

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME
Vienna

Mid-term independent project evaluation

**Management of the Voluntary Trust Fund
for Victims of Trafficking, Especially
Women and Children**

GLOX42
Global

December 2014



UNITED NATIONS
New York, 2014

This evaluation report was prepared by an evaluation team consisting of Phil Marshall (Team Leader), and Martina Melis (International Evaluation Expert). The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) provides normative tools, guidelines and templates to be used in the evaluation process of projects. Please find the respective tools on the IEU web site: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html>

The Independent Evaluation Unit of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime can be contacted at:

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
Vienna International Centre
P.O. Box 500
1400 Vienna, Austria
Telephone: (+43-1) 26060-0
Email: ieu@unodc.org
Website: www.unodc.org

Disclaimer

Independent Project Evaluations are scheduled and managed by the project managers and conducted by external independent evaluators. The role of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) in relation to independent project evaluations is one of quality assurance and support throughout the evaluation process, but IEU does not directly participate in or undertake independent project evaluations. It is, however, the responsibility of IEU to respond to the commitment of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) in professionalizing the evaluation function and promoting a culture of evaluation within UNODC for the purposes of accountability and continuous learning and improvement.

© United Nations, December 2014. All rights reserved worldwide.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This publication has not been formally edited.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Executive summary	iv
Summary matrix of findings, evidence and recommendations	vii
I. Introduction	01
Background and context.....	01
Evaluation methodology	03
II. Evaluation findings	07
Relevance	07
Efficiency	15
Effectiveness	20
Sustainability.....	25
III. Conclusions and lessons learned.....	27
IV. Recommendations	30
<i>Annexes</i>	
I. Terms of reference of the evaluation.....	34
II. Evaluation tools: evaluation matrix and interview guides	46
III. List of reviewed documents	60

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In August 2014, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) commissioned a three-month independent mid-term evaluation of project ‘Management of the Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking, Especially Women and Children’ (henceforth GLOX42). The purpose of the evaluation was to assess progress made in the management of the Trust Fund in the following OECD DAC-mandated areas: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability; as well as two additional areas: partnerships and cooperation; and lessons learned.¹

Background

The Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (UNVTF) was instituted by the UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/64/293 in July 2010, under the Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons. Article 38 of the Resolution on the Global Plan of Action stipulated the establishment of a Trust Fund to “*provide humanitarian, legal and financial aid to victims of trafficking in persons through established channels of assistance, such as governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations.*”²

Project GLOX42 was created to facilitate the administration of the Trust Fund, including management of the grants awarded through the Small Grants Facility (SGF) of the Trust Fund to NGOs. The project was approved in September 2011. GLOX42’s primary activities included: a) installing a permanent Trust Fund Secretariat that would assure financially sound management of the Trust Fund and its sub-instruments/initiatives/components, secure long-term funding, maintain donor liaisons and engage in continuous advocacy initiatives, draft technical criteria for fundable projects and disburse funding to implementing partners; and b) inaugurating a Small Grants Facility, thereto choosing its focus, deciding on the time margins and the maximum amount of funding disburseable, and setting the base-line criteria for applicants and fundable projects.

The Small Grant Facility was launched in March 2011 to provide support to victims of trafficking in persons. It was open to individual NGOs and consortia or coalition led by an eligible NGO. Applicants were permitted to request grants of up to USD 25,000 per year, for project proposals ranging between 6 and 36 months. The 2011 SGF received over 250 applications. Eleven NGOs were selected after the first call for proposals under the SGF to implement projects in all regions of the world. The selected NGOs are required to provide an annual progress report and are currently in their third and final year of implementation.

The GLOX42 project document was revised in 2013. The revision extended the project to December 2016 and revised the logical framework of the project. An increased budget allocation for 2014 and forecasts for 2015 and 2016, allowed a second call for proposals to be implemented under the Small Grants Facility in mid-2014.

The original GLOX42 project document stipulated that: “an independent evaluation of the Trust Fund’s operations must be conducted biennially. The 2013 revision amended the timing of the independent evaluation, stating that: “an independent evaluation of the project will be conducted at the end of the first-grant making cycle ... (envisaged in late 2014 or early 2015).” This mid-term evaluation addresses that requirement.

¹ The evaluation did not address the DAC criterion of Impact.

² Article 38 further stated that the Trust Fund would operate “as a subsidiary fund of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Fund managed by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.”

Using the DAC Criteria to structure the evaluation, the independent team developed a set of research questions to guide assessment of UNVTF, drawing on the draft list of evaluation questions provided in the TOR as a starting point. The team used these research questions to develop an evaluation matrix, which served as the basis for developing a set of analytic codes to organize and assess GLOX42 documents and materials and original data; and tailored interview guides for three primary stakeholder groups, namely UNODC and Board Members, NGOs grantees and Donors. The data was analysed and examined relationally to inform the development of the evaluation findings and recommendations and the overall drafting of this evaluation report.

The evaluation findings have some key limitations. These include: the limited representativeness of NGOs respondents, a very low response rate from donors; the focus on key institutional stakeholders; the liming of the evaluation; and the lack of one consistent overview of the UNVTF development since its start. More details about study limitations are included in Section I: ‘Limitations’. Despite these limitations, the research yielded compelling data from which to draw findings and develop recommendations about the UNVTF.

Evaluation Findings

The UNVTF was established in recognition of unmet clear needs for victims of trafficking in persons globally. The need for increased and on-going resources in this area is not disputed by any stakeholder, and reinforced by the receipt of 250 proposals in response to the first Call for Proposals. In this sense, the UNVTF meets a clear need. At the same time, the Trust Fund has yet to identify a clear niche for itself, and distinguish how it adds value to the range of other potential sources of support for victims of trafficking and the broader issue of slavery. At present, for example, there appear few activities supported by the UNVTF that would not qualify for support from the Slavery Fund, and the UNVTF is not backed by either strong institutional expertise in the specific area of victim support, or by a strong on-the-ground presence, which would facilitate both the setting of priorities and the monitoring of activities. As a result, there remains a challenge for UNVTF fundraising efforts to answer the ‘why’ question, that is why a donor should choose to support the UNVTF over other initiatives or over direct funding of NGOs.

The issue of value added has been recognised since the outset of the UNVTF and respondents involved in its development report initial discussions on positioning the Trust Fund as promoting good practice in the area of victim assistance, supported by the issuance of grants to well-established NGOs with a proven track record. To date, however, the Trust Fund has not evolved in a manner that enables it to identify and share good practice, even among its grantees. Recognizing that UNODC’s prime area of TIP expertise lies in the area of criminal justice, several respondents suggested that the UNVTF might centre its support around legal assistance to ensure remedy and redress for victims – an area of demonstrated need, which is not necessarily being well covered by other donors.

The issue of resource availability hangs over all Trust Fund activities. The Trust has raised \$1.7 million in its first four years, including almost \$400,000 from private sector sources, using a range of innovative approaches. While respondents regard this as a credible and significant amount, current funding falls considerably short of what is needed to allow Fund operational costs to be covered while simultaneously ensuring that the large proportion of funds continue to be allocated to direct assistance to victims.

To date, UNODC has been subsidising the operational costs of the Trust but its ongoing capacity to do so is limited. The new Trust Board has recognised the importance of an appropriately resourced Secretariat and a decision needs to be made as to whether this should be primarily funded from UNVTF contributions or whether specific Secretariat funding should be sought, for example from a strongly

supportive donor. It is worth noting that after 20 years of operation, the Slavery Fund is not close to covering its management costs, relying on OHCHR regular budgetary support and cross-subsidisation by the Torture Fund.

Within the constraints originating from the lack of an initial UNVTF feasibility study and the subsequent mismatch between the Trust Fund aspirations and available resources, UNODC and Trust Board members have made strong efforts towards establishing the UNVTF as a credible entity. A review of documentation and stakeholder interviews suggests the work of those involved has been characterized by considerable reflection and, as a result, the Trust Fund has evolved in response to experience and lessons learned. The issues and constraints identified in this evaluation are largely well recognized by key Trust Fund actors as shown by the framing of the evaluation TOR.

This internal learning has not to date been matched by learning from experience of other actors. Despite attempts to liaise more closely with the Slavery Fund in particular, the Trust Fund has missed opportunities to learn from the experiences of other programmes, notably in the area of grant selection, as well as sharing ideas and even resources on monitoring and resource mobilisation. One consequence is that, while changes made for the second Call for Proposals are likely to bring about significant improvements in efficiency and transparency, the Trust Fund does not appear to have fully considered the wastage involved in a process that generates 250 proposals for 11 grants – either in terms of the UNVTF/UNODC resources to appraise these proposals, or in terms of the NGO resources to write them. The US J/TIP Office and the UN Democracy Fund, both of which operate a two-step application process, have insights into grant-making that might have proved extremely useful.

Monitoring of grants is recognised by respondents as limited. Considerable discussion has taken place on the need to allow more site visits and various solutions have been identified including the use of staff from other agencies. At the same time, even with standard site visit forms, the outcomes of such visits can be quite person dependent. Close collaboration with other funding partners and the opportunistic use of UNODC staff and Board members on missions may allow increased site monitoring without taking away significant resources from victim assistance. Several stakeholders have also suggested that improvements could be made to remote monitoring processes through more regular communication, something NGOs said they would welcome.

With regard to sustainability, there was general agreement among stakeholders that the DAC conceptualisation of sustainability as ensuring ongoing benefits beyond grant life could not be readily applied to the type of assistance provided by the Trust. This is not fully reflected in project documentation, however, and the treatment of the sustainability issue appears to be somewhat piecemeal. One interpretation of sustainability, which might fit with a focus on promoting good practice, is to look for programmes that offer durable solutions, for example in being feasibly scalable within realistically available resources.

Overall, the Fund has made credible progress in its first three years, underlined by the fact that the results of its fund-raising efforts are already almost on a par with the Slavery Fund – which has been in operation for a much longer period of time – and by the very positive feedback received from grantees. UNVTF management has proved adept at identifying gaps and weaknesses and taken strong steps to address these. At the same time, the evaluation found some lack of alignment in decisions made throughout the life of the Trust and across different areas of its operation. For example, an early focus on developing and demonstrating a proven track record has not been supported by subsequent reporting and fund-raising efforts. Further, the focus on grassroots organizations in the second Call for Proposals, while an attempt to promote sustainability, appears to have been taken independently of decisions on the proposal process, which seems to favour English-speaking organisations with existing experience in preparing proposals for

international organizations.

These examples are perhaps reflective of the lack of an overarching template for decision-making. Such a framework has may be provided by the establishment and articulation of a clear niche for the Fund. The evaluation team has identified this is one of the two most important priorities for the Trust, alongside an assessment of the Fund ' s long-term financial viability. This is reflected in the three Key Recommendations for the UNVTF, which address its added value, the role of UNODC in supporting the Fund, and the preparedness of member States to provide the Fund with sufficient resources to enable it to function in line with the expectations of these States as articulated in Article 38.

Twelve further primary, crosscutting recommendations are provided covering: 1) value added of the UNVTF; 2) ongoing viability and resource mobilization; 3) promoting cooperation and collaboration; and 4) grant monitoring, evaluation and sustainability. These are presented in the *Summary Matrix of Findings, Evidence and Recommendations* below, linked to their relevant findings. The relevance of recommendations 2,3,4 and 8 is to some extent contingent on the adoption or non-adoption of the key recommendations. However, interim decisions could be made on the remaining recommendations and progress made in their implementation while the longer-term issues raised by the key recommendations are considered and addressed.

SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings ³	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations ⁴
Key recommendations		
<p>The UNVTF has not clearly defined its comparative advantage or distinguishing features from other funds supporting victims of trafficking, particularly the UN Slavery Fund.</p>	<p>Interviews (UNODC, Board Members, NGOs, Donors, others); Document review</p>	<p>Rec. 1: Determine and articulate the value added of the UNVTF and use this to guide UNVTF decision-making.</p> <p><i>Responsible party: UNVTF Board</i></p> <p>Rec. 6: Consider presenting a paper to UNODC management outlining Fund requirements and options and seeking clarification about whether UNVTF management is an organisational priority for UNODC.</p>
<p>UNVTF has not been provided with the resources necessary to fulfil Article 38 of 2010 GA Resolution A/RES/64/293</p>	<p>Interviews (UNODC, Board Members); Document review</p>	<p><i>Responsible party: UNVTF Board with support from UNVTF Fund Manager</i></p> <p>Rec. 7: Based on the responses of UNODC management, consider presenting member States with scenarios for the future of the UNVTF. These scenarios may set out the basic resource requirements for the UNVTF to function in line with Article 38. Should member States be unwilling to commit to these requirements, consider merging the remaining UNVTF resources with the UN Slavery Fund.</p> <p><i>Responsible party: UNODC Senior Management</i></p>

³ A finding uses evidence from data collection to allow for a factual statement.

⁴ Recommendations are proposals aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of a project/programme; at redesigning the objectives; and/or at the reallocation of resources. For accuracy and credibility, recommendations should be the logical implications of the findings and conclusions.

