protocols during the period of GLOT55 implementation, there is no direct correlation between GLOT55 activities and Protocol ratifications.

As discussed in Section II.E.1, GLOT55’s horizon made it difficult to determine if the activities supported will translate into desired outcomes and meaningful changes in efforts to combat trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants at the regional or national level, while there is some indications that it will do so in a few instances, either directly (Colombia) or through follow-up projects (Bhutan, West Africa, Central America).

GLOT55’s structure may also have prevented it from supporting the implementation or operationalization of the Protocols. Legislative passage rarely ensures changes will occur in practice, that is, that a country’s relevant institutions will develop new policies or strengthen regional or national efforts to combat trafficking or smuggling. In Eastern Africa, for example, “the existence of relevant national laws appears to be relatively meaningless, given the apparent size and seriousness of the smuggling problem and the obvious lack of capacity to respond to this issue.” Further, “national legislation takes a long period of time to implement … we cannot assure the outcomes.” As such, it is not possible to determine GLOT55’s achievements in terms of building an effective and sustainable criminal justice response.

**Sustainability**

In this section, we address GLOT55 programme sustainability. As defined by DAC, sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. The findings focus on cross-cutting issues, emergent in multiple countries and documents and from diverse and differently-situated respondents.

9. **To what extent are the key outcomes achieved sustainable beyond the UNODC/ GLOT55’s involvement?**

- *New tools and materials will contribute to the sustainability of activities initiated under GLOT55.*

Multiple respondents highlighted the development of new tools on combatting smuggling of migrants to be not only a major achievement of GLOT55, but also one that will continue following the end of the project. This process will be assisted by the consolidation of UNODC’s resources on smuggling of migrants and trafficking in persons into a common database, which will support the use of the materials development under GLOT55 across all of the organisation’s counter-migrant smuggling activities. UNODC staff have distributed these resources widely and, as highlighted in Table II.1, all documents have been downloaded on several thousand occasions and continue to be downloaded regularly. All documents will remain available for ongoing use and adaptation after the completion of GLOT55.
Table II.1. Downloads from the UNODC website (as of 26 Nov 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Downloads 2012</th>
<th>Downloads 2013 (Nov)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model Law against the Smuggling of Migrants</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>1,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Depth Training Manual for Investigation and Prosecution of SOM</td>
<td>2,158</td>
<td>1,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Guide to the Criminal Justice Response to the Smuggling of Migrants</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>7,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways and Means 60s and Training Film.</td>
<td>10,407</td>
<td>3,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolkit against the Smuggling of Migrants</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>2,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Status of Victim Service Providers and Criminal Justice Actors in India on anti human trafficking</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2,646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **There is a need for follow-up to support the passage and implementation of counter-TIP and counter-SOM legislation.**

UNODC and EU staff report that GLOT55’s sustainability strategy was based on avoiding activities requiring substantial support after project completion and on building/strengthening sustainable structures in the legal and judicial systems of the target countries, thus disconnecting the sustainability of the project benefits from any need for further direct financing.

The indicator for the Outcome 1 of the project, relating to legal assistance, for example, was the number of assisted Member States that have brought domestic legislation into line with provisions of the Protocols at end of programme. The project document set targets of 10 countries under both trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. As written, this can be seen as a stand-alone activity, not requiring further follow-up.

Given the amount of time it takes to pass new legislation in any one country, however, GLOT55’s timeframe made it unlikely that its implementation could directly impact ratification of the Protocols and transposition into domestic law. Although 18 countries were involved in the human trafficking and migrant smuggling assessments, no legislative changes had been made in any of these countries at the completion of the project. As one respondent explained, “With legislative assistance, once a draft is produced, it can take years before it is adopted in the country. It is too early to see impacts.” Several respondents noted that an organization needs to work over a longer period of time before, as one respondent explained, it can “achieve any one thing on the national level or legislative level or regionally.” Even where a project is designed to “go out and meet a need,” as another respondent described, “When we look at indicators, we cannot see a turnaround in investigations in a two-three year project. The changes come over a longer time period.” Respondents explained that given the duration of the process, any project seeking to achieve the passage and implementation of new legislation would need to provide sustained support over a longer duration of time.

More work is thus required to ensure passage of anti-TIP and anti-SOM legislation. The ROM Global assessment highlighted this need, noting the importance of a follow-up phase to assist in the adoption and implementation of new laws. Respondents identified several barriers to the passage of new legislation, including a lack in political will at the national level, changes of government (in one case the lack of a government) and turnover within government, and levels of understanding among politicians. In one
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project country, a respondent explained that “the parliament has turned it [the draft legislation] upside down and the legislation looks crazy.” Thus attempts to support legislation under GLOT55 will require additional resources to ensure passage and implementation.

UNODC currently plans to support activities aimed at passing new anti-migrant smuggling legislation in several countries involved in GLOT55. Under new UNODC projects, these are Benin, Togo, Guatemala, El Salvador, Ethiopia and Djibouti. In Togo and potentially Benin, the legal working groups formed under GLOT55 will continue to support this work. An existing EU project is supporting further development in Guinea. In the Kyrgyz Republic, some of the recommendations from the legal assessment were included in the National Action Plan, 2012-15. UNODC is promoting additional changes as part of its work with UNDP, OHCHR, Soros Institute and local NGOs to support government reform of the Penal Code and Criminal Procedure Code. There are currently no specific plans for follow up in the remaining four Central Asia countries or in Sierra Leone and Liberia, where the workshops took place in the last four months of the project.

- **UNODC and some national partners are pursuing selected GLOT55 follow-up activities at the global and local levels.**

In addition to the development of new projects, and other follow-up work described above, a number of follow-up activities are taking place. GLOT55 supported more activities in Colombia than any other country. Colombia also reported the highest number of GLOT55 follow-up activities, including the following:

- Additional presentations of *5 Women the Same Deal*, which are scheduled in 2013 after the end of GLOT55 and may continue into 2014. UNODC in Colombia is seeking funds to take this presentation to Vienna.
  - A planned continuation of *Toma de Ciudades* (Capture of Cities), ideally with local funding.
  - Ongoing collaboration between the Ministry of the Interior and UNODC to support a continuation of mock trials of traffickers. One interviewee noted that it was hoped that local governments will take on the cost of the mock trials, but this has not happened yet.
  - An announcement by the Colombian Ministry of the Exterior in August 2013 that it will push for Congressional ratification of the Smuggling of Migrants Protocol and that it expects the Protocol to be ratified in 2014.
  - A commitment from the Ministry of the Interior to distribute the new GLOT55 supported Manual for Legal Representation of the Interests of Victims of Human Trafficking, although one respondent noted that there is not yet a strategy to do so.

Follow-up activities in other countries include:

- An inter-agency working group remains in place in Moldova to carry on the awareness raising campaign. The campaign will continue into 2014, while the tools will remain available and the ‘report’
button on the *Sigur Online* website will remain in place indefinitely. Based on the experience with this campaign, the GLOT55 consultant and the local partner are also developing *pro bono* a manual on implementing awareness raising campaigns.

- In India, GLOT55 supported a 3-day border workshop involving 40 officials from India, Nepal and Bangladesh borders. The Indian government funded a second training based on the training curriculum developed and with technical input from UNODC. The government has indicated that they plan to support more such workshops although there appears to be some uncertainty as to whether this will come to fruition.

- Also in India, the country assessment on the "status of victim service providers and criminal justice actors in India" completed in July 2013 will reportedly be used by the government to identify and address priority gaps. The government of Bangladesh would like to undertake a similar assessment and this will be funded by the US J/TIP office.

- Following the Pacific Islands workshop in June 2013, UNODC and the organisers are attempting to maintain a contact group and have a commitment to share a monthly bulletin amongst participants.

- At the Central America regional conference, a directory with contact details of the participating authorities was shared with the participants and, as noted previously, led to cooperation between Colombian and Guatemalan prosecutors in a case that resulted in arrests in both Colombia and Guatemala.

- At the II Ibero-American Summit of Public Ministries against Trafficking in Person, in Chile, co-funded by UNODC, a protocol for international cooperation to strengthen investigation, prevention, and attention to victims was signed by all 10 attending General Prosecutor Officers.

- The Pacific Islands regional workshop involved plans to create a standing regional workshop with regional partner organizations; and the creation of a newsletter/email forum for follow-up discussion to the regional workshop.

- Under the new consolidated HTMSS reporting system, all participants in training workshops undertaken in the last six months of GLOT55 will be followed up and asked to report on progress in implementing the action plans they had developed during the workshops.

