



IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL INITIATIVE TO FIGHT HUMAN TRAFFICKING (UN.GIFT)

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Summary of UN.GIFT

UN.GIFT aims to mobilize state and non-state actors to eradicate human trafficking by reducing both the vulnerability of potential victims and the demand for exploitation in all its forms; ensuring adequate protection and support to those who fall victim; and supporting the efficient prosecution of the criminals involved, while respecting the fundamental human rights of all persons.

The objectives of UN.GIFT

- 1 Prevent trafficking in persons and reduce the number of trafficked persons worldwide
- 2 Foster awareness, global commitment and action to counter human trafficking in partnership with different stakeholders
- 3 Create and strengthen support structures for victims of trafficking

Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the extent to which recommendations from the previous in-depth evaluation published in May 2011¹

¹ Some of the main recommendation from in-depth midterm independent evaluation in 2011 were: to develop a strategy that features both an agenda for global level inter-agency co-operation and region-specific agendas; to strengthen the regional dimension of UN.GIFT's work; to direct more technical assistance toward strengthening victim support structures; to make inter-agency co-operation an explicit objective and to develop a detailed pro-active stakeholder communication plan; to utilize lower cost events at the local level with more clearly defined deliverables; focus

have been implemented and incorporated into new activities under the Programme extension.

Methodology of evaluation

The evaluation team used a mix method approach. The data collection and analysis included desk review of appropriate documentation and semi-structured interviews with 34 stakeholders, direct programme observation and questionnaires sent to 56 recipients (with 46% response rate). Objectivity was built into the overall methodology by triangulating the information.

RESULTS

The main findings

a) UN.GIFT has not managed to implement the key recommendations from the May 2011 evaluation, in particular pertaining to the re-energising and re-engagement of Steering Committee (SC) members and the donor community. As a result, UN.GIFT is unsustainable in its present form.

b) However, in the context of ever decreasing funds UN.GIFT was able to achieve some results through its Joint Programmes (JPs) with most notable success in the Republic of Serbia.



Serbian Red Cross staff – winner of the small grant facility - preparing anti-human trafficking material for children.

on multi-year Programmes and allow for joint fundraising by Steering Committee members etc.

QUICK FACTS

COUNTRY:

Global

EVALUATION TEAM:

**Mr. Peter Allan
Ms. Alexandra Capello (IEU)**

PROGRAMME DURATION:
2007 - 2014

Programme Coordinator: **Ilias Chatzis**

THEMATIC PROGRAMMES:

1. Rule of Law
2. Policy and Trend Analysis
3. Prevention, treatment and reintegration, and alternative development

PROGRAMME CODE: **GLOS83**

PROGRAMME BUDGET:
USD 14,300,845

DONORS:

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, Monaco, United Arab Emirates, Sweden, Switzerland

IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES:
ILO, IOM, OHCHR, OSCE, UNICEF, UNODC

PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS:
In-depth Evaluation 2011 ([please click for the report](#))

[Please click for the full evaluation report.](#)

Main conclusions

Relevance: There is no doubt that the objectives of UN.GIFT are still relevant from a global anti-human trafficking perspective. While at the global level the interest of some SC members has eroded over time, at the country level external stakeholders assessed the UN.GIFT initiative as being relevant. UN.GIFT was perceived as very visible and had created a strong brand.

Effectiveness: Overall, where there was little or no cost involved, the UN.GIFT team has attempted to progress the recommendations on 'effectiveness'², e.g. it did (i) promote the UN.GIFT Box, the Business Leaders Award (BLA), JPs, UN.GIFT Hub and the webinar series; (ii) review the results of the small grants facility to help inform the future use of the UN Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking; (iii) use the Victim Translation Assistance tool (VITA); (iv) deliver JPs in partnership with the appropriate state agencies and civil society stakeholders. However, to what extent UN.GIFT can exploit these initiatives given the lack of current funding and the apparent disinterest of key donors and stakeholders poses immediate concern for the viable continuation of the Programme in its current form.

When the UN.GIFT team has met the barriers caused by the lack of funding and/or a lack of enthusiasm for the Programme then implementing those recommendations has proved very challenging, e.g. no baseline or needs assessment were undertaken; no fundraising strategy for inter-agency coordination and technical co-operation was developed.



Tram in Belgrade displaying anti-human trafficking information (i.e. UN GIFT Box and Red Cross of Serbia logos). Funded by the Serbia Joint Programme, it was estimated that the tram was seen by around 2,000,000 people since 18 October 2012.

Efficiency: It has proven difficult to assess the overall efficiency of UN.GIFT given that the activities have not been systematically monitored and evaluated on a cost basis due in part to the limitations of the financial system noted in the 2011 evaluation report. However, it should be noted that of UN.GIFT total funding JPs only received approximately 7.5%.

Impact: Through the Strategic Plan, UN.GIFT agreed mechanisms to achieving impact (e.g. prioritise certain activities; develop a common needs assessment and progress monitoring checklist). However, there is little evidence that

² The effectiveness recommendations can be aggregated into three broad areas: promotion of UN.GIFT outputs (i.e. UN.GIFT Box, the Business Leaders Award (BLA), Joint Programmes (JP), UN.GIFT Hub and the webinar series); management of effectiveness (i.e. baseline studies and needs assessments, the tracking of contributions, fund raising and the ability to create measurable performance and impact indicators); victim support.

these mechanisms have been meaningfully utilised primarily due to a lack of resources.

Sustainability: This evaluation concludes that UN.GIFT is unsustainable under its current structure. It further concludes that the 2011 evaluation report provided the opportunity of a new impetus to the Programme. For various reasons, most notably a lack of funding and a lack of appetite and interest from some SC members, this opportunity wasn't fully grasped.

Governance, Management and Partnerships: There are many challenges in inter agency collaboration including lack of ownership, unclear roles and responsibilities, competition for resources, antagonist agendas, no timely communication or consultation, and unclear criteria for resource distribution. UN.GIFT encountered all of these to a greater or lesser extent. In particular, incompatible rules among SC members created barriers to meaningful collaboration.

Key UN.GIFT accomplishments

UN.GIFT has established a positive brand image with many external stakeholders, in particular through its JPs. Other examples of UN.GIFT products that have made a positive impression are the Virtual Knowledge Hub, UN.GIFT Box and the Business Leaders Award.

Key Recommendation

The future of the Programme: Strong consideration should be given to closing UN.GIFT by the end of December 2014. The final 8 months of the Programme should be dedicated to:

1. Identifying which UN.GIFT initiatives are worthwhile continuing and developing.
2. Identifying alternative delivery vehicles and mechanisms for those initiatives.
3. Drawing lessons learned from the entire life cycle of the Programme to help inform other Anti Human Trafficking inter-agency co-operation Programmes.

LESSONS LEARNED

Need for UNODC to:

- Ensure that where multi-agency cooperation is required each partner is engaged through express agreements that are fully understood and that provide 'standard operating procedures' covering their involvement.
- Ensure engagement and diversification of donors at the beginning of and throughout the life span of a Programme to maintain and retain donor 'buy-in'.
- Ensure there are proper baseline studies and the subsequent development of a log-frame that details meaningful indicators for measuring outputs and outcomes.

Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU)
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
Vienna International Centre
P.O. Box 500
1400 Vienna, Austria
E-mail: ieu@unodc.org