Findings ³	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations ⁴
Important Recommendations		
The UNVTF addresses a clear need for assistance to victims of trafficking in persons.	Interviews (UNODC, Board Members, NGOs, Donors, others); Document review	<p>Rec. 4: The UNVTF should continue to focus on support for NGOs through a small grants facility. UNVTF should consider aligning the criteria for grant selection with the overall strategy of the Fund.</p> <p><i>Responsible party: UNVTF Board with support from UNVTF Fund Manager</i></p>
Stakeholders, on balance, consider that the UNVTF should continue to focus exclusively on support for NGOs at the present time.	Interviews (UNODC, Board Members, NGOs, Donors, others); Document review	
The thematic priorities for the Small Grant Facility have deliberately been set broadly to encompass most forms of assistance to victims.	Interviews (UNODC, Board Members); Document review	
The Small Grants Facility is an appropriate and efficient mechanism for disbursement of UNVTF funds.	Interviews (UNODC, Board Members, NGOs, Donors, others); Document review	
The UNVTF has not clearly defined its comparative advantage or distinguishing features from other funds supporting victims of trafficking, particularly the UN Slavery Fund.	Interviews (UNODC, Board Members, NGOs, Donors, others); Document review	<p>Rec. 2: Consider whether UNODC's recognised role as the guardian of the TIP Protocol provides an opportunity for the UNVTF to establish a niche as identifying and promoting good practice in the area of victim support.</p> <p><i>Responsible party: UNVTF Board with support from UNVTF Fund Manager</i></p> <p>Rec.3: Consider whether an emphasis on legal remedies, with links to UNODC's criminal justice focus might provide a clear niche for the UNVTF.</p> <p><i>Responsible party: UNVTF Board with support from UNVTF Fund Manager</i></p>
The UNVTF is currently deriving limited added value from its location in UNODC.	Interviews (UNODC, Board Members, one donor); Document review	
Despite attempts to define a fundraising strategy, important fund-raising issues remain unresolved. As well as the value added of the UNVTF, these include the financing of operational costs, targeting of fundraising efforts, and organizational barriers to private	Interviews (UNODC, Board Members); Document review	<p>Rec. 5: Continue current efforts to identify and cost the staffing levels and skills needed to meet the basic requirements of UNVTF operation and monitoring.</p> <p><i>Responsible party: UNVTF Fund Manager with support from UNVTF Board</i></p>

Findings ³	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations ⁴
sector fundraising.		<p>Rec. 8: Consider expanding options for private sector support, including innovative ways of private sector assistance to TIP victims, as well as menu-based options for earmarked funding.</p> <p><i>Responsible party: UNVTF Board with support from UNVTF Fund Manager</i></p> <p>See also Recommendation 1.</p>
UNVTF stakeholders appear effective in identifying and responding to lessons learned within GLOX42.	Interviews (UNODC, Board Members); Document review	<p>Rec.9: Consider establishing an informal network of major international funding mechanisms that provide support for victims of trafficking.</p>
The UNVTF has not made strong progress in establishing partnerships or creating synergies, either with other programmes assisting victims of trafficking, or between the organisations supported by the Fund. Among the consequences has been a failure to learn from, and capitalize on, lessons learned externally.	Interviews (UNODC, one Board Member, NGOs, Donors, others); Document review	<p><i>Responsible party: UNVTF Fund Manager</i></p> <p>Rec. 10: Consider establishing a network of grantees with a view to sharing experiences and lessons learned and potentially identifying and adapting good practices.</p> <p><i>Responsible party: UNVTF Fund Manager</i></p>
Monitoring of projects is recognised by stakeholders to be limited and hindered by lack of resources.	Interviews (UNODC, Board Members, NGOs); Document review	<p>Rec. 11: Continue current efforts to develop an M&E framework for grants to ensure data collection is in line with overall UNVTF objectives while not placing an undue burden on NGOs.</p> <p><i>Responsible party: UNVTF Fund Manager with support from UNVTF Board</i></p>
Grantees consider UNVTF processes to be efficient and, in comparison with other funding sources, “user friendly”.	Interviews (NGOs,); Document review	<p>Rec.12: Consider strengthening current remote monitoring efforts, including through routinely providing feedback on reports and possibly a tranche based payment system linked to milestones.</p> <p><i>Responsible parties: UNVTF Fund Manager</i></p> <p>Rec. 14: Develop an opportunity-based system for monitoring visits.</p> <p><i>Responsible party: UNVTF Fund Manager</i></p>

Findings³	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations⁴
		<i>with support from UNVTF Board</i>
The UNVTF does not have mechanisms in place to assess the relevance of thematic priorities to the end beneficiaries.	Interviews (UNODC, Board Members, NGOs); Document review	Rec. 13: Require all grantees to institute an appropriate and ethical system for soliciting victim feedback. <i>Responsible party: UNVTF Fund Manager</i>
The UNVTF has not defined and addressed the concept of sustainability as it pertains to its activities.	Interviews (UNODC, Board Members, NGOs); Document review	Rec 15: Consider clearly defining a concept of sustainability appropriate to the activities supported by the UNVTF. <i>Responsible party: UNVTF Board with support from UNVTF Fund Manager</i>

I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents findings from a mid-term evaluation of United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) project ‘Management of the Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking, Especially Women and Children’ (henceforth GLOX42). The evaluation was commissioned in August 2014 and covers the period from July 2010 to 31 July 2014.

Background and Context – GLOX42

The Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (UNVTF) was instituted by the UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/64/293 in July 2010, under the Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons. The United Nations Global Plan of Action was an initiative of Belarus and the Group of Friends United Against Human Trafficking.⁵ Article 38 of the Resolution on the Global Plan of Action stipulated the establishment of a Trust Fund to “*provide humanitarian, legal and financial aid to victims of trafficking in persons through established channels of assistance, such as governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations.*”⁶

Project GLOX42 was created to facilitate the administration of the Trust Fund and was approved in September 2011. The project’s original estimated duration was 18 months. (27 September 2011 to 26 March 2013). In 2013, GLOX42 was revised and its duration was extended until December 2016.

The original GLOX42 objective was to “create and strengthen support structures for victims of trafficking in persons.” There were two associated outcomes:

Outcome 1: The Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children is managed as effectively and sustainably as possible, and

Outcome 2: Establish funding instruments which respond to urgent temporal and local challenges, strengthening front-line support providers, principally NGOs.

GLOX42’s primary activities included: a) installing a permanent Trust Fund Secretariat that would assure financially sound management of the Trust Fund and its sub-instruments/initiatives/components, secure long-term funding, maintain donor liaisons and engage in continuous advocacy initiatives, draft technical criteria for fundable projects and disburse funding to implementing partners; and b) inaugurating a Small

⁵ The Group of Friends is composed of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Libya, Nicaragua, Nigeria, the Philippines, Qatar, Russia, Singapore, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, UAE, Uzbekistan and Venezuela.

⁶ Article 38 further stated that the Trust Fund would operate “as a subsidiary fund of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Fund managed by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and be administered in accordance with the Financial Regulations and Rules of the United Nations and other relevant provisions, with the advice of a board of trustees composed of five person with relevant experience in the field of trafficking in persons who shall be appointed with due regard to equitable geographical distribution by the Secretary-General in consultation with Member States and the Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.”

Grants Facility, thereto choosing its focus, deciding on the time margins and the maximum amount of funding disburseable, and setting the base-line criteria for applicants and fundable projects. Noticeably, the concept of urgency as embedded in outcome 2 never became a funding determinant. This concept has disappeared from GLOX42 documentation.

In 2013, GLOX42 was revised. The project document attributes this revision to an increased budget allocation for 2014 and forecasts for 2015 and 2016⁷, allowing a second call for proposals to be implemented under the Small Grants Facility. The revised project document also states that the revision provided “the opportunity to improve the logical framework of the project by defining outcomes more accurately, including more relevant outputs and activities tailored to achieve these outcomes” . The revision extended the duration of the project to 31 December 2016.

In the new GLOX42 project document, the project objectives were re-formulated as to:

- 1) enable the provision of humanitarian, legal and financial aid to victims of trafficking in persons by the UN Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking, through established channels of assistance, such as governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations;
- 2) promote cooperation among Member States, governmental institutions, civil society and the private sector in support of victims of trafficking, as set out in the Global Plan of Action; and
- 3) reach out to state and non-state actors such as the private sector for contributions to the Fund.

These objectives are to be achieved by:

- Outcome 1: The Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children is managed effectively and sustainably
- Outcome 2: Grants programme established to deliver assistance to victims of human trafficking, focusing on front-line support providers, principally NGOs.
- Outcome 3: A high-profile Board of Trustees provides strong and coherent strategic guidance

Review of the original GLOX42 logical framework suggests that the framework neither clearly hypothesized nor documented the relationship or link between project inputs, planned outputs, and desired outcomes. It also did not include clear and appropriate indicators of progress related to outputs and outcome. These issues have not been fully resolved in the project revision. Data from both documents and interviews further suggests that the first project document has not significantly guided UNVTF development.

This evaluation report is organized into the following sections: Section II includes the primary findings of the assessment, organized by the OECD Development Assistance Criteria. 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. Section III offers conclusions and lessons learned based on the study findings. The report concludes with Section IV, which provides a set of recommendations to inform the future development of the Trust Fund. Annex I contains the original Terms of Reference. Annex II contains the Evaluation Matrix and interview guides. Annex III contains the list of documents reviewed for this assignment.

⁷ As per GLOX42 2013 revised project document, the proposed increase to the overall project budget is USD 2,290,093. With the extended duration of GLOX42 to 5 years 3 months, the new overall budget for the revised project is USD 3,483,373

Objective and scope of the evaluation

The original GLOX42 project document stipulated that: “an independent evaluation of the Trust Fund’s operations must be conducted biennially. The evaluation assesses the functioning of the Trust Fund as a whole, against the objectives of the Trust Fund as stated in the ‘Global Plan of Action’ and the TOR, looking at both substantive and operational issues”. The 2013 project revision amended the timing of the independent evaluation, stating that: “an independent evaluation of the project will be conducted at the end of the first-grant making cycle, instead of biennially (envisaged in late 2014 or early 2015).” This mid-term evaluation addresses that requirement.

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to assess progress made in the management of the Trust Fund in the following OECD DAC-mandated areas: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. As per this evaluation’s TOR, (see Annex I), two additional evaluation areas were included: partnerships and cooperation; and lessons learned. Issues pertaining to these two additional criteria have been answered within the overarching DAC area of efficiency.

Evaluation methodology

The evaluation team developed a set of research questions designed to examine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, partnerships and cooperation, lessons learned and sustainability of GLOX42. The team used as a starting point the draft list of evaluation questions provided in the TOR. From this list, and in consultation with the Fund Manager, the team omitted a question on the impact of Trust Fund grants, which was outside the evaluation focus on “the structural and managerial aspects of the Trust Fund”.⁸ Another TOR question focused on the extent that Trust Fund is proving effective in fulfilling its objective to assist victims of human trafficking. The team had no basis on which to make an objective assessment on this point. As such, the question was modified to be a reflection of stakeholder views on the Trust Fund effectiveness. Other proposed questions were subsumed into more over-arching primary research questions and appear as data collection questions.

The evaluation employed the following methodologies to address the study’s research questions: (1) review and analysis of key project documents from GLOX42 and other TIP funding mechanisms⁹; and (2) semi-structured, in-person and telephone interviews with staff from UNODC, current and ex-Board Members, NGO recipients of Trust Fund grants, donors and personnel involved in the operations of other relevant TIP funding mechanisms.¹⁰

⁸ Further, as is common with anti-TIP projects, the grants have not defined impacts in a way that is readily measurable.

⁹ These included: the UN Voluntary Trust Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery, the IOM Global Assistance Fund, the US JTIP International Grants Program, the EC DEVCO/IFRC project to promote and protect the rights of migrants moving between developing countries under the Global Public Goods and Challenges Programme, preliminary documents on the establishment of the Walk Free Foundation Global Fund to End Slavery.

¹⁰ An online survey was also considered to widen the scope of data collection. However, as the interview list contained a majority of those significantly involved with the Fund, this idea was dropped in discussion with UNODC.

Using the DAC Criteria to structure the evaluation, the independent team developed a set of research questions to guide assessment of UNVTF, drawing on the draft list of evaluation questions provided in the TOR as a starting point. As required by the original TOR, questions on partnerships and cooperation, and lessons learned were also included. The team used these research questions to develop an evaluation matrix, which served as the basis for developing (1) a set of analytic codes to organize and assess GLOX42 documents and materials and original data, and (2) tailored interview guides for three primary stakeholder groups, namely 1) UNODC and Board Members, 2) NGOs grantees and 3) Donors ¹¹ (Annex II).

Data collection took place between August and October 2014. In all, more than 60 documents were reviewed and 31 stakeholders interviewed across all respondent groups. The two primary data types were analysed to identify key patterns, findings, and themes and developed into a set of evidence-backed findings and recommendations. These analytical results informed the drafting of the evaluation report. UNODC provided initial feedback on the draft report, which has been incorporated into a revised draft. The draft report findings and recommendations were then presented and discussed with UNODC and the Board at the UNVTF Board Meeting, held in Vienna on 21-22 November 2014. This report has been revised to reflect discussions held in Vienna and incorporate final comments provided by the UNODC IEU.

Desk Review

At the time of this report, the evaluation team has reviewed more than 60 documents. These include: project documents and progress reports prepared by UNODC HQs, Trust Fund documents and papers such as Terms of Reference, Governance and Funding papers, Fundraising and Resource Mobilization Strategies, Small Grants Facility Guidelines and Application Forms, the Minutes of ten Boards Meetings, Annual Trust Fund Progress Reports, other Trust Funds background documents and funding guidelines, SGF grantees applications and annual reports. The review of documents served to increase the understanding of the evaluators of the structure, activities and objectives of the Trust Fund and of its management by UNODC, and informed the development of the research instruments.

As well as increasing the research team's understanding of the structure, activities, and objectives of GLOX42, and informing the development of study instruments, the review contributed key data to the analysis of GLOX42 results. The study documents along with the qualitative interviews were coded according to the analysis coding structure developed to organize and assess project documents and materials. The results of this analysis were used to explore and validate findings that emerged from analysis of the interview data.

Stakeholder Interviews

In order to gain insight into the structure, objectives, and results of GLOX42, the evaluators conducted telephone and in-person interviews with a range of key stakeholders. Their input provided informed historical and current perspectives on multiple aspects of GLOX42, including its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, efforts to foster partnerships and coordination with other relevant actors, lessons learned and the sustainability of its achievements. A total of 31 stakeholders were interviewed. Twenty-nine stakeholders were interviewed by telephone, with two of them providing additional written responses due

¹¹ The interview guide developed to interview UNODC staff and Board Members was used to broadly guide the interviews with personnel involved with other TIP funding mechanisms.

to time constraints that did not allow the telephone interview to be concluded. Two respondents provided their responses in writing only. Interviewed stakeholders included UNODC staff directly and indirectly involved with the Trust Fund Management; current and former Members of the Board, NGOs who received grants from the first SGF funding round, Donors, and Personnel involved with the UN Slavery Fund and other TIP funding initiatives.

Analytic Methods and Approach

Analysis of project documents and stakeholder interviews was focussed on addressing research questions and determining the Trust Fund's progress made to date. The evaluators examined the data to assess progress made by UNVTF and how UNVTF activities have contributed to progress the overall objectives of the Trust Fund. This included examining project outputs and outcomes in relation to study research questions in the context of the DAC criteria.

Primary themes that were confirmed across data sources served as the study's findings and were used to develop responses to each research question based on those themes and patterns most frequently cited across respondents and respondent types. Each evaluator 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 evaluators met to discuss and determine the strength of the evidence for each candidate finding. Once a set of findings was identified, these were used to develop a set of recommendations to inform the future development of the Trust Fund.

Taken together, the data collection and analysis activities described here have provided in-depth information to address the mid-term evaluation questions regarding the functioning, management and future of the Trust Fund.

Limitations

The evaluation team identified five limitations. These are described below, along with the steps taken to address these limitations:

1. *Timing of the Evaluation was too late to inform the second SGF funding call.* The second Call for Proposals was issued on 30 July 2014 before this evaluation could be completed. The evaluation team sought to offset some of this problem by informally providing recommendations to UNODC based on the review of initial documents. Feedback from UNODC was that these recommendations helped to inform the guidelines for the call.
2. *Stakeholder bias.* The evaluation team interviewed only NGOs who received funding from the Fund. This cohort is not necessarily representative of all NGOs with potential to access the Fund. The team considered the feasibility of interviewing a wider field of NGOs but decided that this issue would best be addressed through adequate attention to the relational analysis of data. Further, there was a risk that NGO responses would be influenced by perceptions of implications for further funding. To address this, the team made sure that all NGOs informants understood that responses would be kept confidential, that no comments would be attributed to specific individuals during the reporting and presentation process, and that there was no direct or indirect link between this evaluation and the grantees selection under the next round of SGF.
3. *Limited donors' perspective.* Despite numerous attempts to establish contact with the Trust Fund's main donors, donor responses were minimal. The donor cohort that is included in this evaluation is too small to be representative of actual or potential donors to the Fund.