**Summary of findings by source**

This report presents findings based on original data collection and analysis regarding the strategies, activities, implementation and results of UNODC’s GLOT55. In June through November 2013, a research team conducted a retrospective assessment of GLOT55 based on key program documents and materials and telephone and field interviews. As discussed in Section II, analysis of these data identified initial findings in each of the thematic areas of the DAC criteria and to address each research question. Topically, the assessment focused on GLOT55’s design, strategies and activities; challenges and successes with implementation; outputs and results of these efforts. Table II.2 summarizes the findings related to each criterion. Using “M” to denote multiple respondents/documents and “S” to denote a single respondent/document, the table also indicates the type of source(s) upon which each finding is based.
Table II.2. Summary of UNODC GLOT55 Evaluation Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Interviews UNODC</th>
<th>Interviews Non-UNODC</th>
<th>Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GLOT55 addressed clearly defined and demonstrated global, regional</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and national needs for strategies and resources to combat trafficking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in persons and smuggling of migrants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GLOT55 was well aligned with UNODC’s mission, particularly in</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing legal assistance and supporting law enforcement capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The GLOT55 logical framework did not clearly articulate the</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship between project inputs, planned activities or outputs, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desired outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GLOT55’s flexible structure constituted an original and oft-cited</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GLOT55’s global-led design prevented some regional and national</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partners from adapting counter-trafficking and counter–smuggling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities to align with local needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GLOT55 produced and disseminated a number of self-sustaining tools</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and resources for combating trafficking in persons and smuggling of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>migrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GLOT55 contributed to the development and consolidation of</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge about trafficking in persons and migrant smuggling as well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as legislative and criminal justice strategies for combating them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholders report that GLOT55 helped to build regional and</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national ownership of counter-trafficking and counter-migrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smuggling issues and mechanisms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The design of GLOT55 and the primary focus on one-time activities</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appears to have prevented the project from achieving key objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Despite engendering gains in knowledge and criminal justice sector</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity, there remains a significant need to consolidate these gains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through additional training and technical assistance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNODC, in consultation with EU, introduced changes to the GLOT55</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project design during implementation to improve efficiency and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>streamline reporting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNODC planned and successfully implemented a number of activities</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Clusters 1 and 2. UNODC planned and implemented many fewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities in Clusters 3 and 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respondents highlighted UNODC’s experience, relationships and</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials as contributing to the efficiency of programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNODC created value and contributed to GLOT55’s efficiency by</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building on existing activities, cooperating with other UNODC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects, and cooperating with other key stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GLOT55 contributed to a new UNODC reporting system, designed to</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support the consolidation of institutional knowledge and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNODC and partner organization staff successfully leveraged</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOT55-funded activities to develop a number of follow-on activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supported by partner institutions, national governments and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GLOT55 helped UNODC establish itself as an organization with the expertise and resources necessary to combat human trafficking and the smuggling of migrants.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GLOT55 made notable contributions to UNODC’s new consolidated approach to combating human trafficking and smuggling of migrants.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• While effective in supporting the development of draft legislation, GLOT55 does not appear to have made demonstrative contributions toward ratification of Protocols or to passage, implementation or operationalization of new laws against trafficking in persons or smuggling or migrants.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a need for follow-up to support the passage and implementation of counter-TIP and counter-SOM legislation.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNODC and some national partners are pursuing selected GLOT55 follow-up activities at the global and local levels.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GLOT55 Document Review, Telephone and In-person Field Interviews.

M = multiple respondents/documents; S = single respondents/documents.
III. CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

In this section, we draw some preliminary conclusions about GLOT55’s relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability based on data collected and analysed for this retrospective assessment. Conclusions focus on (1) the strengths and assets of GLOT55’s approach to combating trafficking in persons and migrant smuggling, (2) the strengths and limitations of the project’s design, structure, and implementation, and (3) the character and limitations of GLOT55’s achievements and results in relation to project objectives and the DAC criteria.

In some ways, GLOT55 has been a “breakthrough” project for UNODC. The flexibility of the project design allowed the organisation to initiate activities involving more than 50 countries, generally targeting support to governments that were most willing to engage on the issues of trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. The resulting levels of local ownership helped to generate costs savings that allowed the implementation of more activities than initially envisaged. After a slow start, administrative changes by UNODC and the EU allowed implementation to proceed increasingly smoothly, with the majority of activities undertaken in the second half of the project.

GLOT55 has also been instrumental in allowing UNODC to build its own internal capacity, particularly in the area of smuggling of migrants, acknowledged by staff as an area of comparative weakness at the outset of the project. Both UNODC and EU staff view the project as having strengthened their relationship, at both global and local levels. As a result, UNODC and the EU have broadened their relationship overall, beyond GLOT55. Partners expressed appreciation for the expertise of UNODC staff and the general quality of implementation of individual activities. Respondents highlighted the development and adaptation of counter-trafficking and counter-smuggling materials as well as their sustained availability for future work as a positive output of GLOT55. Staff also documented all GLOT55 activities in a new, internal monitoring database and made new evaluation processes and forms for workshop trainers and participants. Through the UNODC website, they also made key project outputs and resources available externally (see Section II.B.4). These resources have the potential to provide a structure to institutional learning, longer term follow-up and streamlining of materials across all programmes. Over time, the database also has the potential to help track progress toward goals and to identify linkages between UNODC activities and changes at country level.

The primary criticisms of GLOT55 across multiple respondents were (1) limited consultation with national offices and partners about local needs, activities eligible for support, and adaptation to the local context, (2) the lack of follow-up activities to institutionalize and sustain progress made, and (3) the short timeframe, insufficient to achieve the planned objectives. For example, although GLOT55 supported 24

---

32 The evaluation highlighted strong cooperation between UNODC and the EU, as well as strong working relationship with other partners, notably the US Government’s J/TIP office. UNODC did not appear to have used any materials developed by other organizations, even through the joint UN.GIFT process, in which UNODC participates.
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legal assessments of counter-trafficking or counter-smuggling legislation in 18 countries, no legislative changes had been implemented by project end. Respondents also pointed to the inadequacy of single training activities, and problems created by raising expectations of counterparts that were subsequently not addressed.

Another weakness involved the disjuncture between the project as conceptualised and the project logic model, which focused on the achievement of specific outcomes such as Protocol ratification, legislative changes and increases in investigations. Measured against the initial log-frames, GLOT55 has not achieved its objectives. Both EU and UNODC acknowledged the shortcomings of these log-frames and made modifications to the indicators. The changes did not, however, align the overall project logic model with its activities or results.

The revised log-frame also did not capture several key project strengths, including flexibility, responsiveness and catalysing of new initiatives at the country level. The latter was a particularly important strategy for addressing singular project activities that did not have specific, planned follow-up. UNODC field offices leveraged the outputs and results of these efforts to develop additional follow up activities and pursue funding for them. This proved to be an effective strategy as UNODC has secured country or international donor support for follow-up projects or activities in at least 16 countries. Further, at project end, UNODC and local partners were pursuing several follow-up projects to activities completed close to project end (August 2013). This might result in additional projects with the capacity to sustain GLOT55’s results.

The singular nature of many GLOT55 training activities was particularly problematic with regard to capacity building. That participants generally rated these trainings positively in post-workshop evaluations reiterates the their potential to increase knowledge and understanding of the issue. According to study respondents and materials, the main value of the workshops was increasing basic knowledge of key issues and fostering the development of relationships. In one case, Colombia and Guatemala participants came to realise they were working on the same case in the course of a GLOT55 workshop. This positive outcome did not align entirely with planned objectives related to skills development and application; it recommends considering defining objectives for singular workshops around these kinds of achievable results. It also reiterates other approaches to capacity building identified during the evaluation, for example, e-learning tools and the integration of counter-TIP and counter-SOM topics into police, prosecutorial and judicial training academies. In general, UNODC’s capacity building efforts might benefit from the adoption of an overall guiding framework or strategy within which individual activities can be located.33

Overall, GLOT55’s results appear to be strongest in Activity Clusters 1 and 2 – legislative development and capacity building related to the criminal justice system. Achievements were more attenuated in Activity Clusters 3 and 4 – victim support and awareness raising. Stakeholders across levels and regions identified legislative development and criminal justice sector capacity building as key areas of UNODC mandate and strength. They diverged in their view of the alignment between Activity Clusters 3 and 4 and UNODC mandate and capacity. For example, despite implementation of awareness raising activities in Colombia and Moldova, there remain questions about the value that UNODC can add in an area that

33 For example, ASEAN has developed a Practitioner Guidelines on Criminal Justice Response to Trafficking in Persons http://www.artipproject.org/artip-tip-cjs/resources/guides_standards/ASEAN-PG_Web_English_Final.pdf
appears beyond its expertise. Respondents noted that UNODC has limited internal resources for awareness raising and communications beyond their own promotional activities.

The area of victim support is more complex, given that inadequate identification mechanisms and unsuitable services for victims, some of which actually deter victims from coming forward, have a direct impact on the criminal justice response. In this regard, the working relationship developed with IOM in Colombia through GLOT55 and the positive, though short-term, collaboration between UNODC and a major NGO in India suggest collaboration as a means of pursuing efforts at victim support.
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section, we discuss primary, crosscutting recommendations that follow from the findings presented in Section II and the concluding comments in Section III. Given the retrospective nature of this assessment, the research team focused on recommendations with implications beyond GLOT55. Going forward, UNODC plans to pursue efforts to combat trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants through a single united global programme. Recommendations focus on supporting what respondents identified as UNODC’s plan to employ a flexible, GLOT55-informed strategy for providing technical assistance, capacity building activities, and the development of tools, policy, and partnerships.

The recommendations are divided into the following key subtopics: (A) UNODC’s role in combating human trafficking and migrant smuggling; (B) project development; (C) capacity building; and (D) inter-agency cooperation. Each section includes a brief introduction, followed by the recommendations and an attendant discussion. There are 11 consecutively numbered recommendations ordered by topic; the order in which the recommendations appear does not reflect their importance.

UNODC’s Role in Combating Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants

According to evaluation findings, GLOT55 has enabled UNODC to re-establish momentum in its work to combat trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. Through the project, the EU and other stakeholders have come to recognize UNODC’s expertise and capacity to address the criminal justice aspects of both issues. The project also helped strengthen the UNODC’s internal resources and capacity to address migrant smuggling in particular. The consolidation of counter-trafficking and counter-migrant smuggling programmes internally through the consolidation in a single unit and the development of a common database have further strengthened the organization’s capacity to address these issues.