4. *High turnover of UNVTF management staff.* As a result of high turnover, there was not one consistent overview of the Trust Fund development, strategy and progress since its start.¹² To address the issue, the team interviewed former Board members as well as staff that had been involved throughout the Fund, including those who now have different positions, or are no longer with UNODC.
5. *The evaluation is limited to the views and experiences of key 'institutional' stakeholders.* It thus does not include views and perspectives of the victims that have been assisted through the grants allocated by the SGF. While this could not be addressed within the evaluation, the team has sought to identify ways in which the Fund can better seek and draw on victim views in future.

The evaluation team adopted a number of strategies to minimise the potential effects of these limitations. These included: ensuring that NGO (and other) respondents informants understood that responses would be kept confidential, and that no comments would be attributed to specific individuals during the reporting and presentation process; interviewing former Board Members and UNODC staff and ex-staff involved in early UNVTF development; and informally providing recommendations to UNODC for the second Call for Proposals. While the issue of victim feedback could not be addressed within the evaluation, the team has sought to identify ways in which the Fund could better seek and draw on victim views in future.

¹² UNODC also no longer has contract details of some early private donors. The team did not attempt to reach these donors but rather focused on more recent donors.

II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

This section describes the primary findings from the evaluation of the UNVTF. The findings discuss – and are organized by – the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of UNVTF activities and outcomes. Findings pertaining to the additional criteria of partnerships and cooperation, and lessons learned are included under the efficiency category. Findings 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 documentation. Where respondents and documents differed in their views on the substance or characteristics of an issue, each differing point of view is included. The study findings are set off by a bullet point and appear in italics to indicate their status as a finding.

Relevance

This section addresses research questions relating to UNVTF 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 documents and from diverse respondents. In answering the questions on relevance, this section also addresses evaluation sub-questions on the development of the UNVTF and its relationship with UNODC Project GLOX42 – Management of the Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children.

1. To what extent does the UNVTF respond to a clearly identified need?

- *The UNVTF addresses a clear need for assistance to victims of trafficking in persons.*

Available documentation and stakeholders place the origins of the UNVTF in a number of resolutions that called for the strengthening of international cooperation to combat trafficking in persons.¹³ The ‘Group of Friends United against Human Trafficking’ comprising 21 states from all regions of the world was created in 2010 at the initiative of the Government of Belarus. This Group sought to operationalize the UN resolutions and consolidate cooperative anti-trafficking efforts, primarily through the elaboration of a Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons (GPA), developed with support from the UNODC Liaison Office in New York. UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/64/293 Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons was adopted at the Sixty-fourth UN General Assembly meeting in July 2010.

The Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children, was established by Article 38 of this Resolution. A respondent involved in the negotiation process highlighted that Members States wanted to establish an immediate mechanism for the provision of direct assistance to

¹³ The full list of these resolutions is included in the GPA resolution, accessible at http://www.unodc.org/documents/humantrafficking/United_Nations_Global_Plan_of_Action_to_Combat_Trafficking_in_Persons.pdf

victims that would be a ‘light’ mechanism, responsive to needs and without high overheads. While the existence of the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery (Slavery Fund) was acknowledged by Member States, and some Member States reportedly expressed concern at possible duplication, various respondents highlighted concerns that this Fund was “dormant,” “not exclusively dedicated to victims of trafficking” and subject to political influences related its location in the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.

In supporting “the provision of humanitarian, legal and financial aid to victims of trafficking through channels of assistance such as governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations,” Article 38 provides wide scope for the UNVTF, while being short on specifics. No attempt was made, for example, to estimate core running costs of the Fund nor to identify how these would be met while maintaining a commitment directing the funds to victims with minimal overhead costs. This is discussed further in section II.7.

As the designated Fund Manager, UNODC established project GLOX42 to facilitate the administration of the Trust Fund. The GLOX42 project document provided the basic structure for the Fund, but does not appear to have acted as a guiding document for the Fund’s evolution. The second of its two outcomes, for example, includes the intention to “establish funding instruments which respond to **urgent temporal and local challenges**” (emphasis added). No further reference is made to this intention in any document. Rather, the Board pursued the adoption of a small grants facility as a way of ensuring a relatively quick start to Fund disbursement, building on previous UNODC experience with the UN.GIFT Small Grants Facility.

The provision of financial support to NGOs specifically working on victim support through the Small Grants Facility (SGF) was deemed the most effective means to provide support to victims, achieve specific results in the shortest time possible and thus to illustrate the potential of the Fund. The Board further considered that the SGF, through periodical issuing of grants, would allow the Trust Fund to be dynamic and responsive to changing priorities and concerns within the global community.

Responses across all documentation and stakeholder groups highlighted the importance of support for victims of trafficking and the on-going resource needs in this area. As evidenced by the receipt of 250 proposals in response to the first Call for Proposals – a number achieved despite several last minute administrative and human resource hitches – and 113 proposals in response to the second Call, evaluation respondents highlighted a significant gap between the level of resources needed for victim support services and the amount of resources currently available. Although, as described in Section II.3, other sources of victim support exist, NGO respondents in two cases highlighted that the type of assistance provided by the Trust Fund was not available from other sources. One interviewee, for example, noted that although her NGO currently had 17 different TIP-related projects, with multiple donors, the UNVTF was the only possible source of support to take forward a major legal case. Another respondent commented that in her country “there is no dedicated mechanism for action towards victims of TIP. When applying for funding, we need to include trafficking under other issues.” Other NGO respondents highlighted how the UNVTF was used to complement existing funds from other sources in order for them to better serve their target populations.

- *Stakeholders, on balance, consider that the UNVTF should continue to focus exclusively on support for NGOs at the present time.*

Article 38 expressly mentions governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations as possible channels through which assistance may be provided to victims of trafficking. Thus far, the

UNVTF has focused exclusively on NGOs. Several evaluation respondents raised the possibility of the UNVTF supporting governments as a way to (1) increase government responsibility and accountability and (2) promote longer-term sustainability. One interviewee suggested a potential comparative advantage for the UNVTF would be in evolving into an inter-governmental mechanism that promoted shared accountability, including through the process of reporting to the UN General Assembly.

The majority of respondents, however, favoured a continuation of support to NGOs, on the basis that NGOs remain underfunded, that they are the first point of call for most victims, are often more trusted than governments and have stronger experience overall in the provision of assistance. Multiple respondents felt that although more support was needed for governments, this should not be the role of the UNVTF, as summed up by the following quote: "institutionalization should be running in parallel but at the moment governments are incapable, therefore (it is) good to keep the focus on NGOs." Thus, while there was widespread recognition that support for governments could promote sustainability in the long-term, respondents across all types almost universally considered that support for governments was, at best, premature, and that assistance should remain focused on NGOs for the feasible future.

2. To what extent is the UN Trust Fund relevant to its key stakeholders?

- *The thematic priorities for the Small Grants Facility have deliberately been set broadly to encompass most forms of assistance to victims.*
- *The UNVTF does not have mechanisms in place to assess the relevance of these priorities to the end beneficiaries.*

The thematic priorities for the first call for proposals in 2011 were:

1. Cross-border and inter-regional activities providing direct humanitarian, legal and/or financial assistance to victims.
2. Effective remedies for victims of human trafficking, including, but not limited to, legal support, access to justice and compensation.

In 2014, the thematic priorities were revisited and further specified as:

1. **Direct, effective and sustainable** remedies for victims of human trafficking, with an emphasis on assistance delivery by **grassroots organizations**, including, but not limited to, housing, food, legal aid, access to justice, psychosocial support, medical care, training and sustainable livelihoods.
2. Humanitarian, financial and/or legal assistance to victims of cross border and interregional trafficking, **with an emphasis on activities in developing countries** (emphasis added).

As indicated by the bolded text, the major changes involved (1) emphasizing that funds were for victim support, exclusive of activities such as lobbying and capacity building, (2) introducing the concept of sustainability and (3) specifying an emphasis on grassroots organizations in developing countries.

Some UNODC staff and Board Members involved during the first Call for Proposals stated that the UNVTF pursued an approach aimed at building up a track record for the Fund through targeting established NGOs and promoting good practice. In pursuit of this objective, the broad nature of the thematic priorities allowed them to be relevant to a wide range of organizations and needs, and thus generate a high number of fundable proposals. Other respondents, however, described the process leading to the setting of thematic priorities as undertaken without any data to support particular (or proposed) choices and without any involvement of external actors. This led some respondents to view the process for the identification and decision of thematic priorities as lacking objectivity and a solid evidence base.

The increased specification of the priorities for the second round reflects lessons learned from the first call but still does not appear to draw on input from NGOs or other sources.

To date, the UNVTF does not have a system for soliciting feedback from NGOs on the relevance of its thematic priorities, nor for gaining feedback from NGOs beyond basic reporting requirements. Further, the Fund does not attempt to seek feedback from victims who are the end beneficiaries of the Fund, nor to require its grantees to do so. As such, there is no real way of objectively assessing the relevance of supported activities to victims. While this is a shortcoming in the counter-TIP field generally,¹⁴ at least one grantee, Different and Equal, has an established system in place to solicit feedback from the victims it assists.

The failure to identify and promote this innovative initiative appears a lost opportunity for UNVTF in relation to its initial aspiration to promote good practice. Assisting and requiring grantees to establish a similar system of victim feedback, adapted for different cultural settings, would have allowed the Trust to demonstrate value added, while also providing valuable feedback internally on the views of victims across all of its grants.¹⁵

Taken together, data relating to the setting of thematic priorities suggest that they are deliberately broad to generate a wide range of possible proposals. Along with a decision to support established and well-known NGOs, this was seen by Board members and UNODC staff as maximising the possibility of establishing Fund credibility. The broad nature of the thematic priorities has, by nature, ensured that they are relevant to selected NGOs. At the same time, opportunities have not been taken to seek more refined feedback, from NGOs, from other sources and particularly from victims, despite at least one grantee having a system in place to do so.

3. What is the value added of the Trust Fund vis-à-vis other similar donor sources?

- *The UNVTF has not clearly defined its comparative advantage or distinguishing features from other funds supporting victims of trafficking, particularly the UN Slavery Fund.*

The UNVTF is one of at least five multi-country funding sources that can be accessed for the support of victims of trafficking. Sources pre-dating the UNVTF are the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery (hereafter referred to as the Slavery Fund), the IOM Global Assistance Fund (GAF) and the US Government J/TIP International Grants Program to Combat Trafficking in Persons. Recently, the EC has initiated a new project under the Global Public Goods and Challenges Programme of DG DEVCO. The project, in partnership with the International Federation of the Red Cross (IFRC) is currently being finalized, and includes the provision of assistance to civil society organisations (CSOs) working on assistance to migrants, with special attention given to victims of trafficking. A brief overview of these five funds is included in Table 1.¹⁶

¹⁴ Liberty Asia, 2014. From Experience. How to Combat Slavery in Our Generation, Hong Kong.

¹⁵ An alternative for seeking victim feedback is directly interviewing victims through monitoring visits. However, as noted in UNODC's Toolkit to Toolkit to Combat Trafficking in Persons (p.314), this raises a number of ethical questions, and requires appropriately trained interviewers with sufficient time to build a relationship with the victims.

¹⁶ The table does not include two new funds that are currently under development. The Freedom Fund is an initiative by Humanity United, the Legatum Foundation and Walk Free Foundation. Its website reports "an emphasis on providing resources to grassroots organizations working on the front lines to free and rehabilitate survivors of trafficking." <http://www.freedomfund.org>. The Walk Free Foundation has also initiated the Global Fund to End

Table 1. Comparative Overview of International TIP Funding Instruments

	United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons	United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery	EC DEVCO/IFRC project under the <i>Global Public Goods and Challenges Programme</i>	IOM <i>Global Assistance Fund</i>	US JTIP <i>International Grants Program</i>
Purpose	To provide humanitarian, legal and financial aid to victims of trafficking in persons through established channels of assistance, such as governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations	To provide direct humanitarian, legal and financial assistance to victims [of modern slavery] through grants awarded to non-governmental organisations.	To address human trafficking and forced labour through 1) direct social assistance and protection, 2) help civil society organisations to better protect migrants' rights, 3) promote well-managed migration, labour and anti-TIP policies and legislation, and 4) support dialogue with public authorities, employers' associations and the private sector	To provide emergency case-specific assistance (safe accommodation, medical care, psychosocial support, legal assistance, assistance with retrieving lost or stolen travel documents etc.) to men, women, and children who have been trafficked across international borders not eligible for other assistance	To fund programs that help foreign governments enforce laws to combat TIP and expand victim assistance services; demonstrate model approaches to combating TIP; and add to existing knowledge and understanding of how best to eradicate this form of modern slavery through comprehensive research and evaluation.
Focus	Victims of trafficking	Victims of slavery, including trafficking	Migrants in domestic work in the recipient country and those who fall victim of human trafficking.	Persons trafficked or otherwise exploited - in rare cases, individuals at high risk	Trafficked persons or persons at risk of being trafficked
Coverage	Global	Global	Ethiopia, Zimbabwe, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Russia, Honduras, Indonesia, Nepal, Thailand, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Jordan, Lebanon Morocco	Global, excluding Australia, Canada, Europe, Japan, New Zealand, and the United States of America	Priority countries identified yearly. For 2014: Mozambique, Liberia, Guyana, Swaziland, Thailand, Belize, Albania, India, Pakistan, Mexico, Mongolia, Iraq, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay
Type of assistance/beneficiaries	Grants to NGOs	Grants to NGOs	Grants to CSOs	Individuals	NGOs, Academic institutions, for-

Slavery. This is still under development but informal feedback suggests a greater focus on governments (<http://www.fundtoendslavery.org/#progress>).

	United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons	United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery	EC DEVCO/IFRC project under the <i>Global Public Goods and Challenges Programme</i>	IOM <i>Global Assistance Fund</i>	US JTIP <i>International Grants Program</i>
					profit organisations ¹⁷
Grant size	20,000 USD/year for up to three years. No limitations on reapplication under next round	20,000 USD per grant with max duration of 12-months. Max 5 consecutive grants	10 mill Euros available for the whole programme. Grants between 75,000 and 200,000 Euros	Budget proposed on case-by case (IOM sends screening form along with budget for proposed assistance)	Up to 750,000 USD per grant
Grant cycle	SGF Call for proposal based on availability of sufficient funds. To date: one call in 2011, one in 2014	Yearly call	<i>Details being finalised.</i>	Ad hoc	Yearly call
Application and Selection Process	One round application process with full project proposal. Shortlisting by UNODC. Final selection by UNODC and the Board.	One round application with full project proposal, inclusive of five case studies indicating previously assisted victims or victims planned to be assisted. Pre-screening of first-time applicants and short-listing done by Secretariat. ¹⁸	Two-round proposal system (concept note and full proposal) Evaluation by independent committee at country level.	Applications for grant made by IOM country missions to HQs	Two-page statements of interest followed by submission of full proposal for selected applicants. Specific thematic priority/ies and country specific requirements identified for each eligible country. Final selection by US J/TIP Office with input from other departments
Language of proposals	English	English, French, Spanish	National language (TBC)	National language (translated by IOM office)	English
Governance	Secretariat (provided by UNODC) and Board of Trustees	Secretariat (provided by UN/OHCHR) and Board of Trustees	EC-IFCR joint programme (implemented through the IFRC)	IOM	US JTIP – Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Person

Of these Funds, the UNVTF and the IOM GAF specifically focus on assistance to victims of trafficking. The GAF focuses exclusively on emergency case-specific assistance to individuals where no other

¹⁷ Separate granting scheme available for IOs.

¹⁸ Three categories (highly recommended; recommended; not recommended by region and forms of slavery) proposed to the Board. Final selection by the Board

assistance is available. These two funds and the Slavery Fund are available globally, although IOM has indicated that in practice, support is not normally provided to higher income countries.

The EC-IFRC project will support actions in the area of direct social assistance and protection together with capacity building, policy and advocacy. The programme is restricted to 14 countries. The US J/TIP programme supports projects in all aspects of the response to trafficking in persons and its current round is focusing on 15 countries.

The Slavery Fund focuses on assistance to victims of slavery, including trafficking. There are clear similarities between the Slavery Fund and the UNVTF, and three of the 11 UNVTF grantees also received grants from the Slavery Fund in 2013. The stated purposes of the two funds are as follows:

- *UN Slavery Fund*: To provide direct humanitarian, legal and financial assistance to victims [of modern slavery] through grants awarded to non-governmental organisations
- *UNVTF*: ‘To provide humanitarian, legal and financial aid to victims of trafficking in persons through established channels of assistance, such as governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations’ for the UNVTF.

These statements suggest two significant differences. The first is that UNVTF support is not necessarily restricted to NGOs. In practice, this difference is currently nullified by a UNVTF management decision to focus solely on NGOs during the first two Calls for Proposals. The second difference is that the Slavery Fund provides support for victims of all forms of modern day slavery, not just trafficking in persons. This distinction is concretized by the decision of the UNVTF to focus on cross-border/international cases. UNODC staff and Board Members highlighted this as a distinguishing feature from the Slavery Fund.¹⁹ Notwithstanding its mandate to provide “direct” assistance to victims, the Slavery Fund can provide some support to capacity building and seminars, although it does so rarely.

The need for UNVTF to identify its specific niche has been recognized since its outset. The original GLOX42 project document identified the need for a clear and unique UNVTF identity, noting in the section on Assumptions and Risks that “the Trust Fund competes with UN.GIFT²⁰ and the Slavery Fund for scarce resources” and that “the Trust Fund has to identify its unique position and focus on distinguishing itself and its work from funding recipients”.²¹

To date, however, the UNVTF has not yet been able to articulate its clear comparative advantage or value added, particularly with regard to the Slavery Fund. Most attempts to distinguish the two Funds have focussed on individual details such as size and length of grant, rather than matters of substance. Currently, it appears that although not all activities supported by the Slavery Fund would fall within the scope of the UNVTF, the activities funded by the UNVTF would all be eligible for UN Slavery Fund support. At present it is therefore not readily apparent what the UNVTF does that could not be done by the Slavery Fund.

¹⁹ Caution is suggested in attempting to draw too strong a circle around the definition of victims of trafficking, given variations in the way this concept is understood even among experienced practitioners. See discussion in Marshall, P. and S.Nordh, Study on Child Trafficking in the Nordic Countries, UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, Florence, www.unicef-irc.org/publications/654, 2012, p.6.

²⁰ UN.GIFT is no longer actively seeking to raise funds.

²¹ UNODC Project Document GLOX42 “Management of the Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children”, June 2011, p. 10.

Possible comparative advantages identified by respondents were: (1) a focus on legal support and (2) support for identifying and promoting good practice. Both of these would be feasible given the flexibility afforded to the Trust Fund. A focus on legal support, while needing to ensure victims basic needs were also met, would align with, and capitalise on, UNODC's core competencies in trafficking – widely acknowledged as lying in the criminal justice area. Support for identifying and disseminating good practices in support for victims of trafficking would capitalise on the UNVTF's location in the UN system and the potential use of the UN imprimatur in promoting these practices.

- *The UNVTF is currently deriving limited added value from its location in UNODC.*

The Trust Fund is located in the Co-financing and Partnerships Section (CPS) of UNODC, where the roles of the Fund Manager and Secretariat to the Board of Trustees is assigned to one staff member, along with other duties as External Relations Officer (around 60 % of this staff member's time is spent on the Trust Fund management). Two other staff members in this Section devote part of their staff time to issues relating to the Trust Fund (Administrative Assistant and Private Sector Focal Point). This arrangement was described by interviewees as an attempt to provide adequate staffing for the UNVTF and to provide closer access to those involved in resource mobilization, recognized by all respondents as a major imperative.

Multiple respondents, however, noted that UNVTF's current location outside of the Human Trafficking and Migrant Smuggling Section (HTMSS) is limiting its access to expertise on trafficking in persons. This is illustrated by the following quote, "UNODC as the custodian of the Protocol on Trafficking in Persons was selected to be the manager of the Trust Fund because of its expertise in the area of human trafficking. This expertise has not been sufficiently put to use for the benefit of the Trust Fund." Another respondent suggested that there has been "no discussion about how this Fund could be an opportunity to further UNODC's organizational goals".

In practice, staff from UNODC's Human Trafficking and Migrant Smuggling Section have provided considerable input into the work of the Trust, including in the first funding round where staff contributed to the design of the first SGF call and in the appraisal of the received proposals. The current HTMSS focal point for the UNVTF is contributing significantly beyond her TOR. None of this input is costed and appears to largely be absorbed by individual staff members in addition to their other duties.

Respondents across all groups were strong in their praise of the current Fund Manager. They noted, however, that the current location of the UNVTF outside of HTMSS represents a lost opportunity for both the Trust and UNODC. On the one hand, the UNVTF is not deriving maximum benefit from the trafficking expertise available in UNODC, noted above as the main reason for the allocation of the Fund to UNODC. On the other, HTMSS is losing an opportunity for engagement with those working on the front lines of trafficking, which could potentially serve to inform its work across all programme areas. This issue is recognised internally but the constraint on greater HTMSS involvement is seen as resources. HTMSS positions are largely project-funded and thus the Section does not have spare personnel capacity.

Multiple respondents recommended the relocation of the UNVTF to the HTMSS. This view is not universal, however, as noted by the following response "several considerations speak for retaining the current set-up [...] albeit with more dedicated resources to cover all fund management aspects adequately. Most prominently, this concerns the issue of fundraising – which is central to the current challenges faced by the Fund – and managing the small grants facility." This respondent noted that much of the Fund Manager's role involved managing the selection process, reporting and communicating with NGOs and

facilitating the Board's meetings, and suggested that, once resource issues were addressed, there may be alternative ways to ensure the Trust has access to UNODC's substantive TIP expertise.

Moreover, the relocation of the Trust will not necessarily address the limited access that the Fund has to specialized support in the area of victim support. External stakeholders recognized UNODC capacity and track record in criminal justice responses to trafficking but not necessarily in the specific area of support for trafficking victims. Notably, the EC while stating in the context of a previous evaluation that they see UNODC as the leader in the criminal justice response,²² and providing ongoing support in this area, has chosen to operate its victim support project through IFRC, which combines more direct experience with victims of trafficking with a global presence on the ground. Similarly, although all of the nine former and current Board members have some background in trafficking, this is not necessarily in the specialised area of victim support. As a result, the Fund may not be accessing the latest thinking in this area. Despite the opportunity provided by UN.GIFT, where UNODC and IOM were two of the six Steering Committee members, no clear attempt has been made to draw in IOM's expertise as probably the largest direct assistance organization in the world for victims of trafficking.

Respondents also noted that UNODC's administrative systems appear to be placing constraints on the Trust²³. For example, the location of the Trust within UNODC is creating barriers to private sector fund-raising (see Section II.8). The 2014 UNODC/UNOV Grants Manual Guidelines and Policies has further imposed a limitation on the grants of \$20,000 a year, which has removed the power of the Board to determine grant ceilings, and will necessitate a reduction from the yearly maximum grant of \$25,000 allowed under the 2011 SGF funding round.

Efficiency

This section addresses three research questions relating to UNVTF programme efficiency, defined by DAC as a measure of the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs. This includes whether the activities were cost-efficient and whether the Fund was implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives. Two research questions that were not initially included under the four applicable DAC categories have been included in this section as the best fit. They relate to *Partnerships and Cooperation*, and *Lessons Learned*.

4. To what extent is the Trust Fund operating in a cost-effective manner (particularly in comparison to similar UN multi-donor Trust Funds addressing human rights issues)?

- *The Small Grants Facility is an appropriate and efficient mechanism for disbursement of UNVTF funds.*

There was strong agreement across all respondent groups that the Small Grants Facility was the appropriate means for disbursement of funds received by the UNVTF. The SGF allows the provision of time-bound assistance in the pursuit of clear objectives. This was seen by those involved early in the life of the Trust as an appropriate mean to pursue the objective of building the credibility of UNVTF by

²² Independent Project Evaluation, "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", UNODC, December 2013, pg. 47-48

http://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Independent_Project_Evaluations/2014/GLOT55_Independent_Project_Evaluation_Report_2014.pdf

²³ Additionally, UNODC has limited experience in managing UN Multi-donor Trust Funds.

establishing a track record through support for a small group of established NGOs. NGOs reported the mechanism to be largely appropriate to their needs.

Alternative support mechanisms identified during the evaluation were the provision of urgent/emergency funding for victim support, and the sharing of resources with other UN partners for onward distribution. Although the initial project document called for the establishment of “funding instruments which respond to urgent temporal and local challenges” there is no indication that this idea has been further pursued, and no reference to this can be found in future documentation. While acknowledging that the need remains for urgent assistance to victims of trafficking in underserved areas, several respondents questioned the capacity of the UN administrative system to fulfil the requirements of an urgent fund.²⁴ Further, there is already a fund specifically designed for urgent assistance, the IOM Global Assistance Fund, which has been in operation since 2000, and capitalizes on IOM’s comparatively greater in-country presence.

With regard to the alternative of distribution of resources through other UN partners, it was noted that this might increase inter-agency “buy in” but that it would also add another layer of administration and therefore cost, for a Fund that is already under-resourced. As such, there was no clear value to the Fund in pursuing this option, nor would there appear value to donors in channelling funds through the Fund for use by other UN agencies. There was no support expressed for this option from any respondent group.

The disbursement of UNVTF funds through a Small Grants Facility was thus strongly endorsed by all stakeholders, both in terms of past decisions and as a way of operating in the future. This reflected both the suitability of the Facility to the nature and objectives of the UNVTF and the lack of any clear and realistic alternative.

- *Grantees consider UNVTF processes to be efficient and, in comparison with other funding sources, “user friendly.”*

All NGO respondents spoke positively about Fund processes. All but one interviewee considered that the application form was concise and that the application process was straightforward, comparing favourably with other processes, including the Slavery Fund. The remaining respondent highlighted the fact that the forms must be completed in English as a significant barrier, as did one Board member. Notwithstanding this issue, and the constraint noted in the methodology section of this report that only successful applicants were interviewed, a review of required documentation by the evaluation team supports the view that the application processes are more straightforward than for the Slavery Fund.

NGO respondents further spoke favourably of the limited administrative burden placed on them by the Fund, considering this was appropriate for grants of this size. In particular, NGOs noted that, although the reporting focus was similar to other donors, the documentation requirements were much less.

NGOs view UNVTF staff as being responsive and supportive. UNVTF management was described as “very attentive and receptive to new ideas” and “supportive by not being too complicated”. Views were more mixed as to the degree of communication between UNVTF and NGOs. While one NGO informant stated that “I love this UNVTF. They have been very supportive and even promoted us. This is a real partnership”, NGO respondents more commonly requested increased communication with the Secretariat and more facilitation of contact among grantees. One NGO also suggested the production of a booklet detailing the whole grant cycle.

²⁴ This view appears to be supported by the experience of the first SGF round, where the period between the launch of the call and the disbursement of Funds to awarded grantees amounted to 8 – 10 months under the first SGF round.

5. To what extent have lessons learned identified by the Board and UNODC (CPS and HTMSS) been considered to make decisions for the future of the Trust Fund?

- *UNVTF stakeholders appear effective in identifying and responding to lessons learned within GLOX42.*

Project documentation suggests a high degree of reflection among the Board and UNODC about the Fund and how it might be strengthened, as well as clear examples of resulting changes. In particular, UNVTF Board Members and UNODC staff recognized that the process for grant selection under the first SGF Call for Proposals was not only inefficient but had resulted in activities funded that were outside of the agreed scope of the Fund. The assessment process for the first round for proposals relied heavily on voluntary labour from UNODC staff, as well as placing a high burden on Board Members.²⁵

A review of the proposals that received funding under the 2011 SGF call further suggests that these were not fully consistent either with the UNVTF objectives or SGF call criteria. For example, while the Fund objectives are “to provide humanitarian, legal and financial aid to victims of trafficking in persons”, activities supported have included strengthening of the law enforcement response and awareness raising aimed at “prevention”. Notwithstanding the SGF criteria calling for innovative projects, funds have often been used to continue (and strengthen) existing programmes of established NGOs. This was expressly confirmed by three NGO respondents.

UNODC recognized these shortcomings and invited the evaluation team to provide a preliminary assessment of the first Call for proposals, and make recommendations in time for the second Call²⁶. As well as the above points, the team identified a lack of correlation between the application form and the evaluation criteria. For example, there were evaluation criteria on dissemination and risk assessment/mitigation, which were not included as specific sections in the application forms, and on which the applicants were not required to elaborate. Conversely, the application forms included sections on value-added and cost-effectiveness, which were not matched by corresponding evaluation criteria.