At the same time, GLOT55 was weakened by its design. While the project approach allowed for greater flexibility than other projects, the design limited work to four activity clusters developed without significant consultation from regional and local offices and partners. Further, the project lacked a clear logic model that linked the proposed strategies and activities with the context, and the short and interim outcomes as well as the longer-term objectives of the project. This disconnect left several project objectives unrealized, despite a general view among respondents that GLOT55 activities had been successfully implemented and achieved notable results. The plan to employ GLOT55 strategies in guiding the new global programme, suggests it is important for UNODC to consider how the design and logic model affected implementation and results.

According to UNODC staff, GLOT55 was developed relationally to complement other, existing institutional responses to human trafficking and migrant smuggling. When GLOT55 was developed, staff
had already developed a Global Programme on Trafficking in Persons (later GLOT59)\textsuperscript{34} and were in the process of elaborating a Global Programme on the Smuggling of Migrants (GLOT92) \textsuperscript{35}. GLOT55 was designed not as a substitute for these two programmes, but to complement and reinforce their work. In this context, evaluation findings suggest that, as UNODC continues to evolve its Global Programmes on Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants, staff might consider reviewing the outcomes of all three GLOT projects to identify and reaffirm core competencies and areas of comparative advantage. For example, although the Protocols addressed by the Global Programmes mandate far-reaching interventions, both interview responses and GLOT55 performance in Activity Clusters 3 and 4 suggest victim support and awareness raising as areas of comparative weakness. Study data also reiterate UNODC’s strength in the areas of legislative development and criminal justice capacity building to support victim identification, investigation of traffickers and smugglers, and prosecution of criminals. Specific recommendations relating to UNODC’s role in combating human trafficking and migrant smuggling are:

1. \textbf{Consider further consolidation of UNODC’s counter-trafficking and counter-smuggling expertise and activities under a common global programme, including through ongoing development of the programme database.}

2. \textbf{Consider developing clear and detailed logic models for the overall work of UNODC’s HTMSS, one for trafficking in persons and one for smuggling of migrants.}

Each model should be based on a clear theory of change, seeking to articulate the connection between strategies, inputs, context, activities, outputs and outcomes pursued by the global programme, toward the overall goal of full implementation of both Protocols.

3. \textbf{As part of the evolution of a section-specific theory of change and logic model, consider developing additional strategies to affirm a leading role in the global criminal justice response to trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants.}

As discussed, GLOT55 helped reassert and reiterate UNODC’s expertise in combating human trafficking and migrant smuggling. This suggests that UNODC might benefit from further developing their comparative advantage in the criminal justice space. While evaluation data do not specifically suggest the following actions, steps to consider might include defining the elements of an effective criminal justice response to frame future action; assisting Member States in increasing the focus on targeting criminal networks rather than individuals; and strengthening internal linkages among UNODC programmes (for example, anti-money laundering and counter-terrorism) to identify additional opportunities for combating human trafficking and migrant smuggling.

4. \textbf{Review UNODC’s role in the areas of victim support and awareness raising, and consider engaging in these areas only where they relate directly to its criminal justice related goals.}

\textbf{Development of Projects to Combat Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants}

\textsuperscript{34} UNODC GLO/T59 Project document (GLOT59 - Global Programme against Trafficking (GPAT), January 2009 – December 2011), 30 September 2009.

GLOT55 enjoyed considerable success in implementing activities and ensuring participant benefits from them, especially in clusters 1 and 2. Most of the challenges identified could be traced to the initial project design process. The development of overall logic models for UNODC’s work in human trafficking and migrant smuggling (recommendation 2) have the potential to provide the scaffolding for the development of project specific logic models or frameworks. Project specific log-frames built on an overall logic model can help ensure alignment of project activities and structures with individual project objectives and the overall goals of the global programme. Further, while the GLOT55 model allowed countries to benefit from a range of options, a more consultative process would have enabled greater tailoring of these options to local and regional realities. It would also have been useful for headquarters to communicate the scope of available supports more clearly and better align partner expectations with resources available. Specific recommendations in relation to project development are:

5. **For each UNODC project on trafficking in persons and/or smuggling of migrants, consider developing clear and robust, project-specific logic models and an articulated theory of change.**

These might be linked to the overall goals and objectives of the global programmes (as per Recommendation 2).

6. **Consider how best to communicate project parameters to regional and country partners to help ensure that participant expectations align with resources available.**

7. **When developing a menu of project activities, consider strengthening the process of consultation with local and regional offices and partners, as well as concerned donors.**

**Capacity Building Efforts to Combat Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants**

Although many training participants rated the quality, knowledge acquisition and networking opportunities highly, the evaluation identified several instances in which one-time only GLOT55 workshops and trainings introduced new challenges. These included inadequate time to develop and adopt new skills; the relatively small number of actors able to attend a single training; and high turnover of law enforcement and judicial officials working on trafficking and migrant smuggling.

Further, while GLOT55 documentation did not define the concept of trainer of trainers (TOT), feedback from some follow-up TOT workshops suggested the challenges of meeting TOT objectives through supporting stand-alone workshops. Trainers noted especially the need for guided practice and the opportunity to develop implementation strategies for newly acquired skills. UNODC’s work in this area may benefit from a clear definition of how the organization conceptualizes a training of trainers process. Specific recommendations based on lessons learned in the area of capacity building include:

8. **Consider developing a clear strategy for capacity building activities in the areas of trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants.**

This might be done separately, or as part of the development of an overall logic model as per Recommendation 2.

9. **Consider developing an internal definition of the core elements of a training of trainers programme as it relates to counter-trafficking and counter-smuggling.**
10. Consider ways to increase the content and timeline of UNODC’s capacity-building activities, for example, by developing computer-based training courses as well as materials or strategies for incorporating human trafficking and migrant smuggling topics into police, prosecutorial and judicial training academies.

Inter-Agency Collaboration and Cooperation

GLOT55 involved several instances of inter-agency cooperation, with respondents noting collaboration with a range of other agencies. These included the EU, IOM, the US Government, beneficiary national governments and a variety of regional agencies. Specific recommendations to build on the achievements in the area of inter-agency cooperation include:

11. Consider continuing to seek and strengthen opportunities for collaboration with other actors in the counter-trafficking and counter-smuggling fields, particularly in areas where UNODC does not have a clear comparative advantage. These would include victim support and awareness raising.

12. Consider identifying and using appropriate resources developed by other organizations to complement assets and tools produced by UNODC.

UNODC might be able to draw on the UN.GIFT process to assist in addressing this recommendation.
ANNEX I: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this evaluation was to assess the outputs and outcomes of UNODC’s GLOT55 in the following five DAC-mandated areas: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. The mixed-methods design sought to employ the following methodologies to address the study’s research questions: (1) review and analysis of key project documents from GLOT55; (2) semi-structured, in-person and telephone interviews with staff from UNODC headquarters (HQ), GLOT55 donors, and countries implementing selected GLOT55 activities; and (3) a structured, web-based survey of global staff and stakeholders involved with the implementation of GLOT55 activities.

We analysed qualitative study data (interviews and documents) by developing project-specific codes based on study research questions and coded the qualitative data (interviews and documents) using qualitative data analysis software (QDAS) to assist with the coding process. For the survey, we analysed the data by producing descriptive statistics to assess a broader array of inputs and perspectives on the implementation and results of GLOT55. Because of the low response rate to the survey, survey data may be subject to a non-response bias, which led us to exclude them from the main analysis of the report. Instead, we (1) analysed the two primary data types to identify key patterns, findings, and themes in the data, (2) developed a set of concrete findings aimed at addressing each research question, and (3) aggregated across findings to develop a set of recommendations regarding the implementation and results of GLOT55. We employed the outcomes of these data collection and analysis activities to draft this final report, document and explain study findings, and develop a set of recommendations.

Desk Review

The evaluation of GLOT55 included a review of key project documents – project design documents, annual progress reports prepared by UNODC in Vienna, reports on results oriented monitoring missions undertaken by the EU, individual activity reports, conference reports, and reports on participant evaluation of GLOT55 workshops, among others. As well as increasing the research team’s understanding of the structure, activities, and objectives of GLOT55, and informing the development of study instruments, the review contributed key data to the analysis of GLOT55 results. We coded key study documents along with the qualitative interviews using QDAS (discussed further below). We then used the results of this analysis to explore and validate findings that emerged from analysis of the interview data.

At the time of this report, we collected and reviewed some 300-plus documents, selecting 166 for further analysis. Early in the evaluation process, the review of GLOT55 documents yielded key information about the structure, purpose, and activities of the project. It also provided critical input used to define study research questions. The final review of GLOT55 documents helped document the evolution and results of GLOT55; explore and extend themes in the interview data; and validated as well as helped to evolve emergent findings from the interviews.
**Stakeholder Interviews**

An important feature of GLOT55 was the key staff and stakeholders involved in the planning, development, and implementation of project activities designed to accomplish project goals and objectives. In order to gain insight into the structure, objectives, and results of GLOT55, we conducted telephone and in-person interviews with a range of key stakeholders. Their input provided informed, historical and current perspectives on multiple aspects of GLOT55, including its relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness, impact and the sustainability of its achievements.