The second Call for Proposals reflects much greater correlation between the application form and the stated Call criteria, and money has been set aside for the engagement of external consultants to assess the proposals. The new Trust Fund TOR issued in January 2013 have addressed other issues identified by stakeholders during the first round. These include clarifying the situation with regard to possible conflict of interest, expressly disqualifying organizations affiliated to Board Members. In the first round, Board Members declaring a possible conflict were simply asked to leave the room, and two of the 11 organizations selected had links to Board Members. In addition, the final decision for funding now lies with the Fund Manager, providing clear accountability for ensuring activities supported are consistent with UNVTF objectives and within SGF guidelines.²⁷ Previously, the Board was able to re-visit Fund Manager decisions.

²⁵ HTMSS staff estimated their collective engagement as totalling more than two staff months, while each Board Member was tasked with reviewing 42 proposals and then further review of 22 short-listed projects plus several added at the suggestion of various members of the Board.

²⁶ Due to the timing of the launch of the second call (30 July 2014) and the start of this evaluation (1 August), the team was able to provide UNODC with some informal comments and suggestions on the Call for proposals documents only a few days before the launch of the Call.

²⁷ The Fund Manager effectively has the power of veto. It can block proposals supported by the Board, but not approve proposals that the Board has not supported.

The new TOR also moves to clarify the wider roles of UNODC and the Board and the relationship between them, although the allocation of responsibility for fund-raising as joint, absent of any clear division of labour, appears to leave room for uncertainty. A further example of management efforts to identify and act on lessons learned is the recommendations provided by the outgoing Board for consideration by the incoming Board. These provide reflections on lessons learned, particularly with regard to monitoring, which are discussed in section II.7.

These examples highlight how UNODC and Board Members have sought to, and been able to, identify and act effectively on lessons learned with regard to Fund management. As a result, the evaluation noted clear improvements in respect of the Call for Proposals, and increased clarity with respect to the roles and responsibilities of the Board.

6. To what extent have partnerships been sought and established and synergies created?

- *The UNVTF has not made strong progress in establishing partnerships or creating synergies, either with other programmes assisting victims of trafficking, or between the organisations supported by the Fund. Among the consequences has been a failure to learn from, and capitalize on, lessons learned externally.*

To date, the UNVTF has not established working partnerships with other programmes assisting victims of trafficking, nor managed to foster communication to create synergies between grantees. As a consequence, the Trust has (1) not benefitted from experience and lessons learned from similar initiatives and (2) missed an opportunity to add value to its work through promoting the sharing of experiences and good practices between NGOs from different parts of the world.

The need for coordination with the Slavery Fund has been recognised since Fund inception, with Section 1.3 of the original project document on Synergies/Cooperation stating that the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery “has been operational since 1999, and provides a rich history of experience for this Trust Fund to draw upon. Though there are obviously overlapping mandates, cooperation with the Slavery Trust Fund will avoid duplication and allow the UN system to exploit the synergies of its agencies.” The Slavery Fund has likewise expressed an interest in collaboration with the Board recommending “the secretariats of the two Funds organize regular meetings to ensure continued collaboration with the aim of avoiding duplication of work.”

Several attempts have been made to establish a working relationship with the Slavery Fund, including the inclusion of two members on both Boards, following up of personal contacts and meetings between the two Secretariats, incorporating discussions on ways in which OHCHR and UNODC could capitalize on institutional synergies and identify areas for cooperation. In a 2012 meeting, for example, the two Secretariats considered the opportunity to coordinate a joint call for proposals or, if separate call for proposals were issued, to select different thematic priorities. Additionally, they expressed the willingness to explore the possibility for the Board of Trustees of the Slavery and Victims Trust Fund to conduct a joint review and evaluation of grant applications.

Overall, those interviewed, however, did not consider that these steps had resulted in better communication between the two Funds, or in the exchange of lessons learned. Respondents stated, for example, that there had been no real follow up to the ideas proposed in joint meetings, besides the sharing by the UN Slavery Fund of various background papers and documents such as reporting and monitoring forms. Frequent turnover of UNVTF staff was also noted as a barrier to ongoing communication.

Contact with other funders appears to be limited, notably the IOM Global Assistance Fund, but also with entities such as US Government J/TIP Office. Data collected during the evaluation suggested that closer contact with these funds might offer potential gains in: (1) determining priorities – notably IOM; (2) situating the Fund within the broader landscape of support for trafficking victims; (3) efficiency, through capitalising on experience and lessons learned in selecting and administering grants.

The UN Democracy Fund, while not specifically focused on trafficking, also has insights that might be useful for the UNVTF, particularly in the area of resource mobilisation and donor management, at which the former appears extremely successful.²⁸ For example, although respondents identified a lack of clear urgency and the fact that most people do not know a victim of trafficking as barriers to UNVTF fund-raising, the Democracy Fund has seemingly overcome both the long-term nature of its issues and the much more evident lack of a human face.

Both the US J/TIP Office and the UN Democracy Fund have a two-step, application process. Under this process a preliminary project outline is developed and then short-listed organizations are asked to submit a fuller proposal. The US J/TIP Office recently modified its application process in recognition not just of the work involved in appraising proposals but also that the “costs of writing proposals are very high.” This is highly relevant for the UNVTF given that the first Call involved the writing of 250 proposals by NGOs and their subsequent assessment, with just 12 selected and 11 eventually funded.

Both the US J/TIP Office and the UN Democracy Fund invest considerable effort in the first application phase, so that the number of full proposals sought is only slightly larger than the number that are to be funded. The major efficiency gain generated by the US J/TIP Office, however, was in carefully articulating its priority areas of support – by country and type of assistance. The first time the new system was instituted, the number of proposals received fell from 518 to 176, an estimated saving of 4000 person-hours for the Office, without including the time saved in 342 NGOs not writing redundant proposals.

There is also the potential for sharing information and even personnel for monitoring purposes. This has featured in discussion with the Slavery Fund but could potentially be extended to the other funding mechanisms focusing on trafficking/slavery.

With regard to grantees, multiple respondents highlighted that they would have welcomed closer communication with the Fund Secretariat, and, in particular, with the other NGOs supported by the UNVTF. NGO respondents typically considered that they had both a lot to share with others, and a lot to learn, and two NGOs specifically requested the creation of a network of grantees. The idea of facilitating communication between grantees was raised by Board members and UNODC staff as a potential added value of the Fund. This could not only allow the sharing of practices such as victim feedback mechanisms, but also help provide feedback to UNVTF and to UNODC on common issues faced by NGOs.

The limited progress on promoting cooperation across different actors has been recognised by the UNVTF management with the specific inclusion of the following objective in the Project Revision:

To promote cooperation among Member States, governmental institutions, civil society and the private sector in support of victims of trafficking, as set out in the Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons.

²⁸ The evaluation team will provide the Fund Manager with more detailed information on the Democracy Fund.

There are, however, currently no specific outcomes or outputs attached to this objective, which may be better stated as a strategy. Increased cooperation with other funds could increase efficiency through streamlining of resources and sharing of experiences and lessons learned, as well as supporting resource mobilisation through the articulation of distinguishing features of different funds. Facilitating communication and network among grantees offers potential value added for the UNVTF in identifying sharing, adapting and dissemination effective practices.

Effectiveness

This section addresses the two evaluation research questions aimed at assessing GLOX42 effectiveness. Effectiveness is defined by DAC as “a measure of the extent to which an (aid) activity attains its objectives”, and includes an assessment of the factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of project objectives. In line with the evaluation TOR, findings under this heading focus on the effectiveness of UNVTF management, including M&E processes, rather than the effectiveness of individual grants.

7. To what extent do stakeholders consider the Trust Fund is effective in fulfilling its objective to assist victims of human trafficking?²⁹

- *UNVTF has not been provided with the resources necessary to fulfil Article 38 of 2010 UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/64/293.*

Across all stakeholder groups, a lack of sufficient funding was identified as a major constraint to the UNVTF fulfilling its objective to assist victims of trafficking. To date, the Trust has been unable to generate a critical mass of funds that would allow for all administrative costs to be met, while remaining true to the spirit of Article 38 in providing humanitarian, legal and financial aid to victims of trafficking in persons, with low overheads. UNVTF has relied heavily on subsidization from UNODC and in some cases Board Members for the support necessary to carry out the administrative and management work for Fund operation.

The Trust Fund arose from Article 38 of the 2010 UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/64/293. The wording of Article 38 was extremely broad and provided no guidance on how the UNVTF was to be set up and run, and from where administrative resources should be drawn. As noted by one respondent “what was missing was a feasibility study on minimum requirements to make the Fund operational at a certain level for a particular purpose.” Absent a clear articulation of the minimum requirements, inevitable issues have arisen. On the one hand, multiple UNODC respondents highlight that, as a largely project-funded organization, UNODC is limited in its capacity to provide, in particular, specialist counter-TIP expertise, without these costs being directly met by the Fund. On the other, former Board members considered that

²⁹ Initially, the first key evaluation question below was intended to reflect the views of Member States only. However, data from Members States on this question was somewhat limited, while significant relevant data was generated from other sources. As such, the findings more accurately reflect wider stakeholder views and the question has been modified accordingly.

it was difficult enough to raise money for victims without also having to raise money to cover Secretariat costs.³⁰

Documents and interviews have also highlighted concern on the one hand that the 13% charged by UNODC in programme support costs does not cover any direct costs for the UNVTF and, on the other, the UNODC response that at current fund levels, 13% does not go close to meeting the indirect costs of managing the Trust Fund, (although these cannot be specifically articulated), let alone the direct costs, starting with the salary of the Trust Fund Manager. Interviews and documents have highlighted often simultaneous concerns about the need for project monitoring and the consequent reduction this would require in the already limited resources available for distribution to grantees.

The evaluators consider that all of these viewpoints have merit and the fact some are in conflict appears to reflect that the UNVTF currently lacks sufficient resources to be a “going concern”, without significant cross-subsidization from UNODC, which the organization considers it is unable to provide. This is not unique - one respondent noted that the “UN graveyard is full of Trust Funds”. Revealingly, data received on the Slavery Fund suggests that it is similarly unable to meet its basic requirements – the Fund draws heavily on the infrastructure provided by the UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture – while core staff are funded from OHCHR’s regular budget and other extra-budgetary resources outside of the Slavery Fund.³¹

Those involved in the UNVTF have made strong attempts to work within existing resources, including by merging different roles in the terms of reference of a CPS staff member to fund the Fund Manager position, and holding meetings remotely where possible. Similarly, while organisations such as the EC are able to engage in rigorous project appraisal processes through heavy investment in outside expertise, UNVTF has done its best to limit these costs, the first funding round relying exclusively on UNODC staff and Board members. Board members also report spending considerable effort “begging” member States to provide resources, despite the fact that the Fund is only in existence at the request of these States.

Notwithstanding the efforts of staff and Board members to work within existing constraints, there is agreement across those involved in management of the UNVTF that its current level of resources is insufficient to meet the basic running costs of the Fund, while still ensuring that most of the money goes primarily for the support of victims of trafficking. Attempts are now underway to estimate and agree on what these basic running costs would be.

³⁰ This position was exacerbated by the feeling – expressed by some former Board members – of ambiguity in relation to their UNVTF fund-raising role. A new Board has been recently elected and has not yet discussed this issue in detail.

³¹ In a 2013 meeting between UNODC and OHCHR, the UN Slavery Fund Secretariat explained that management of three OHCHR Trust Funds (Torture, Slavery and Indigenous People) had been merged. The team supporting the three Funds is staffed with two P-4s (one full-time and one P-4 External Relations Officer partially assigned to the team), three P-3s, two P-2s, two General Service staff and two “Fellows” (engaged under a special fellowship programme set up to support the Fund in monitoring NGO projects in the field). Staff are partly funded from OHCHR’s regular budgetary resources as well as other extra-budgetary resources; only stipends paid to Fellows are charged directly to the Fund. The total income of the Slavery Trust Fund for 2012 was around USD 600,000 (for comparison: the Torture Fund receives around USD 6 million each year). The PSC charge applied by OHCHR is 13%. An additional 15 per cent (~ USD 85,000) are charged to the Fund as direct costs related to the management of the Fund, including monitoring (done by Fellows); costs of the Board; and travel costs for the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery. Also, a mandatory “working reserve” (minimum to sustain operations in case the Fund runs out of funding) is kept. So, out of the USD 600,000 received in 2012, USD 425,000 or 71 per cent were spent on grants to NGO projects.

- *Monitoring of projects is recognised by stakeholders to be limited and hindered by lack of resources.*

The original GLOX42 project document stated that: “Projects receiving funding from the Trust Fund must be extensively reported on” and established that reporting would comprise regular annual narrative progress reports and financial statements. It also foresaw “active monitoring from UNODC Field Office networks and members of the Board of Trustees.”

In practice, monitoring of the first round of projects has largely revolved around the requirement for NGOs to submit annual reports on activities, obstacles and additional fund-raising efforts. This reporting process allowed the Fund Manager to identify issues with two grants. One case, where the NGO appeared to be focusing too much on lobbying activities, was resolved remotely.³² In the other, where an NGO appeared to be using funds for a purpose other than what had been agreed, it was determined that the Fund Manager should visit the NGO. This situation was resolved through a site visit by the Fund Manager and resulted in a grant extension that was approved by the Board.

A review of Board meetings highlights a continuous concern over the absence of a rigorous monitoring system, including the lack of site visits to verify the information provided by reports. The ability to demonstrate impact was initially perceived as an important component of measuring the success of the Fund and thereby ensuring sustained contributions. A paper prepared to guide discussions for the first meeting of the Board highlighted the need to consider establishing a performance baseline with clear criteria so that performance could be duly measured and evaluated. However, this approach does not appear to have been followed through. The current monitoring system was defined by various respondents as lacking a conceptual framework, largely about ticking boxes and lacking clear guidelines for responding to different scenarios, such as work not proceeding in line with agreed activities.

Much Board discussion on the monitoring issue has focused on the desirability of more site visits and the shortage of resources to do so. Various options have been discussed, such as involving UNODC field offices and, recognising UNODC’s comparatively limited field presence, the involvement of other agencies.

The Slavery Fund has faced many of the same issues. Until 2012, on-site monitoring was reportedly limited and undertaken by Board members at their own expense, as has also happened with the UNVTF. One of the consequences was a failure to pick up a case of severe misuse of funds, a risk that the UNVTF has attempted to minimise through “working with established NGOs who get money from others, which helps us build our confidence that the money is not misused.” The Slavery Fund has subsequently attempted to involve other actors in monitoring. Although this is done using standard monitoring form, one respondent considered that the “process was still person dependent. A local programme officer working off the same checklist as me can find quite different things.” Unless those engaged locally have sufficient understanding of the specific and sensitive issues around victim support, the benefit of such outsourcing may be largely in terms of helping to ensure appropriateness of fund use, rather than assessing grant effectiveness.

In 2013, the outgoing Board stressed the importance of improving the monitoring of selected projects, “preferably by the Board, with support from the Secretariat.” The newly elected Board discussed the issue at its first meeting and UNODC suggested that it could use its existing network of human trafficking

³² Provision had in fact been made in the grant for lobbying even though this falls outside the scope of direct assistance to victims of trafficking. However, it was determined that too much of the funding was supporting this area.

experts located in various places throughout the globe to conduct project visits (around 5 projects a year) to check on the status of implementation of on-going projects. The Board agreed that \$20,000 be made available to UNODC in 2014 to support Trust Fund monitoring activities.

Overall, responses suggested that there will remain a trade-off between the resources allocated for project implementation and those for monitoring and this trade-off will be particularly evident when resources are comparatively scarce. At the same time, multiple UNODC and Board respondents suggested that there were ways in which remote monitoring could be strengthened. This included: (1) establishing a clear M&E framework with help from HTMSS, which may include collection of standardised data; (2) systematically providing feedback to NGO on their reports; and (3) introducing a tranche system so payments were more clearly linked to performance, accompanied by clear and transparent criteria for grant suspension and termination. The introduction of victim feedback systems, discussed throughout this document, could also be incorporated into such an M&E system.

Evaluation data also suggests discrepancies between the information received from NGOs and the information provided in UNVTF reports. Most notably, the evaluation could find no evidence to support claims in the 2013 UNVTF publication, *Hear Their Story*, that “the grants have had a **profound impact** supporting and strengthening grassroots organizations around the world that serve vulnerable or exploited individuals” (emphasis added). Further, it was suggested that: “the latest brochure highlighted victims that were assisted by the NGO, not necessarily by the Fund.” At the same time, multiple NGO respondents perceived a lack of opportunities and avenues to show how the UNVTF grants were used to support their activities in different areas of victim assistance. More active engagement with NGOs may allow them to provide richer information on their activities, increasing the ability of UNVTF to monitor the effects of their grants and ensuring that the information provided in annual reports is more authentic.

8. How effectively is the Trust Fund being promoted to external audiences and resources being mobilized?

- *Despite attempts to define a fundraising strategy, important fundraising issues remain unresolved. As well as the value added of the UNVTF, these include the financing of operational costs, targeting of fundraising efforts, and organizational barriers to private sector fundraising.*

As highlighted throughout the evaluation, lack of resources has placed significant constraints on UNVTF since its inception. This is a measurement against the needs of the UNVTF and does not necessarily reflect negatively on resource mobilisation efforts to date. The Slavery Fund, for example, considers that UNVTF’s paid contributions of \$1.68 million from November 2010 until April 2014 compare favourably with the early years of the Fund. In fact, UNVTF’s average annual resources for its first four years are roughly comparable to those for the same period of the Slavery Fund, despite the latter being in operation for 20 years.

The issue of fund-raising figures very prominently in Board discussions and other documentation. This includes two efforts to define a fund-raising strategy. The resulting documents, however, focus mainly on fund-raising activities and targets and do not appear to have addressed crucial strategic issues. Foremost amongst these is the issue of value added or comparative advantage, specifically the answer to the question of why a donor would chose this fund over another fund, or over direct funding of NGOs. This is discussed in detail in Section II.3. Other issues include the financing of running costs, and issues pertaining to private sector funding, including institutional barriers to establishing partnerships with the private sector.

There has been considerable discussion throughout the life of the Board on the issue of running costs. As stated by one Board Member, “the previous Board did not want to spend funding on the operational costs, but now we see that it is necessary to ensure the professional management of the UNVTF in the long run”. Nonetheless, respondents noted the difficulty in raising money for support costs as well as for victims. The situation is further complicated by the requirement for the Trust Fund to pay programme support costs of 13% to UNODC. On the one hand, UNODC reports that this is not enough to cover both the indirect and the direct cost of managing the Trust Fund. On the other hand, Board Members have expressed difficulties in understanding why, when the Fund is intended for low overheads, 13% is removed from the funding pot without making inroads into the direct costs of running the Trust.³³

In terms of private sector contributions, approximately \$400,000 has been raised, representing about one-quarter of total contributions. One private sector donor strongly praised UNVTF fundraising approaches and noted that “other ‘traditional’ funds are not taking account of the fact that times have changed and somehow the UNVTF recognized the need to move with the times [...] starting a partnership with private investors to increase the level of funding is not only a fresh approach, it is definitely effective.”

As this quote suggests, the evaluation noted how those engaged in working with the private sector have moved beyond a “philanthropic approach”, focussed on seeking cash donations, to engage private sector on the level of partnership. Further opportunities may exist for engaging private sector support in terms of— for example, assistance through cause-related marketing or promoting behavioural change in private companies that would directly benefit TIP victims (e.g. through providing employment ideas/opportunities for TIP victims) – or through a ‘menu’ system which complements generic fund-raising efforts by allowing private donors to earmark funding. This may allow funding of, for example, educational scholarships for individuals, identified by one NGO as a priority for which they could not currently access support.

At present, 100% of the private sector funds come through the Blue Heart Campaign. The stated aim of the Blue Heart Campaign is “to mobilize support and to inspire people to act against human trafficking.” A review of Board Minutes and feedback from external stakeholders suggests some uncertainty about the relationship between the UNVTF and the Blue Heart campaign. However feedback from the Fund Manager suggest that this issue has now been resolved.

In terms of constraints to fundraising, several UNODC staff and Board members highlighted that the Office for Legal Affairs was placing restrictions on private sector partnerships and had led to some initiatives being dropped. There appears to be inconsistency between the expressed UNODC organisational priority of raising private sector funding, and the policy of the OLA, which places the Trust at a disadvantage to other Funds.

Overall, respondent feedback suggested that in order to move forward with its fund-raising, the Fund needs to take steps to clarify and articulate its value added and distinguishing characteristics, assess whether operational costs should be funded through a percentage of grant money or through separate sources, and clarify the main focus of its fund-raising efforts. In this regard, the Fund was created by UN Member States, and the large majority of respondents considered that the responsibility for support fell primarily with these States.

³³ By comparison, the Piracy Fund, with UNODC serving as the Fund Manager and Department of Political Affairs (DPA) serving as the Secretariat of the Fund, was created with a total overhead rate of 10 per cent: a 3 per cent fund management fee and 7 per cent for the project support costs incurred on top of the project value for each accepted proposal.

Private sector funding should remain a supplement to Member State contributions, noting also the arrival of a new actor, the Walk Free Foundation, which is set up by private sector actors to raise funds from the private sector. Unlike the Trust, Walk Free’s association with high net worth individuals provides with it a high budget for start-up and the organisation will almost certainly face fewer bureaucratic obstacles to private sector funding. Although some private actors will still want to give money to a mechanism backed by the UN, it appears unlikely that the Trust can based its future too heavily on potential private sector funding.

Sustainability

In this section, we address UNVTF 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, as well as the factors that influence the achievement or non-achievement of the sustainability of the project. This section focuses on the sustainability of activities supported by the Trust, rather than the Trust itself, which is discussed in the previous finding on resource mobilisation.

9. To what extent is the Trust Fund ensuring that results achieved through its grants are continuing after the end of the funding?

- *The UNVTF has not defined and addressed the concept of sustainability as it pertains to its activities.*

The initial GLOX42 project document states that: “the Trust Fund Management and the Board of Trustees have to make sure that projects which receive funding prove the capacity of establishing sustainable structures and of furnishing aid with the potential to generate long-term, sustainable benefits.” Limited attention appears to have been paid to the sustainability issue to date, however.

As highlighted above, the OECD DAC consider sustainability from the frame of the extent to which benefits of the project are likely to continue after donor funding has ceased. Such a framing appears problematic for victim support, which will be needed for as long as there are victims of trafficking. Further, victim reintegration is a long-term process that does not necessarily lend itself to fixed project cycles. Several NGOs openly stated that Trust Fund support was not being used for a discreet project but rather to contribute to on-going operational costs.

Reviewed documents and interviews suggest that, while individual respondents recognise the difficulty of pursuing sustainability as defined by DAC, the Trust has not made a significant attempt to: (1) consider whether and how the effects of project activities could be monitored following the completion of the grant; and/or (2) redefine sustainability as it applies to the type of support provided by the Trust. In fact, UNODC staff report that “we made a decision that the activities supported by the UNVTF would not necessarily be sustainable.” This situation is not unique to the UNVTF. In regards to the Slavery Fund, for example, one respondent stated that: “We don’t really worry about this. The grants are too small.”

Although sustainability has been introduced as an element of the thematic priorities for the 2014 Call, along with a focus on local “grassroots” NGOs, it was noted that the accompanying requirement for the proposals to be in English mitigates against such NGOs. Further, while a focus on grassroots NGOs may offer sustainability benefits in terms of retention of knowledge and skills, the primary effect of this strategy for a programme such as UNVTF that funds assistance to victims exclusive of capacity building

appears to be in reducing the cost of victim support. This would likely increase potential for sustainable levels of external support, rather than make programmes sustainable without external support in line with the DAC definition.

Another option that has been flagged to promote sustainability is the provision of assistance to government to encourage greater ownership and accountability. As highlighted in Section II.1, however, the majority of respondents see this as, at best, a long-term objective and not necessarily falling within the mandate of the UNVTF.

An alternative perspective on sustainability may involve examining whether the solutions being funded have the potential to address the problem on an appropriate scale, rather than as one respondent suggested in relation to another fund, “placing 1/10th of a band-aid on a gaping wound.” An example is support for one project, covering vocational training for 45 people, calculated by the NGO as 15% of those needed assistance within the grant period alone. Without trivialising the impact of those who benefit from the project, it is difficult to see how this approach can lead to long-term durable solutions for the wider pool of victims.

In summary, there appears to have been limited attention to the issue of sustainability, whether this be: (1) an attempt to measure the extent to which UNVTF grants are continuing after the end of the funding; or (2) a redefinition of the concept of sustainability as it applies to the Trust Fund. The majority of respondents are not in favour of expanding grant eligibility of governments in the foreseeable future as a potential response to sustainability issues. Trust Fund stakeholders have identified focusing support on local rather than international NGOs as promoting sustainability, although this is constrained by the English language requirement for applications. Further, successful application of this strategy would more accurately reduce the amount of ongoing outside assistance needed, rather than eliminate it.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

In this section, we draw some preliminary conclusions about the UNVTF's relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability, and partnerships and cooperation, as well as discussing lessons learned. Conclusions focus on (1) the relevance and comparative advantage of the Trust (2) resource availability and (3) Trust Fund Management.

The UNVTF was established in recognition of unmet clear needs for victims of trafficking in persons globally. The need for increased and ongoing resources in this area is not disputed by any stakeholder, and reinforced by the receipt of 250 proposals in response to the first Call for Proposals. In this sense, the UNVTF meets a clear need. At the same time, the Trust Fund has yet to identify a clear niche for itself, and distinguish how it adds value to the range of other potential sources of support for victims of trafficking and the broader issue of slavery. At present, for example, there appears little supported by the UNVTF that would not qualify for support from the Slavery Fund, and the UNVTF is not backed by either strong institutional expertise in the specific area of victim support, or by a strong on-the-ground presence, which would facilitate both the setting of priorities and the monitoring of activities. Further, institutional barriers to private sector fund-raising appear to place the UNVTF at a disadvantage in this area, particularly in relation to the proposed new "business-to-business" Global Fund being established by the Walk Free Foundation.

Although some attempts have been made to date to distinguish the UNVTF from others, these appear largely "cosmetic", around issues such as the size and length of grants. Some respondents have suggested that the specific focus on victims of trafficking is an added value, though this is essentially a subset of the target group of the other Funds. As a result, there remains a challenge for UNVTF fundraising efforts to answer the 'why' question, that is why should a donor choose to support the UNVTF over other initiatives or over direct funding of NGOs.

The issue of value added has been recognised since the outset of the UNVTF and respondents involved in its development report initial discussions on positioning the Trust Fund as promoting good practice in the area of victim assistance, supported by the issuance of grants to well-established NGOs with a proven track record. To date, however, the Trust Fund has not evolved in a manner that enables it to identify and share good practice, even among its grantees. One barrier to the Fund in doing so currently is its limited access to specialised expertise in the specific area of victim support. Recognizing that UNODC's prime area of TIP expertise lies in the area of criminal justice, several respondents suggested that the UNVTF might centre its support around legal assistance to ensure remedy and redress for victims. Apart from being an area of demonstrated need, which is not necessarily being well covered by other donors, the promotion of legal remedies, particularly in the area of victim compensation, starts to transfer some of the costs of victim support to those causing the TIP problem. In turn, this potentially creates disincentives to traffickers, while lessening the financial burden on States for victim support.

The issue of resource availability hangs over all Trust Fund activities. The Trust has raised \$1.7 million in its first four years, including almost \$400,000 from private sector sources, using a range of innovative approaches. Respondents regard this as a credible and significant amount, close to what the well-

established Slavery Fund has raised in the same period, and the funds disbursed to date have been greatly appreciated by the eleven grantees (and, although there is no specific feedback on this, one might assume by beneficiaries). At the same time, current funding falls considerably short of what is needed to allow Fund operational costs to be covered, while simultaneously ensuring that the large proportion of funds continue to be allocated to direct assistance to victims.

Along with the issue of value added, this question of funding of operational costs is one of several key fund-raising issues that have not yet been fully addressed. Although the new Board has recognised the importance of an appropriately resourced Secretariat, several respondents have noted that it is difficult enough to raise money for victims without also having to raise funds for the Secretariat. UNODC has been subsidising the Trust to date but has clearly stated that its ongoing capacity to do so is somewhat limited. Concerns have also been raised internally that efforts by the organization to promote the Fund may draw resources away from its other TIP work.

A decision thus needs to be made as to whether the Secretariat should be primarily funded from UNVTF contributions or whether specific Secretariat funding should be sought, for example from a strongly supportive donor. It is worth noting that after 20 years of operation, the Slavery Fund is not close to covering its management costs and does not appear to be attempting to do so, relying on OHCHR regular budgetary support and cross-subsidisation through its co-location with the much larger Torture Fund. Other fund-raising issues that need to be resolved include institutional blockages to private sector engagement.

Within the constraints originating from the lack of an initial UNVTF feasibility study and the subsequent mismatch between the Trust Fund aspirations and available resources, UNODC and Trust Board members have made strong efforts towards establishing the UNVTF as a credible entity. A review of documentation and stakeholder interviews suggests the work of those involved has been characterized by considerable reflection and, as a result, the Trust Fund has evolved in response to experience and lessons learned. The issues and constraints identified in this evaluation are largely well recognized by key Trust Fund actors as shown by the framing of the evaluation TOR.