We interviewed a total of 50 stakeholders, including a sample of UNODC HQ and field staff and consultants, representatives of national governments and EU HQ and field staff. We identified a purposive sample of interview respondents based on where UNODC implemented the most significant number of GLOT55 activities and as respondents were available within the time period allotted for this retrospective assessment. UNODC staff in Vienna identified the countries visited and respondents interviewed, which included country visits to Austria (UNODC Vienna), Colombia, Moldova and Senegal, as well as telephone interviews with multiple respondents in Benin, Bhutan, Guinea, El Salvador, India, Kenya, the Kyrgyz Republic, Mexico, and Togo.

Using study research questions, the research team developed an initial set of questions to use as a basis for producing a semi-structured interview guide for the evaluation and submitted them to UNODC for their review. We then developed the interview guide itself, piloted and revised it. (The guide is included as Annex III). Prior to each interview, we adapted and tailored it to respondents’ different roles in GLOT55, while still maintaining sufficient consistency across the versions of the guide to ensure data comparability.

**Survey**

We developed and administered a web-based survey of GLOT55 staff and stakeholders. UNODC provided a list and contact information for staff and stakeholders whom they identified as involved in or knowledgeable about GLOT55. We fielded the survey with the universe of respondents identified by UNODC. The goal was to integrate the views of a much larger number of respondents into the evaluation in a confidential format. The focus of the survey was stakeholder perceptions of GLOT55’s objectives, activities, relevance, and results, including the achievement of specific outputs and outcomes during the project period, and the sustainability of these activities and achievements after project end (The survey questionnaire can be found in Annex IV). The purpose of the survey was to provide the study with quantitative data to use explore the differences among and between data types as well as to validate findings.

The survey was fielded in English, Spanish and Russian, as aligned with those the countries in which UNODC implemented multiple GLOT55 activities. Respondents were sent an email with a URL link to the survey that they could complete immediately or at a later time. UNODC HQ staff contacted stakeholders three separate times to encourage them to complete to the survey. Despite multiple efforts at follow up, across all languages, the survey yielded an approximately 20 to 25 percent response rate, too low to consider data valid and free of a non-response bias. As discussed, this led us to exclude these data from the body of the report; results of the survey data can be found in Annex V.

**Analytic Approach**
Analysis of the project documents and interviews focused on retrospectively determining GLOT55 results achieved to date and addressing research questions. We examined the data to assess whether, where and how activities in each of the four GLOT55 areas achieved project objectives related to ratification and implementation of the Protocols; improvement of criminal justice system skills; strengthening assistance and protection for trafficking victims and smuggled migrants; and awareness-raising. We explored project outputs and outcomes in relation to study research questions in the context of the OECD-DAC criteria. Our analytic methods included thematic framing, descriptive statistics, and relational data assessment.

- **Thematic framing:** Analysis focused on assessing the qualitative data (interviews and documents) in relation to each of the four activity cluster areas and toward addressing each research question. We developed a hierarchical coding scheme using conceptual categories and classifications linked to the research questions to organize the qualitative data (see Annex VI). We used a QDAS to assign codes to documents and interviews and then produced summative memos on primary patterns, themes and trends in the data by code. Coding and summatng the data in this way enabled the team to (1) access comprehensive data on specific topics, (2) organize information in different ways and combinations, (3) analyse the data to identify primary and secondary trends, patterns and themes, (4) assemble evidence supporting each theme identified, and (5) support the formation of initial findings to address each study research question.

- **Descriptive statistics:** We analysed the survey data using quantitative analytical software to calculate frequency distributions and perform selected cross-tabulations. Because the response rate was low enough to introduce a non-response bias, we did not include these data in the primary analysis. We offer results based on the data received (collapsed across language categories) in Annex V.

- **Relational data analysis:** Because we originally planned to have multiple data sources, our planned primary analytical approach was data triangulation across the qualitative and quantitative data for the analysis. We planned to combine the qualitative document review and interview data with the quantitative survey data to examine the data relationally. Because the survey data were not sufficiently robust, we instead examined the document and interview data relationally, to determine the frequency and character of key themes and patterns in the data and assess their validity. We confirmed primary themes across the two primary data sources and developed the study’s findings and responses to each research question based on those themes and patterns most frequently cited across respondents and respondent types. Any specific theme or pattern had to have been mentioned by at least three respondents and in two separate regions before we considered it a candidate finding. Each member of the research team compiled candidate findings independently based on the summary memos of the coded data, as well as additional queries of the data, as needed. Once compiled, the research team met to discuss and determine the strength of the evidence for each candidate finding. After several iterations aimed at ensuring the robustness of the evidence, we identified a set of findings, documents in this report, and used them to develop a set of recommendations to inform future UNODC efforts in the areas of trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants.

Taken together, the data collection and analysis activities provided in-depth information to address UNODC’s evaluation questions regarding GLOT55.

**Study Limitations**

The evaluation design and methods had a number of important limitations. These include the following:

- The entirely retrospective nature of the evaluation, as commissioned by UNODC, requires a research design that precludes comprehensive pre/post assessments of the implementation
and achievements of GLOT55. This prevents the assessment from attributing change or results to GLOT55 activities directly or exclusively.

- The lack of a comparison group precludes assessment of the results in the absence of GLOT55. For example, we cannot say definitively whether, in the absence of GLOT55, similar or different results to those documented in the evaluation would have been achieved.

- Convenience sampling for interviews and the survey preclude generalization of findings to the larger populations from which the samples were drawn. For example, we cannot assume that the perspectives of the UNODC and partner organization staff that were interviewed represent the perspectives of all UNODC and partner organization staff in each country in which GLOT55 was implemented or in any region as a whole.

- A low survey response rate precluded generalization of the survey findings to the larger population of staff from which respondents were drawn.

In addition, many GLOT55 activities occurred only once; approximately half were completed more than two years prior to the evaluation. This limited respondents’ ability to recall the specific activities, structure, focus, and outcomes of GLOT55 and to provide detailed answers to some questions. Further, feedback from study respondents indicated that changes of government and staffing made it difficult to locate the appropriate respondents.

A further challenge, for any evaluation in which respondents participate voluntarily, is self-selection bias. It is possible that persons who chose to participate in the evaluation differ in important ways from those who did not. For example, those who agreed to participate may have had stronger positive or negative feelings about GLOT55 than those who did not. Finally, any evaluation that includes self-reported data has the potential challenge of a social desirability bias – the tendency for evaluation participants to respond in a way that they believe will be pleasing to others, for example, exaggerating the positive aspects of a project to please project staff.

In spite of these limitations, the available data yielded multiple, robust findings concerning challenges, results, and lessons learned from the design, implementation and results of GLOT55.
## ANNEX II: GLOT55 EVALUATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Collection Questions</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNODC HQ &amp; Donor Interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. To what extent did the objectives of GLOT55 – to support ratification and implementation of Palermo – address a clearly defined need? | • How was GLOT55 developed?  
  o Was it developed in response to a specific problem, challenge, or issue? If so, what problems, challenges, and/or issues?  
  o Who was involved with its development?  
  o What was your role in its development?  
  o How do you understand UNODC’s comparative advantage/value-added in developing GLOT55?  
  • What did you hope GLOT55 would achieve?  
    o What were its main objectives overall (at the project/initiative level)?  
  • Was there a specific problem you felt GLOT55 was designed to address?  
    In relation to:  
    o Protocol ratification/transposition into domestic law  
    o Improving criminal justice system actor skills  
    o Assisting and protecting VoT and smuggled migrants  
    o Awareness raising activities | X | X | X |
|                                                                                   |                                                                                          | UNODC HQ & Donor Interviews | UNODC Field Staff Interviews | National Level Interviews | Document Review | Survey |
| 2. How does GLOT55 align with UNODC’s mission?                                   | • How do you see GLOT55 fitting into the mission of UNODC?                                | X | X | X | X |
| 3. How did the project design and the project stakeholders conceptualize the link between planned activities and desired outcomes? | • What were the primary activities implemented as part of GLOT55?  
  • Were there any activities planned, but not implemented?  
    o If so, what were they?  
    o Why or why not?  
  • How do you understand the link between GLOT55’s activities and your desired objectives? | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

## Effectiveness
4. How do key stakeholders understand the extent to which project objectives have been achieved / are likely to be achieved?

- To what extent do you consider project objectives have been met under Activity Cluster 1: Promoting Ratification of the Protocols and their transposition into domestic law
  - o Country legal assessments to have been met?
  - o Regional legal workshops to have been met?
  - o Training workshops to have been met?

- To what extent do you consider the objectives of the Activity Cluster 2: Improving the skills of criminal justice system actors

- To what extent do you consider objectives of the Activity Cluster 3: Improving assistance and protection to trafficking victims and smuggled migrants

- To what extent do you consider objectives of the Activity Cluster 4: Awareness-raising among the general public, in particular vulnerable groups and groups prone to migration

- Are you familiar with any of the following UNODC publications or materials...
  - In Depth Training Manual on Investigation and Prosecuting the Smuggling of Migrants
  - Toolkit to combat the Smuggling of Migrants
  - Model Law against the Smuggling of Migrants
  - Ways and Means: Training film for criminal justice official
  - If so, how have you used them?

- To what extent do you consider the objectives of the victim support activities to have been met? (India, Colombia)

- To what extent do you consider the objectives of the awareness-raising project to be met? (Moldova)

5. What were key barriers and challenges to implementation of project activities? How did these affect project outcomes?

- Have you experienced any barriers or challenges to implementation of GLOT55 project activities?
  - o If so, on which activities?
  - o How did they affect the outcome of the activity(ies)?
  - o Have you been able to overcome them?
  - o If so, how?