Unfortunately, while UNVTF staff are highly regarded by respondents, high turnover appears to have contributed to some inconsistency in approach, such as a lack of measures to back up the Trust Fund strategy of establishing a proven track record. High staff turnover was also noted as a barrier to building cooperation with other funding entities. As a result, despite attempts to liaise more closely with the Slavery Fund in particular, the Trust Fund has missed opportunities to learn from the experiences of other programmes, notably in the area of grant selection, as well as sharing ideas and even resources on monitoring and resource mobilisation. One consequence is that, while changes made for the second Call for Proposals are likely to bring about significant improvements in efficiency and transparency, the Trust Fund does not appear to have fully considered the wastage involved in a process that generates 250 proposals for 11 grants – either in terms of the UNVTF/UNODC resources to appraise these proposals, or in terms of the NGO resources to write them. The US J/TIP Office and the Democracy Fund, both of which operate a two-step application process, have insights into grant-making that might have proved extremely useful.

Grant monitoring is recognised by respondents as limited. Considerable discussion has taken place on the need to allow more site visits and various solutions have been identified including the use of staff from other agencies. At the same time, experience from the Slavery Fund suggests that, even with standard site visit forms, the outcomes of such visits can be quite person dependent. Close collaboration with other

funding partners and the opportunistic use of UNODC staff and Board members on missions may allow increased site monitoring without taking away significant resources from victim assistance. Several stakeholders have also suggested that improvements could be made to monitoring process through more regular communication, something NGOs said they would welcome.

With regard to sustainability, there was general agreement among stakeholders that the DAC conceptualisation of sustainability as ensuring ongoing benefits beyond grant life could not be readily applied to the type of assistance provided by the Trust. This is not fully reflected in project documentation, however, and there does not appear to have been strategic consideration of what the concept of sustainability means in the UNVTF context. The second Call proposal has interpreted sustainability as support for grassroots organisations, with a view to reducing costs of assistance, but has maintained the requirement for proposals to be in English and the one-step process over, for example, a process which might identify broad programme goals and activities then assist NGOs to refine programme logic models etc. – similar to that supported by J/TIP. Another interpretation of sustainability, which might fit with a focus on promoting good practice, is to look for programmes that offer durable solutions, for example in being feasibly scalable within realistically available resources.

Overall, the treatment of the sustainability issue thus appears to be somewhat piecemeal and is perhaps reflective of the lack of an overarching template for decision-making that may be provided by a clear articulation of the Fund's niche.

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. The recommendations are divided into the following key subtopics: (A) Value added of the UNVTF; (B) Ongoing viability and resource mobilization; (C) Promoting Cooperation and Collaboration; and (D) Grant monitoring, evaluation and sustainability. Each section includes a brief introduction, followed by the recommendations and in some cases additional discussion. There are 15 consecutively numbered recommendations ordered by topic. The order in which the recommendations appear does not reflect their importance. There are however, three Key Recommendations (recommendations 1, 6 and 7). These concern the value added of the Fund and its ongoing viability. The relevance of other recommendations are to some extent contingent on the adoption or non-adoption of these recommendations.

Value added of the UNVTF

The need for UNVTF to identify its specific niche has been recognized since its outset. To date, however, UNVTF has not clearly defined its comparative advantage or distinguishing features from other funds supporting victims of trafficking. In particular, both the target group – victims of trafficking – and the initiatives supported – direct assistance – are subsets of the target groups supported by the Slavery Fund and thus do not appear to constitute value added.

The lack of a clearly articulated niche for the Trust has a number of consequences, including a lack of differentiation for fund-raising purposes. Perhaps less obviously, the evaluation found a lack of alignment in decisions made throughout the life of the Trust and across different areas of its operation. For example, an early focus on developing and demonstrating a proven track record has not been supported by subsequent reporting and fund-raising efforts. The focus on grassroots organizations in the second Call for Proposals, while an attempt to promote sustainability, appears to have been taken independently of decisions on the proposal process, which seems to favour English-speaking organisations with existing experience in preparing proposals for international organizations. Notably, only one of the successful NGOs in the first round was unable to communicate to the evaluation team in English.

In view of the constraints currently been placed on the UNVTF by the lack of a clearly defined niche, recommendations relating to the value added/comparative of the Trust are:

- 1. Determine and articulate the value added of the UNVTF and use this to guide UNVTF decision-making.**

This process should take into account the comparative advantages and disadvantages provided by the Fund's location within UNODC. The added value should be clearly defined and distinguished from the question of relevance – that is, that the UNVTF is operating in an area of need. A clear articulation of value-added could then serve as a guide to help facilitate consistent decision-making, particularly around funding priorities.

Responsible party: UNVTF Board

- 2. Consider whether UNODC’ s recognised role as the guardian of the TIP Protocol provides an opportunity for the UNVTF to establish a niche as identifying and promoting good practice in the area of victim support.**

As evidenced by the Global Trafficking in Persons Report, the imprimatur provided by the connection with UNODC carries considerable weight. As a global fund, UNVTF has an opportunity to draw on experiences and lessons learned throughout the world and promote these for wider adaption. Within the current round of grants, the victim feedback system that Different and Equal has in place is an example of a practice that addresses a glaring gap in TIP responses worldwide. Other examples might include systems to define and co-set clear reintegration goals with victims of trafficking, and innovative solutions to providing security of income, potential including safe migration alternatives and greater private sector engagement.

Responsible party: UNVTF Board with support from UNVTF Fund Manager

- 3. Consider whether an emphasis on legal remedies, with links to UNODC’ s criminal justice focus might provide a clear niche for the UNVTF.**

While it is unlikely that the Fund could allocate resources solely to legal assistance, given the prerequisite of meeting victims’ basic needs, a core focus on this area would align UNVTF activities more closely with the work of UNODC, also allowing UNODC’ s criminal justice work to benefit from systemic barriers identified in specific cases. Feedback from an NGO respondent about how none of their other 17 grants would provide the type of support they needed for a legal case suggests a potential niche in this area, which also, through victim compensation, may force traffickers to carry more of the burden for supporting the victims they have created.

Responsible party: UNVTF Board with support from UNVTF Fund Manager

- 4. The UNVTF should continue to focus on support for NGOs through a small grants facility. UNVTF should consider aligning the criteria for grant selection with the overall strategy of the Fund.**

Responsible party: UNVTF Board with support from UNVTF Fund Manager

Ongoing Viability and Resource Mobilisation

The Trust was established without either a feasibility study or any clarity as to how to reconcile the aspiration for a fund with low overheads with the need to administer the Fund and the limited programme resources available to UNODC to subsidize this work. These issues remain unresolved and, as a result, questions remain about the core viability of the UNVTF, without subsidization from UNODC that the organization says it cannot sustain long-term. Many of the issues identified during the evaluation can be traced to a discrepancy between the requirements placed by UN Member States on the UNVTF and the resources these States have made available to the Trust.

In order to resolve these discrepancies, specific recommendations in relation to the ongoing viability of the Trust and future resource mobilisation efforts are:

- 5. Continue current efforts to identify and cost the staffing levels and skills needed to meet the basic requirements of UNVTF operation and monitoring.**

Responsible party: UNVTF Fund Manager with support from UNVTF Board

- 6. Consider presenting a paper to UNODC management outlining Fund requirements and options and seeking clarification about whether UNVTF management is an organisational priority for UNODC.**

As noted in the Findings section, there does not appear to have been an assessment of how UNVTF management fits with the overall priorities of UNODC. High-level UNODC backing appears to be crucial to the UNVTF in terms of soliciting the required level of support from member States and ideally addressing organization procedures that impact on Trust management.

Responsible party: UNVTF Board with support from UNVTF Fund Manager

- 7. Based on the responses of UNODC management, consider presenting member States with scenarios for the future of the UNVTF. These scenarios may set out the basic resource requirements for the UNVTF to function in line with Article 38. Should member States be unwilling to commit to these requirements, consider merging the remaining UNVTF resources with the UN Slavery Fund.**

Responsible parties: UNODC Senior Management

- 8. Consider expanding options for private sector support, for example, to include innovative ways of private sector assistance to TIP, as well as menu-based options for earmarked funding.**

Responsible party: UNVTF Board with support from UNVTF Fund Manager

Promoting cooperation and collaboration

The UNVTF is one of at least five multi-country funding sources that can be accessed for the support of victims of trafficking. The evaluation suggests considerable potential for mutual learning between these funds, as well as the opportunity to pool resources in areas such as analysis, priority-setting and monitoring. In parallel, there was a strong request from NGOs for increased communication both with UNVTF and with other grantees. Specific recommendations relating to promoting cooperation and collaboration are:

- 9. Consider establishing an informal network of other major international funding mechanisms that provide support for victims of trafficking.**

Responsible party: UNVTF Fund Manager

- 10. Consider establishing a network of grantees with a view to sharing experiences and lessons learned and potentially identifying and adapting good practices.**

Responsible party: UNVTF Fund Manager

Grant monitoring, evaluation and sustainability

Grant monitoring is recognised by respondents as limited and constrained by resource availability. At the same time, grantees have expressed strong appreciation that the procedures do not place an excessive burden on their time. There appears scope to improve current monitoring procedures in a way that (1) provides better quality information for UNVTF, including for reporting; (2) does not draw excessive resources away from assistance to victims; (3) remains manageable for NGOs. Specific recommendations relating to grant monitoring and evaluation are:

- 11. Continue current efforts to develop an M&E framework for grants to ensure data collection is in line with overall UNVTF objectives while not placing an undue burden on NGOs.**

Responsible party: UNVTF Fund Manager with support from UNVTF Board

The M&E framework might include checks on whether activities are in line with the UNVTF's stated victim-centred approach, however defined.

- 12. Consider strengthening current remote monitoring efforts, including through routinely providing feedback on reports and possibly a tranche based payment system linked to milestones.**

Responsible party: UNVTF Fund Manager

- 13. Require all grantees to institute an appropriate and ethical system for soliciting victim feedback.**

Responsible party: UNVTF Fund Manager

It is suggested that this system be implemented irrespective of the adoption of Recommendation 2.

- 14. Develop an opportunity-based system for monitoring visits.**

Various options for undertaking monitoring visits at low cost have been considered by UNVTF management. If UNVTF was to consider the potential monitoring pool as constituting not just Board members and appropriately qualified UNODC staff, but also other funding entities described in Recommendation 9, significant possibility would appear to exist for increased site monitoring with limited resource implications, based on convenience and opportunity. Although this might appear somewhat *ad hoc*, there would be clear gains in efficiency and potentially in quality in comparison to, for example, use of unspecified staff from other agencies. The UNODC expert roster is another potential source of monitoring assistance but may involve additional costs.

Responsible party: UNVTF Fund Manager with support from UNVTF Board

- 15. Consider clearly defining a concept of sustainability appropriate to the activities supported by the Trust.**

One possibility, which might fit with a focus on promoting good practice, is to define sustainability in terms of durable solutions, supporting programmes that offer solutions that can be feasibly scaled up within realistically available resources.

Responsible party: UNVTF Board with support from UNVTF Fund Manager

ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

(a) The below tables which provide an overview of the project and its evaluation.

Project number:	GLOX42
Project title:	Management of the Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children
Duration:	27.09.2011-31.12.2015 Since August 2011 (Trust Fund itself established by GA Resolution 64/293 in August 2010)
Location:	Vienna
Linkages to Country Programme	None
Linkages to Regional Programme	None
Linkages to Thematic Programme	Sub-programme 1. Countering transnational organized crime, illicit trafficking and illicit drug trafficking; Sub-programme 7. Policy support
Executing Agency:	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
Partner Organizations:	Selected NGOs working with victims of human trafficking through grants provided by the Trust Fund.
Total Approved Budget:	USD 822,181
Donors:	20 Member States and 20 private sector donors (as of April 2014)
Project Manager/Coordinator:	Monica Belalcazar, CPS

Type of evaluation (mid-term or final):	Mid-term
Time period covered by the evaluation:	July 2010 – May 2014
Geographical coverage of the evaluation:	Global coverage of NGO projects (through interviews and desk review)
Core Learning Partners ³⁴ (entities)	Member State donors and Friends of the Global Plan of Action, Trust Fund Board, UNODC, NGO grantees

(b) Project overview and historical context in which the project is implemented;

The idea of establishing a Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons came as the United Nations Global Plan of Action was developed. The Member States, ten years after the adoption of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its Protocols on Trafficking in Persons, Smuggling of Migrants and Illicit Trafficking in Firearms decided that there was a need to renew their commitment to combatting trafficking in persons.

The United Nations Global Plan of Action was an initiative of Belarus and the Group of Friends of the Global Plan of Action, which was created to lobby for the adoption of the Global Plan of Action at the General Assembly.³⁵

The United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (UNVTF) was instituted by General Assembly Resolution A/RES/64/293 in July 2010, under the Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons. Article 38 of the resolution stipulated that the Trust Fund would provide humanitarian, legal and financial aid to victims of trafficking in persons through established channels of assistance, such as governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. UNODC was mandated to manage the Trust Fund. UNODC is supported by a Board of Trustees composed of five persons, appointed by the UN Secretary-General for a three-year term, who have relevant experience in the field of human trafficking. The Board should provide strategic direction to the Trust Fund, mobilize resources and make resource allocations.

The project (GLOX42) was created to facilitate the administration of the Trust Fund. Primarily, to manage the grants awarded through the Small Grants Facility (SGF) of the Trust Fund to Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and to manage the budgeting and expenditure of the direct costs related to the Trust Fund operations.

The SGF was launched in March 2011 to provide tangible support to victims of trafficking in persons, through selected NGOs. The design of the Small Grants Facility drew from lessons learned from a pilot project hosted under the auspices of UN.GIFT. Applicants were permitted to

³⁴ The **Core Learning Partnership (CLP)** encourages a participatory evaluation approach by allowing its members to participate in and provide feedback on key steps of the evaluation process. CLP members are the key stakeholders of the subject evaluated (project, programme, policy etc.) who have an interest in the evaluation. The CLP works closely with the Evaluation Manager to guide the evaluation process. The list of CLP members is to be found in Annex 3.

³⁵ The Group of Friends is composed of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Libya, Nicaragua, Nigeria, the Philippines, Qatar, Russia, Singapore, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, UAE, Uzbekistan and Venezuela.

request grants of up to USD 25,000 per year, for project proposals ranging between 6 and 36 months. The two thematic priorities of the 2011 SGF were: 1. Cross-border and inter-regional activities providing direct humanitarian, legal and/or financial assistance to victims; and 2. Effective remedies for victims of human trafficking, including, but not limited to, legal support, access to justice and compensation. All proposals had to focus on either one or both of the above-listed thematic priorities.

The first call for proposals was opened on 8 March 2011 and closed on 30 April 2011. The SGF was open to all NGOs, or a consortium or coalition led by an eligible NGO, to apply for small grants of up to USD 25,000 per year, for up to 36 months. The 2011 SGF received over 250 applications. The Fund Management team reviewed all proposals and distributed the top 20% received to the Board of Trustees for review. The majority of proposals received to the SGF focused on addressing sex-trafficking. In order to include proposals that were indicative of the numerous types of trafficking (forced labour, domestic servitude), projects which were especially novel with a non- sex trafficking focus were also selected.