6. What factors contributed to the efficiency/inefficiency of project implementation?

- What factors, in your view, contributed to the efficiency or inefficiency of project implementation?

- How were the budget and other resources devoted to GLOT55 developed?

7. Has GLOT55 been able to leverage other resources to advance Palermo ratification and implementation?

- Were there other UNODC resources or activities devoted to Palermo ratification and implementation in place in your country before GLOT55 was developed?
If yes, were these resources from:
- Government
- UNODC
- Other external sources
- Don’t know

- Were there any other resources or activities in your country after and to follow up the initiatives supported by GLOT55?
If yes, were these resources from:
- Government
- UNODC
- Other external sources
- Don’t know
(Choose all that apply)

### IMPACT

7. What do those who participated in GLOT55 activities regard as their primary achievements?
- What, in your opinion, have been the main achievements of GLOT55? (e.g. legal assessments, regional workshops, training materials produced)
  - Have there been any new legislation or specific policy changes related to Palermo implemented in the wake of GLOT55 activities?
  - If so, what are they?
  - What evidence is there that GLOT55 contributed to this outcome?

### SUSTAINABILITY

8. To what extent are the key outcomes achieved sustainable beyond the UNODC/ GLOT55’s involvement?
- Of the achievements you listed, are there any plans in place to ensure that they continue now that GLOT55 is over?
- What, if any, follow up activities are planned/have taken place related to GLOT55 . . .
  - Legal review(s)
  - Regional workshop(s)
  - Proposed legislation
  - Awareness raising activities
  - Training(s)
  - Direct services for VoT and smuggled migrants
- Who is funding these activities?
- Are there any other counter-trafficking activities or efforts you consider to have arisen from or because of GLOT 55?
INTRODUCTION AND INFORMED CONSENT

As you know, an independent research team is working with UNODC, to conduct an evaluation of GLOT55 counter-trafficking efforts. This study is assessing the outcomes of GLOT55 activities designed to support the ratification of Palermo.

Our conversation today is designed to help us learn more about how GLOT55 works, especially with regard to its primary activity areas to promote national-level ratification of Palermo and adaptation of local legislation to align with it; build the capacity of national criminal justice systems; develop assistance and protection programs of trafficking victims and smuggled migrants; and raise awareness of the related issues.

Confidentiality

I would like to ask you some questions about UNODC’s GLOT55 and about your work related to it. I would like to take notes during our conversation so that the research team can utilize your perspectives to inform our analysis and can accurately represent the information you provide.

*Your responses will be kept confidential.* Your identity and/or organizational affiliation will not be revealed in reports, presentations, or articles and will not be recognizable to anyone beyond the research team. We will not share your name or individual perspectives with UNODC or other project staff, donors, or anyone outside of the research team. We will keep our notes in a secured location during the project (and on a secured server once they are typed up) and will shred and delete all notes after the study is completed.

We will not include your name or title in a list of study informants or in any other format in any reports that we write. The notes from our conversation will be used as input only on reports we will write for UNODC, who is funding this evaluation. Your responses will be combined with those of other study respondents and reported in aggregate, e.g., study respondents suggested . . . or some field staff felt . . .

Distribution and dissemination of this report will be at UNODC’s discretion.

Compensation and Freedom to Withdraw

There is no compensation for your participation in this study. Your participation is voluntary. You may choose not to participate at all, or you may refuse to answer certain questions or discontinue your participation at any time without any penalty.

Your Responsibilities
I want to emphasize that there are no right or wrong answers to these questions. By voluntarily agreeing to participate in this study, we ask you to answer these questions with responses that are true for you or for your organization.

Do you understand the parameters of our conversation?

Do you have any questions at this time?

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Let’s start with a few introductions. Could you please give me your official title and a brief description of your work?

2. Could you please describe your work on GLOT55 and any roles you have played in its design, planning and/or implementation?

II. RELEVANCE

- How was GLOT55 developed?
  - Was it developed in response to a specific problem, challenge, or issue? If so, what problems, challenges, and/or issues?
  - Who was involved with its development?
  - What was your role in its development?
  - How do you understand UNODC’s comparative advantage/value-added in developing GLOT55?

- What did you hope GLOT55 would achieve? What were its main objectives overall (at the project/initiative level)?

- Was there a specific problem you felt GLOT55 was designed to address? In relation to:
  - Protocol ratification/transposition into domestic law
  - Improving criminal justice system actor skills
  - Assisting and protecting VoT and smuggled migrants
  - Awareness raising activities

- How do you see GLOT55 fitting into the mission of UNODC?

- What were the primary activities implemented as part of GLOT55?

- Were there any activities planned, but not implemented?
  - If so, what were they?
  - Why or why not?

- How do you understand the link between GLOT55’s activities and your desired objectives?

III. EFFECTIVENESS

A. To what extent do you consider project objectives have been met under …
  - Activity Cluster 1: Promoting Ratification of the Protocols and their transposition into domestic law
  - Activity Cluster 2: Improving the skills of criminal justice system actors
Activity Cluster 3: Improving assistance and protection to trafficking victims and smuggled migrants
Activity Cluster 4: Awareness-raising among the general public, in particular vulnerable groups and groups prone to migration

B. Are you familiar with any of the following UNODC publications/spots . . .
   - In Depth Training Manual on Investigation and Prosecuting the Smuggling of Migrants
   - Toolkit to combat the Smuggling of Migrants
   - Model Law against the Smuggling of Migrants
   - Ways and Means: Training film for criminal justice official

If so, how have you used them?

C. Have you experienced any barriers or challenges to implementation of GLOT55 project activities?
   - If so, on which activities?
   - How did they affect the outcome of the activity(ies)?
   - Have you been able to overcome them? If so, how?

IV. EFFICIENCY
   A. What factors, in your view, contributed to the efficiency of programme implementation?
   B. What factors, in your view, contributed to the inefficiency of programme implementation?
   C. How were the budget and other resources devoted to GLOT55 developed?
      - How was GLOT55 prioritized in your budget in relation to competing programs?

D. Were there other UNODC resources or activities devoted to Palermo ratification and implementation in place before GLOT55 was developed?
E. Were there any non-UNODC efforts to advance Palermo in place prior to GLOT55?
   - If so, what were they (both UNODC and non-UNODC)?
   - Did UNODC take any steps to integrate GLOT55 and other efforts to advance Palermo?
   - If so, what steps?
   - What steps were taken to ensure that UNODC was not duplicating other efforts?
   - How would you describe the results of integrating and leveraging different Palermo-focused efforts or resources?

V. IMPACT
   A. What, in your opinion, have been the main achievements of GLOT55? (e.g. legal assessments, regional workshops, training materials produced)
      - Have there been any new legislation or specific policy changes related to Palermo
implemented in the wake of GLOT55 activities?
  o If so, what are they?
  o What evidence is there that GLOT55 contributed to this outcome?

VI. SUSTAINABILITY
A. Of the achievements you listed, are there any plans in place to ensure that they continue now that GLOT55 is over?
B. Are there any other counter-trafficking activities or efforts you consider to have arisen from or because of GLOT 55?
ANNEX IV: GLOT55 SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Section A: Current Work

In this section, we would like to learn more about your current position and the types of counter-trafficking work that you do.

A1. How would you describe your position (Please choose only one)

- Judge
- Prosecutor
- Police/Gendarme
- Border Guard
- Government official in criminal justice/law enforcement area (Justice, Interior, Immigration, etc.)
- Government official in trafficking victim support area
- Government official - other
- NGO worker from victim support agency
- NGO worker – other
- UNODC HQ staff
- UNODC national staff
- UNODC consultant
- Supreme commander of anti-trafficking forces
- Other (please specify) ________________

A2. How long have you been employed by your current organization?

- Less than one year
- 1 to 2.9 years
- 3 to 4.9 years
- More than 5 years

A3. How long have you been working on counter-trafficking or counter-smuggling issues?
O  Less than one year
O  1 to 2.9 years
O  3 to 4.9 years
O  More than 5 years

Section B: Personal Characteristics

B1.  What is your age?
O  18-34
O  35-49
O  50-64
O  65 years or older

B2.  Are you:
O  Male
O  Female

B3.  In or with what region of the world do you work? (Please choose only one)
O  East Africa
O  West Africa
O  Mexico/Central America
O  South America
O  Middle East and North Africa
O  Central Asia
O  East Asia and the Pacific
O  South Asia
O  South-Eastern Europe
O  Global

B4. In what country(ies) do/did you work when involved with GLOT55 activity(ies)? __________________________
(Please list only countries where you work(ed), not those in which you only attended a workshop.)

Section C: GLOT55 Relevance

C1. What activities related to or provided by UNODC’s GLOT55 program were you involved in?

- Please identify any GLOT55 activities in which you were involved in some way (check “Yes, was involved”). Please check all activities that apply (that is, all GLOT55 activities you were involved in).

- For only those activities you were involved in (where you checked Yes), please assess the activity’s relevance to current work to combat trafficking and migrant smuggling in your country/region/globally.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Yes, was involved</th>
<th>Very relevant</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Neither relevant nor irrelevant</th>
<th>Irrelevant</th>
<th>Very irrelevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Assessment of legislation on Trafficking in Persons</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Assessment of legislation on Smuggling of Migrants</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Regional workshop to promote the Implementation of the Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants Protocols in Central Asian State, Uzbekistan, May, 2012</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Regional workshop to foster international cooperation in Trafficking in Persons cases, Turkmenistan, November 2009</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) National workshop on trial preparation techniques in fighting against Human Trafficking - &quot;Mock Trials against TIP&quot;, Colombia, April 2012</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Specialized workshop focusing on trial preparation techniques in fighting against human trafficking &quot;Mock Trials against TIP&quot;, Colombia, November 2011</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Follow-up anti-human trafficking train-the-trainers workshop, Kyrgyzstan, May 2013</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Regional conference on migrant smuggling: challenges and progress in the implementation of the UN Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants, Mexico, April 2012</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Regional training workshop on Smuggling of Migrants cases, Colombia, March 2012</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Regional Workshop on drafting legislation to address Smuggling of Migrants, Kenya, November/December 2010</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) National workshop to develop a strategic plan on establishing an adequate system of assistance and protection for victims of trafficking, Kenya, May 2012</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Provision of legal assistance to victims of trafficking in persons and smuggled migrants, India (project)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) National training workshop for border control officials and front-line</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Activity Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Yes, was involved</th>
<th>Very relevant</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Neither relevant nor irrelevant</th>
<th>Irrelevant</th>
<th>Very irrelevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>police officers in victim identification and referral, India, June 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) Country assessment on the &quot;status of victim service providers and criminal justice actors in India, July 2013</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o) National multi-disciplinary workshop on trafficking in persons, Uganda, July 2013</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section D: GLOT55 Effectiveness

D1. Please read the following statements regarding the GLOT55-led country legal assessments.

- Please click the box that best describes how much you agree or disagree with each item.
- If you are unfamiliar with the activity, please choose “Don’t know/Not applicable.”

#### MARK ONE (〇) FOR EACH QUESTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know/Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The GLOT55-led legal assessments were helpful in determining how to align my country’s legislation with the UN Protocol on trafficking in persons</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The GLOT55-led legal assessments were helpful in determining how to align my country’s legislation with the UN Protocol on smuggling of migrants</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The quality of the legal assessment activity(ies) did not meet my expectations in terms of focus, relevance, information discussed, and/or needs in my country</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) We have begun to modify our legal framework in response to the GLOT55-led review</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e) We have planned, but not yet implemented, specific activities to modify our legal framework as a result of GLOT55-led review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know/Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) We have no plans to modify our legal framework in response to the GLOT55-led review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know/Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D2. Please read the following statements regarding the GLOT55-led training or workshops.

- Please click the box that best describes how much you agree or disagree with each item.
- If you are unfamiliar with the activity, please choose “Don’t know/Not applicable.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK ONE (☐) FOR EACH QUESTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The GLOT55 training or workshop was <strong>not</strong> relevant to my needs with regard to learning about effective means of combating trafficking in persons and/or smuggling of migrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| b) The GLOT55 training or workshop taught me new information or skills that will help me develop effective anti-trafficking and/or anti-migrant smuggling strategies in my country or organization. |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree | Don’t know/Not applicable |
| ☐                 | ☐        | ☐                           | ☐     | ☐             | ☐                        |

| c) The GLOT55 training or workshop was useful for me in my current role developing/implementing anti-trafficking and/or anti-migrant smuggling strategies, legislation or activities. |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree | Don’t know/Not applicable |
| ☐                 | ☐        | ☐                           | ☐     | ☐             | ☐                        |

| d) Following GLOT55 training or workshop, my organization has increased cooperation to combat trafficking and/or smuggling with one or more other organizations within my country. |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree | Don’t know/Not applicable |
| ☐                 | ☐        | ☐                           | ☐     | ☐             | ☐                        |

| e) Following the GLOT55 training or workshop, my country has **not** increased cooperation to combat trafficking and/or smuggling with one or more other countries. |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree | Don’t know/Not applicable |
| ☐                 | ☐        | ☐                           | ☐     | ☐             | ☐                        |
D3. Please read the following statements regarding the **application** of information learned from the GLOT55-led **training or workshop**.

- Please click the box that best describes how much you agree or disagree with each item.
- If you are unfamiliar with the activity, please choose “Don’t know/Not applicable.”

### MARK ONE (〇) FOR EACH QUESTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know/Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>I have successfully applied aspects of the GLOT55 training or workshop to my work related to combating trafficking and/or migrant smuggling.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>I have <strong>no plans</strong> to apply aspects of the GLOT55 training or workshop to my work combating trafficking and/or migrant smuggling.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>The GLOT55 training or workshop was <strong>not</strong> relevant to my counter-trafficking and/or counter-smuggling work.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>I have had difficulty applying aspects of the GLOT55 training or workshop to my work.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>I plan to apply aspects of the GLOT55 training or workshop to my counter-trafficking and/or counter-smuggling work.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Through the GLOT55 training or workshop, I learned new information I can use in my work combating trafficking and/or migrant smuggling</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Since the GLOT55 training or workshop I have moved to a new position that does <strong>not</strong> involve counter-trafficking or counter-smuggling work.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D4. Do you use any of the following GLOT55 publications and resources in your work?

- Please read the following titles of GLOT55 related publications and resources.
- Please click the box that best describes how often you use the resource in your **counter-smuggling** work.
- If you are unfamiliar with the publication or resource, please choose “Don’t know.”
### Publication or Resource Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication or Resource Type</th>
<th>Frequently use</th>
<th>Occasionally use</th>
<th>Never Use</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) In Depth Training Manual on Investigation and Prosecuting the Smuggling of Migrants</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Toolkit to Combat the Smuggling of Migrants</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Model Law against the Smuggling of Migrants</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Ways and Means: Training Film for Criminal Justice Officials</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D5.** Please describe any barriers or challenges you faced in implementing new guidelines, legislation, skills, or other information learned from GLOT55 activities. Please also describe how you have attempted to overcome these barriers or challenges (English only) (400 characters).

---

### Section E: GLOT55 Efficiency

**E1.** Please read the following statements regarding the allocation of resources under GLOT55.

- Please click the box that best describes how much you agree or disagree with each item.
- If you are unfamiliar with the activity, please choose “Don’t know/Not applicable.”

**MARK ONE (☐) FOR EACH QUESTION**
ANNEXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) The GLOT55 programme activities supported in my country were highly relevant to needs in my country related to combating trafficking and/or smuggling</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know/ Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) The GLOT55 programme activities supported in my country did not relate to other activities designed to combat trafficking and/or smuggling or were standalone</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The GLOT55 programme activities supported in my country duplicated, or overlapped with, existing activities to combat trafficking and/or smuggling</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) The GLOT55 programme activities supported in my country complemented or reinforced other existing activities to combat trafficking and/or smuggling</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E2. Were there other resources or activities devoted to bringing the anti-trafficking and/or anti-smuggling laws into line with the Palermo Protocol in place in your country before GLOT55 was developed?

○ Yes
○ No
○ Don’t know

E2a. If yes, who provided these resources or activities? Please check all that apply.

○ National government
○ UNODC
○ Other intergovernmental organization(s) (for example, UNHCR, IOM, OSCE, UNICEF, etc.)
○ EU
○ Other foreign donor (for example, United States, Canada, Sweden, Norway, etc.)
○ Other international non-governmental organization(s) (for example, Red Cross, Terres des Hommes, etc.)
○ Other local non-governmental organization(s)
○ Don’t know

Section F: GLOT55 Impact
F1. Please describe what you think GLOT55’s main achievements have been, for example, new legislation, policies, procedures, and/or programmes designed to combat trafficking in persons and/or smuggling of migrants. (English only) (450 characters)

Section G: GLOT55 Sustainability

G1. Are you familiar with any counter-trafficking or counter-smuggling efforts that have followed, arisen from, or happened because of GLOT55 activities?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

G1a. If yes, please check one answer for each of the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOT55 FOLLOW ON ACTIVITY</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Action on specific trafficking in persons cases in your country(ies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Action on specific trafficking in persons cases involving cooperation with one or more other countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Action on specific migrant smuggling cases in your country(ies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Action on specific migrant smuggling cases involving cooperation with one or more other countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Changes in or reform of national legislation, currently underway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Changes in or reform of national legislation, completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Victim support initiatives or programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Prevention or awareness raising campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Commitment of governmental or institutional funds to counter-trafficking or counter-smuggling activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Commitment of other governmental or institutional resources (non-budgetary) to counter-trafficking or counter-smuggling activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section H: Additional Comments

H1. Please provide any additional comments or perspectives about GLOT55 activities and efforts. (English only) (450 characters)
If you are satisfied with your responses please click the “Submit” button.

Submit
ANNEX V: GLOT55 SURVEY RESULTS

Introduction

An online survey served as a key part of the study’s original approach to data collection and analysis. The survey had the potential to collect data from a much larger set of stakeholders than possible with telephone and in-person interviews. As detailed further below, however, the low response rate introduced a non-response bias into the survey data, that is, the inability to detect the ways in which the responses of non-responders differ from those who completed the survey. The overall study response rate was approximately 20 percent (66 responses out of 320), with an average of 45 responses to any one question. This led the study team, in consultation with UNODC, to exclude the data from the analysis and report. We provide the results of the survey in this Annex.

As discussed in Annex I, the study team developed the survey instrument from research questions and sub-questions contained in the evaluation matrix. Working with UNODC, we developed a list of some 320 GLOT55 stakeholders to target through emails to complete the survey. The team developed the survey in English, consisting of 15 close-ended multiple choice or Likert scaled questions and sub-questions, as well as three open-ended fields. It was then translated into Spanish and Russian to extend its reach to respondents in key GLOT55 countries and regions. Respondents were sent an email with an introduction to the survey and URL link to the questionnaire that could be completed immediately or at a later time. At the request of the evaluation team, UNODC staff contacted stakeholders to encourage them to complete the survey. Both the research team and UNODC HQ sent several follow-up reminder emails to encourage completion. Despite this follow-up as well as two extensions to the survey deadline, responses rates remained low. As noted above, responses were received from 66 stakeholders (21 percent) pooled across all languages, with responses to individual questions averaging around 45 (14 percent), and this introduced a significant non-response bias into these data, which led the study team to exclude the survey data from the primary summative analysis.

Of the 66 responses received, the respondent pool included the following key groups:

- 21 UNODC staff members or consultants
- 15 NGOs
- 11 law enforcement officials (including police and prosecutors)
- 11 government officials
- 4 multilateral organization staff

Respondents were evenly split between men and women.

---

36 The team considers that the one-off nature of many project activities may have contributed to this low response rate.
Overall, both the quantitative and qualitative results of the survey were consistent with the results of the analysis of the other data sources – GLOT55 documents and interviews. Further, there were no significant differences between responses from those affiliated with UNODC (HQ, regional and national staff and consultants) and other stakeholders.37

**Overview of quantitative responses**

As noted, responses to the closed-ended survey questions were consistent with the findings of the analysis of the other study data sources. They emphasized project efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

Table E.1 below provides the responses to survey questions on effectiveness. These findings are generally consistent with those of the other data sources. A majority of respondents (91 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that the GLOT55-led legal assessments were helpful in determining how to align legislation with the TIP Protocol and/or the SOM Protocol. Some 58 percent had initiated steps to modify their legal frameworks. Views of training exercises also supported the view of the training activities as useful, with 89 percent disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that the workshop they attended was not relevant to their work, while 97 percent noted that they had been able to apply aspects of the training to their work.

**Table E1. Survey responses on the effectiveness of GLOT55**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOT55-led country legal assessments.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know/Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The GLOT55-led legal assessments were helpful in determining how to align my country’s legislation with the UN Protocol on trafficking in persons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The GLOT55-led legal assessments were helpful in determining how to align my country’s legislation with the UN Protocol on smuggling of migrants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The quality of the legal assessment activity(ies) did not meet my expectations in terms of focus, relevance, information discussed, and/or needs in my country</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) We have begun to modify our legal framework in response to the GLOT55-led review</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) We have planned, but not yet implemented, specific activities to modify our legal framework as a result of GLOT55-led review</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) We have no plans to modify our legal framework in response to the GLOT55-led review</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOT55-led training or workshops</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know/Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The GLOT55 training or workshop was not relevant to my needs with regard to learning about effective means of combating trafficking in persons and/or smuggling of</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 In some questions relating to national activities and progress the ‘Don’t know/Not applicable’ rate was considerable higher among those affiliated to UNODC but the responses among those who did answer were similar.
### Table E.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application of information learned from the GLOT55-led training or workshop</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don’t know/ Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) I have successfully applied aspects of the GLOT55 training or workshop to my work related to combating trafficking and/or migrant smuggling.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I have no plans to apply aspects of the GLOT55 training or workshop to my work combating trafficking and/or migrant smuggling.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The GLOT55 training or workshop was not relevant to my counter-trafficking and/or counter-smuggling work.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) I have had difficulty applying aspects of the GLOT55 training or workshop to my work.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) I plan to apply aspects of the GLOT55 training or workshop to my counter-trafficking and/or counter-smuggling work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Through the GLOT55 training or workshop, I learned new information I can use in my work combating trafficking and/or migrant smuggling.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Since the GLOT55 training or workshop I have moved to a new position that does not involve counter-trafficking or counter-smuggling work.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E.2 focuses on responses to UNODC materials. UNODC web analytics record a large number of downloads of these materials (see Table II.1 in main report). Survey responses reinforce this perception, suggesting that the materials are being used, with more than 50 percent of respondents in all five categories noting that they frequently or occasionally use GLOT55 materials.
Table E2. Survey responses on materials produced by GLOT55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of GLOT55 publications and resources in your work</th>
<th>Frequently use</th>
<th>Occasionally use</th>
<th>Never use</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) In Depth Training Manual on Investigation and Prosecuting the Smuggling of Migrants</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Toolkit to Combat the Smuggling of Migrants</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Model Law against the Smuggling of Migrants</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Ways and Means – 60 second video clip</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Ways and Means: Training Film for Criminal Justice Officials</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E3 suggests that stakeholders regard GLOT55 as an efficient project. For example, 94 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that GLOT55 activities supported or reinforced existing activities. This is in line with the evaluation findings that UNODC created value and contributed to GLOT55’s efficiency by building on existing activities. The data contain some contradictions, however. For example, some 18 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed, however, that there was an overlap between GLOT55 activities and other activities.

Table E3. Survey responses on the efficiency of GLOT55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation of resources under GLOT55</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don’t know/ Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The GLOT55 programme activities supported in my country were highly relevant to needs in my country related to combating trafficking and/or smuggling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The GLOT55 programme activities supported in my country did not relate to other activities designed to combat trafficking and/or smuggling or were standalone</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The GLOT55 programme activities supported in my country duplicated, or overlapped with, existing activities to combat trafficking and/or smuggling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) The GLOT55 programme activities supported in my country complemented or reinforced other existing activities to combat trafficking and/or smuggling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E4 provides respondent views of GLOT55 sustainability. Over 55 percent said they knew of counter-trafficking or counter-smuggling activities that built on GLOT55’s work. Consistent with other study findings, respondents felt there had been insufficient follow-up in the areas of national legislation, government commitment of funding, and non-budgetary resources.
Table E4. Survey responses on the sustainability of GLOT55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are you familiar with any counter-trafficking or counter-smuggling efforts that have followed, arisen from, or happened because of GLOT55 activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. If yes, indicate GLOT55 follow-on activity.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Action on specific trafficking in persons cases in your country(ies)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Action on specific trafficking in persons cases involving cooperation with one or more other countries</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Action on specific migrant smuggling cases in your country(ies)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Action on specific migrant smuggling cases involving cooperation with one or more other countries</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Changes in or reform of national legislation, currently underway</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Changes in or reform of national legislation, completed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Victim support initiatives or programmes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Prevention or awareness raising campaigns</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Commitment of governmental or institutional funds to counter-trafficking or counter-smuggling activities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Commitment of other governmental or institutional resources (non-budgetary) to counter-trafficking or counter-smuggling activities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of qualitative responses

As with the qualitative data, responses to the open-ended questions were generally consistent with the interview data and document review. Specifically, respondents reinforced the main achievements of GLOT55 as (1) the ability to support activities that were complementary to existing programmes, and (2) the opportunity to leverage GLOT55 outcomes to develop and fund follow-up activities. According to one respondent, for example “the team was very focused in designing meaningful programmes according to country needs.”

Another key theme in the qualitative survey data involved visibility and knowledge building. Eight respondents identified raising the visibility of the issues and increasing knowledge and understanding of human trafficking and migrant smuggling as a key project achievement. They also emphasized the project’s value in bringing new actors into the development of responses and promoting multidisciplinary approaches to trafficking in persons and the smuggling of migrants. Other reported achievements included: progressing the development of legal frameworks, identifying gaps in existing practices; the provision of useful tools and materials; and, in one instance, an increase in investigations. One respondent further stated that one GLOT55 workshop supported the development of several key partnerships that helped identify and repatriate “154 victims or possible victims” of human trafficking. This issue as a GLOT55 achievement is consistent with the findings based on other study data.
In terms of constraints, survey respondents echoed the finding that one-time activities and limited follow-up (for legal drafting workshops in particular) limited the ability of GLOT55 to realize project objectives. The lack of follow-up left countries without mechanisms, for example, to ensure that the legal assessments could be codified into and implemented as law. As one respondent noted “one of the problems with a direct follow-up to activities carried out under GLOT55 is that often there is a lack of continued funding to do a follow-up, even where there is a will of the Government to do more to implement the Protocols and adequately address TIP and SOM.” Several respondents also noted the need for follow up on training activities and one explained that all the trained government officials at one regional workshop had since left their positions.

These qualitative survey data support the quantitative data on sustainability, efficiency and effectiveness in reinforcing the findings of the analysis of other evaluation data sources. They reflect both positive views of the usefulness of individual GLOT55 activities and UNODC’s ability to complement existing counter-trafficking and counter-smuggling efforts, as well as concerns over the lack of follow-up in the wake of key activities, which compromises the longer term impact and sustainability of some of the results achieved.
## ANNEX VI: GLOT55 CODING SCHEME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interview, Document Review and Survey Questions</th>
<th>Coding Scheme for Qualitative Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELEVANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. To what extent did the objectives of GLOT55 – to support ratification and implementation of Palermo – address a clearly defined need? | • How was GLOT55 developed?  
  o Was it developed in response to a specific problem, challenge, or issue? If so, what problems, challenges, and/or issues?  
  o Who was involved with its development?  
  o What was your role in its development?  
  o How do you understand UNODC’s comparative advantage/value-added in developing GLOT55? | 1. GLOT55 Development  
  • GLOT55 design  
  • Plans  
  • Partners |
|                   | • What did you hope GLOT55 would achieve?  
  o What were its main objectives overall (at the project/initiative level)? | 2. UNODC value added  
  • “Comparative advantage”  
  • UNODC previous experience  
  • UNODC Mandate |
|                   | • Was there a specific problem you felt GLOT55 was designed to address?  
  In relation to:  
  o Protocol ratification/transposition into domestic law  
  o Improving criminal justice system actor skills  
  o Assisting and protecting VoT and smuggled migrants  
  o Awareness raising activities | 3. Planned Objectives  
  • Planned goals  
  • Planned outputs  
  • Planned outcomes  
  • Planned impacts  
  • Planned results  
  • Planned achievements |
| 2. How does GLOT55 align with | • How do you see GLOT55 fitting into the mission of UNODC? | 4. UNODC Mission  
  • Mission statement |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interview, Document Review and Survey Questions</th>
<th>Coding Scheme for Qualitative Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **UNODC’s mission?**                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                     | • Convention on Transnational Organized Crime  
• Protocol on Trafficking in Persons  
• Protocol on Smuggling of Migrants  
• GLOT55 fit with mission                                                                 |
| 3. How did the program design and the project stakeholders conceptualize the link  | • What were the primary activities implemented as part of GLOT55?  
• Were there any activities planned, but not implemented?  
  o Why or why not?  
• How do you understand the link between GLOT55’s activities and your desired objectives? | 5. Implemented activities  
6. Unplanned adaptations  
• Activities not implemented                                                                 |
| between planned activities and desired outcomes?                                  |                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                 |
| 4. **EFFECTIVENESS**                                                             | • To what extent do you consider project objectives have been met under …  
  o Activity Cluster 1: Promoting Ratification of the Protocols and their transposition into domestic law  
  o Activity Cluster 2: Improving the skills of criminal justice system actors  
  o Activity Cluster 3: Improving assistance and protection to trafficking victims and smuggled migrants  
  o Activity Cluster 4: Awareness-raising among the general public, in particular vulnerable groups and groups prone to migration  
• To what extent do you consider the objectives of the . . .  
  o Country legal assessments to have been met?  
  o Regional legal workshops to have been met?  
  o Training workshops to have been met?  
• Are you familiar with any of the following UNODC publications/spots . . .  
  o In Depth Training Manual on Investigation and Prosecuting the Smuggling of Migrants  
  o Toolkit to combat the Smuggling of Migrants  
  o Model Law against the Smuggling of Migrants  
  o Ways and Means – 60 second video clip | 7. Output/results: Ratification of Protocols  
  • TIP Protocol  
  • SOM Protocol  
  (Include any information on attribution)  
8. Output/results: Materials development and use  
  • Materials as per third box on left  
9. Output/results: Regional cooperation workshops  
  • Include information on recommendations for follow-up, problems identified, strong/weak points  
10. Output/results: Legal drafting workshops  
  • As above  
11. Output/results: Expert group meetings  
  • As above                                                                 |

---

38 See file under GLOT55 activities list folder for full list of activities.  
39 See list of workshops on last page for classification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interview, Document Review and Survey Questions</th>
<th>Coding Scheme for Qualitative Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ways and Means: Training film for criminal justice official</td>
<td>12. Output/results: Workshops – other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If so, how have you used them?</td>
<td>• As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To what extent do you consider the objectives of the victim support activities to have been met? (India, Colombia only)</td>
<td>13. Output/results: Country legal assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To what extent do you consider the objectives of the awareness-raising programme to be met? (Moldova)</td>
<td>• TIP or SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What were key barriers and challenges to implementation of project activities? How did these affect project outcomes?</td>
<td>• Have you experienced any barriers or challenges to implementation of GLOT55 project activities?</td>
<td>14. Output/results: Victim assistance programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If so, on which activities?</td>
<td>• Include Manual for identification of TIP Victims, Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How did they affect the outcome of the activity(ies)?</td>
<td>15. Output/results: Awareness raising activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have you been able to overcome them?</td>
<td>16. Output/results: Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If so, how?</td>
<td>• Code anything categorized as an output, outcome, impact, result or achievement as output or result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>• What factors, in your view, contributed to the efficiency of programme implementation?</td>
<td>17. Implementation barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What factors contributed to the efficiency/inefficiency of programme implementation?</td>
<td>• What factors, in your view, contributed to the inefficiency of programme implementation?</td>
<td>• Challenges to implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Include effects of barriers on outcomes and actions to overcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. Efficiencies</td>
<td>19. Inefficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Design</td>
<td>• Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partnerships</td>
<td>• Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staffing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td>Interview, Document Review and Survey Questions</td>
<td>Coding Scheme for Qualitative Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9. Has GLOT55 been able to leverage other resources to advance Palermo ratification and implementation? | • Were there other UNODC resources or activities devoted to Palermo ratification and implementation in place before GLOT55 was developed?  
  o How was GLOT55 prioritized in your budget in relation to competing programs?  
  o Were there any non-UNODC efforts to advance Palermo in place prior to GLOT55?  
  o If so, what were they (both UNODC and non-UNODC)?  
  o Did UNODC take any steps to integrate GLOT55 and other efforts to advance Palermo?  
  o If so, what steps?  
  o What steps were taken to ensure that UNODC was not duplicating other efforts?  
  o How would you describe the results of integrating and leveraging different Palermo-focused efforts or resources? | 20. Budget issues  
  • Implementation  
  • Activities  
  • Staffing  
  21. Resource Leveraging  
  • Other TIP/SOM actors  
  • Other TIP/SOM activities  
  • Integration of programs/actors  
  • Partnerships  
  • Duplication/overlap |
| 10. IMPACT                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                      |
| 11. What do those who participated in GLOT55 activities regard as their primary achievements? | • What, in your opinion, have been the main achievements of GLOT55? (e.g. legal assessments, regional workshops, training materials produced)  
  o Have there been any new legislation or specific policy changes related to Palermo implemented in the wake of GLOT55 activities?  
  o If so, what are they?  
  o What evidence is there that GLOT55 contributed to this outcome? | Covered above under effectiveness                                                                 |
| 12. SUSTAINABILITY                                                               |                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                      |
| 13. To what extent are the key outcomes achieved sustainable beyond the UNODC/ GLOT55’s involvement? | • Of the achievements you listed, are there any plans in place to ensure that they continue now that GLOT55 is over? | 22. Follow-up activities  
  • Directly based on GLOT55  
  • Designed to continue GLOT55 activities (including work to progress draft TIP and SOM legislation into law) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interview, Document Review and Survey Questions</th>
<th>Coding Scheme for Qualitative Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23. New activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Initiatives arising as result of GLOT55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Related to GLOT55 but not a direct follow on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Background of the assignment:**

As the guardian of the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, UNODC is mandated to promote global adherence to it and assist Member States in implementing it.

The project GLOT55 has aimed to support selected Member States in preventing and combating human trafficking and migrant smuggling by promoting the ratification and implementation of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children (Trafficking Protocol), and the Protocol against Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air (Smuggling Protocol), both supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime. The project has aimed at further developing and disseminating existing material to customize them to the specific needs of selected beneficiary countries. The Project has also worked on the development of tools for specific countries on the basis of their identified needs thus providing them with means to properly self-implement the Trafficking and Smuggling Protocols.

The objective of the consultancy is to evaluate the GLOT55 and to draw lessons learned for future projects in partnership with the EU. The evaluation seeks to provide accountability to donors by determining whether project objectives were met and resources were wisely utilized, as well as to identify areas of improvement in a project, to get feedback, appraisal and recognition, and to attract resources toward future projects.

The evaluation criteria for the project evaluation will include relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. In addition, attention will be paid to the lessons learned, best practices, partnerships and governance. These will be connected to the project concept and design, the project implementation and deliverables (outputs and outcomes), and management issues.

The evaluators will be contracted by UNODC and cannot have previous, current or foreseen involvement with the project. The evaluators will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial.

2. **Purpose of the assignment:**

The evaluation was foreseen in the project document as per evaluation guidelines provided by the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of UNODC. It is being undertaken to evaluate the GLOT55 and to draw lessons learned for future projects in partnership with the EU. The evaluation seeks to provide accountability to donors by determining whether project objectives were met and resources were wisely utilized, as well as to identify areas of improvement in a project, to get feedback, appraisal and recognition, and to attract resources toward future projects.

3. **Specific tasks to be performed by the consultant:**

The evaluation is expected to start on 29 May 2013 and will be conducted by 2 International Evaluation Consultants. The lead consultant will allocate 46 working days and the team consultant will allocate 50 working days to complete the evaluation which includes the time for possible field visits to Central
America, Colombia, East Africa, India and Central Asia as deemed appropriate after the discussion of the evaluation plan with the HTMSS.

The consultant shall deliver the duties listed in Section 5 of this TOR and shall submit the following deliverables on time:

1. Inception report (i.e. Desk review, Methodology and scope of the evaluation, Evaluation tools, Workplan, Draft questionnaires, and etc.)

2. Draft evaluation report and presentation of preliminary findings

3. Final evaluation report and Presentation on the Final Report and Key Findings

Duty station for each International Evaluation Consultant shall be home-based with certain field visits as deemed appropriate.

4. **Expected tangible and measurable output(s):**
   
   - Inception report (i.e. Desk review, Methodology and scope of the evaluation, Evaluation tools, Workplan, Draft questionnaires, and etc.)
   
   - Preliminary valuation report and presentation of preliminary findings
   
   - Final evaluation report and Presentation of the Final Report and Key Findings