Eleven NGOs were selected after the first call for proposals under the SGF to implement projects in all parts of the globe. The selected NGOs provide an annual progress report and are currently in their third and final year of implementation.

Given the low level of funds received during the first three years, the Board decided not to launch a second call for proposals until a minimum of USD 500,000 was available for grant-making purposes.

(c) Justification of the project and main experiences / challenges during implementation, if any;

The United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking was established by the General Assembly in a bid to promote a more victim-centric approach to human trafficking and to find a more prominent place in the UN agenda for this important issue.

One of the main challenges has been raising funds for the Trust Fund and achieving sustainable funding levels that would allow a sound and effective functioning of the Fund and maximize its impact through its implementing partners. Initially, it was expected that the Trust Fund would raise USD 1 million per year. However, in the period between 2010 – 2012 the UNVTF raised only USD 806,000.

Due to the lack of funds, the Trust Fund Board did not approve the initial annual budget that foresaw expenditures for monitoring (USD 20,000), advocacy and fundraising (USD 12,000) among others, and focused instead on grant-making and some limited miscellaneous expenditures.

(d) Project documents and revisions of the original project document;

The project document for GLOX42 was approved in August 2011, which made the Trust Fund operational (one year after its establishment through the GA Resolution). One project revision has been approved in August 2013 to extend the duration of the project until 31 December 2015. The project revision also included activities which had not been explicitly elaborated in the original project document. The new activities - resource mobilization and engagement with non-traditional UN partners - also fall within the remit of the mandate and terms of reference of the Trust Fund.

(e) UNODC strategy context and project's contribution to UNODC country, regional or thematic programme;

The management of the UNVTF is linked to Sub-programme 1. Countering transnational organized crime, illicit trafficking and illicit drug trafficking; and Sub-programme 7. Policy support.

(f) Project's main objectives and outcomes;

The Trust Fund's main objective is to provide humanitarian, legal and financial aid to victims of trafficking in persons through established channels of assistance, such as governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations.

The project's main objective is to create and strengthen support structures for victims of trafficking, specifically, humanitarian, legal and financial support through implementing partners including governments, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations.

The project's main outcomes are:

Outcome 1: The Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children is managed effectively and sustainably.

Outcome 2: Establish funding instruments which respond to urgent temporal and local challenges, strengthening front-line support providers, principally NGOs.

Outcome 3: A Board of Trustees to provide strong and coherent strategic guidance

(g) References

Annex 2 - Background Information List includes important background documents such as the Global Plan of Action – GA Res 64/293, The Terms of Reference of the Trust Fund, Annual Reports, Minutes of Board meetings, GLOX42 project documents, etc.

2. DISBURSEMENT HISTORY

Overall Budget (Sept.2011 – Dec 2015)	Total Approved Budget (Nov.2013 – May 2014)	Expenditure (2011 – Dec.2013)	Expenditure in % (2011 – Dec.2013)
USD 1,193,280	USD 822,181	USD 789,525	88 %

3. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

This section identifies the purpose of the evaluation by answering the below questions.

(a) Who commissioned the evaluation?

At the first meeting of the Board of Trustees in February 2011, following discussions with the Financial Resources Management Section (FRMS) and Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) the Board agreed to a budget of USD 20,000 for a 2-year period in order to fund effective monitoring and evaluation of the projects.

The project document for GLOX42 stipulates the following on evaluation: “An independent evaluation of the Trust Fund’s operations must be conducted biennially. The evaluation assesses the functioning of the Trust Fund as a whole, against the objectives of the Trust Fund as stated in the ‘Global Plan of Action’ and the ToR, looking at both substantive and operational issues. Provisions for external evaluation have been made in the project budget and may not be reduced or eliminated, not even by written agreement of Fund Management and the Board of Trustees.

(b) Why is the evaluation being undertaken at this point?

The project revision document stated that “an independent evaluation of the project will be conducted at the end of the first-grant making cycle, instead of biennially (envisaged in late 2014 or early 2015). The Board of Trustees will continue to be involved in developing various aspects of the evaluation with the Fund Manager and IEU.” This decision to change the timing of the evaluation was discussed with the Board of Trustees and reflected the actual funding levels as well as sought to maximize the impact of the evaluation.

The timing of the current evaluation will allow to assess progress made by the implementing partners, yet within their third year of operation, but will allow the evaluation report to be finalized before the end of the first grant-making cycle so that lessons learned and recommendation can be incorporated into a second grant-making cycle.

(c) What does the evaluation seek to accomplish?

To learn lessons about the management of the Trust Fund and the use of the funds that could help to improve the way the Trust Fund operates in the future; to provide accountability to donors on whether resources were wisely utilized; to help identify the value added of the Trust Fund and formulate recommendations for improvement.

(d) What decisions may the evaluation guide you to?

To suggest new or revised grant-making mechanisms to assist victims of human trafficking, to ensure basic trust fund management functions are budgeted for, to define priorities for the Trust Fund Board and Secretariat, to assess the cost structure of the Trust Fund management to maximise efficiency and impact.

(e) Who are the main evaluation users and how will they be involved?

UNODC as Trust Fund manager, the Board of Trustees, the donors, the UN Member States advocating for the creation of the Trust Fund, i.e. the Group of Friends of the Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons.

UNODC and Board of Trustees will address and implement recommendations of the evaluation. Donors and UN Member States, especially those who have an interest in the Global Plan of

Action will provide input and receive the final evaluation report for consideration of future contributions to the Trust Fund.

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

In clarifying the scope of the evaluation, the following points should first be determined:

- (a) The unit of analysis to be covered by the evaluation

The UN Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking, project GLOX42.

- (b) The time period to be covered by the evaluation

July 2010 – beginning of evaluation (tentative date: 15 June 2014).

- (c) The geographical coverage of the evaluation.

Global. Given that the UN Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking has provided funding to NGOs in 11 different countries around the globe, that it is a UN-wide Trust Fund and open to contributions from a wide range of donors, the coverage of the evaluation will be global. However, the evaluation should be desk-based with limited travel. It is not envisaged that the independent evaluators will be travelling to visit the ongoing projects but rather focus on the structural and managerial aspects of the Trust Fund.

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation questions will address relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact, and the criteria related to partnerships and cooperation.

In addition, attention will be paid to the lessons learned. The below evaluation questions are provided as indicative only, and they are required to be further refined by the evaluator.

Relevance:

- To what extent is the UN Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking relevant for the victims it aims to assist?
- To what extent is the Trust Fund relevant for the specialized NGOs eligible for its grants?
- What is the value added of the Trust Fund vis-à-vis other similar donor sources? What is its unique function that distinguishes it from other funding sources addressing human trafficking?

Efficiency:

- To what extent is the Trust Fund operating in a cost-effective manner, particularly in comparison to similar UN multi-donor Trust Funds addressing human rights issues?
- To what extent are there clear roles and responsibilities laid out, assigned, and followed by the Board of Trustees and the UNODC Secretariat of the Fund?

Partnerships and Cooperation:

- To what extent have partnerships been sought and established and synergies been created with
 - a) UN agencies (Inter-agency Coordination Group against Trafficking in Persons (ICAT));
 - b) other UN Trust Funds assisting victims of human trafficking (OHCHR);
 - c) NGO networks working on human trafficking;
 - d) private sector partners willing to help in fundraising or contributing to the Trust Fund?

Effectiveness:

- To what extent is the Trust Fund being effective in fulfilling its objective to assist victims of human trafficking? Has it met the expectations of the UN Member States that advocated for its creation?
- How effective is the Trust Fund monitoring the implementation of projects it is funding?
- How effective is the Trust Fund being promoted to external audiences and resources being mobilized?

Impact:

- What are some preliminary findings about the impact the Trust Fund grants are making to the long-term well-being of victims of trafficking in persons?
- Should the Trust Fund keep its scope of reaching out to the victims through NGOs or should it consider widening its scope and involve other international organizations working with victims of trafficking in the direct delivery of assistance?

Sustainability:

- To what extent is the Trust Fund ensuring that results achieved through its grants are continuing after the end of the funding?

Lessons learned:

- To what extent have lessons learned identified by the Board and UNODC (CPS and HTMSS) been considered to make decisions for the future of the Trust Fund?
- What could be learned from lessons learned exercises made by from similar UN Trust Funds (OHCHR) for the Fund's future decisions?

6. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

- (a) The methods used to collect and analyse data on which the quality of the evaluation is dependent on.

Desk review, structured interviews, discussions, questionnaires.

- (b) The sources of data

Primary and secondary sources. These include: Foundational and procedural documents of the Trust Fund, Annual progress reports, interviews with former and current Board Members and UNODC staff involved with the Trust Fund, data and interviews with OHCHR Anti-Slavery Trust Fund, interviews with Member State representatives involved with the Global Plan of

Action, interviews with NGOs implementing Trust Fund grants; questionnaires. A preliminary desk review list is provided in Annex I.

(c) Possible reference to an evaluation methodology summarized in an evaluation matrix by the evaluator.

The evaluation should not be seen purely as an ex-post evaluation but it should contain elements of an ex-ante evaluation to guide the future of the Trust Fund.

7. TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

Deliverables	Location	Tentative deadlines
Desk study	Home-based	15-30 June 2014
Draft Inception Report	Home-based / UNODC HQ	30 June – 15 July 2014
Presentation of final inception report; Mission to Vienna	UNODC HQ	Inception report by 15 July 2014, mission third week of July
Possible evaluation mission	Geneva	July – end August 2014
Presentation of preliminary findings	Home-based, via Skype	31 August 2014
First draft evaluation report	Home-based	15 September 2014, revised first draft by 15 October 2014
Second draft evaluation report	Home-based	5 November 2014
Final evaluation report	Home-based	13 November 2014
Presentation of evaluation findings and recommendations	UNODC HQ	14 November 2014
Presentation to board		21 November 2014

Around 40 days – could be more ...

\$19,000 travel including ...travel ...

(a) When the evaluation takes place

The evaluation will be undertaken for 4-5 months starting in mid-June 2014.

(b) When the field missions of the evaluation are planned for

Field missions not envisaged. Travel will be to Vienna twice (July and November 2014) and could include Geneva (July/August 2014), if the budget permits.

(c) What the expected deliverables and respective timeframes are

The Lead Evaluator will have the overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of all deliverables, as specified below:

- Inception Report: The evaluation team will conduct a desk review of existing documentation and summarize this in an inception report, containing a refined work plan, methodology and evaluation tools (in line with UNODC/IEU evaluation handbook, guidelines and templates³⁶). The report should present evaluation criteria, indicators, sources of information, and methods of data collection to address the evaluation questions. The Inception Report is to be submitted through the application on Independent Project Evaluation in ProFi and will be reviewed, commented on and cleared by IEU before a possible mission takes place. The Inception Report is to be presented to UNODC stakeholders in Vienna.

- Draft Evaluation Report: The evaluation team will produce an evaluation report summarizing the main findings along agreed evaluation criteria addressing the key evaluation questions, in line with UNODC evaluation policy, guidelines and templates. A presentation of preliminary findings will take place via teleconference with UNODC HQ. The draft report is to be submitted through the application on Independent Project Evaluation in ProFi to IEU for review, comments and clearance, as well as to all relevant stakeholders (CLP) for comments.

- Final Evaluation Report: to be submitted through the application on Independent Project Evaluation in ProFi to IEU for review, comments and clearance.

- Presentation of evaluation findings and recommendations in Vienna to CLP and other stakeholders.

8. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

(a) The number of evaluators needed

The evaluation team will be composed of two international evaluators, with one of them serving as the team leader. The evaluation team will work closely with UNODC's Independent Evaluation Unit and consult with relevant staff within UNODC. The independent evaluation will be carried out following UNODC evaluation policy, guidelines, handbook and templates.

(b) The role of Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU)

The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) provides norms, tools and templates for the different stages of the evaluation process. IEU also advises on evaluation matters and is involved in the process described in the Roles and Responsibilities table for Independent Project Evaluations (to be found on the IEU website, <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html>). IEU clears the final Terms of Reference and the final inception report. Furthermore, IEU clears the draft evaluation report and assesses the final evaluation report after final assessment made by the Project Manager.

³⁶ All UNODC/IEU Evaluation Norms, Standards, Guidelines and Templates that must be used in the evaluation process, can be found on the IEU-website: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html>

IEU supports the process of issuing a management response, and posts the final evaluation report on the evaluation website.

(c) Conflict of interest

Members of the evaluation team must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of the Trust Fund, including UNODC project GLOX42 and/or have benefited from the grants provided by the Trust Fund.

(d) Reference to the specific job descriptions detailing qualifications and responsibilities

The evaluation will be conducted by an evaluation team with a lead evaluator with expertise in evaluation and a supporting consultant with expertise in the subject area of trafficking in persons. Preference will be given to evaluation teams that are gender balanced and from different geographical regions.

The evaluators will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial.

The consultants are contracted by UNODC. The qualifications and responsibilities for each team member are specified in the respective job descriptions attached to these Terms of Reference (Annex 1).

9. MANAGEMENT OF EVALUATION PROCESS

(a) Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation stakeholders, including responsibilities of the field offices and units and sections at headquarters (where appropriate);

Management Arrangements

The independent evaluation will be carried out following UNODC's evaluation policy, handbook, guidelines and templates, as well as UNEG Norms and Standards. The evaluation team will consult with relevant sections within UNODC.

Roles and responsibilities

Project Managers:

Management is responsible for drafting and finalizing the ToR, selecting Core Learning Partners and informing them of their role, recruiting evaluators, providing desk review materials to the evaluation team, reviewing the inception report as well as the evaluation methodology, liaising with the Core Learning Partners, reviewing the draft report, assessing the quality of the final report by using the Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports, disseminating the final evaluation report, as well as developing an implementation plan for the evaluation recommendations.

The Independent Evaluation Unit:

The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) provides norms, tools and templates for the different stages of the evaluation process. IEU also advises on evaluation matters and is involved in the process described in the Roles and Responsibilities table for Independent Project Evaluations (to be found

on the IEU website, <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html>). IEU clears the final Terms of Reference and the final inception report. Furthermore, IEU clears the draft evaluation report and assesses the final evaluation report after final assessment made by the Project Manager. IEU supports the process of issuing a management response, and posts the final evaluation report on the evaluation website.

Core Learning Partners:

Members of the Core Learning Partnership (CLP) are selected by the project managers. Members of the CLP are selected from the key stakeholder groups, including UNODC management, mentors, beneficiaries, partner organizations and donor Member States. The CLPs are asked to comment on key steps of the evaluation and act as facilitators with respect to the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up action.

Evaluation Team:

Roles and Responsibilities of the Lead Evaluator:

- ensure quality and timely delivery of all activities and reports; carry out the desk review;
- develop the inception report, including sample size and sampling technique;
- draft and finalize the inception report and evaluation methodology, incorporating relevant comments; clearance IEU;
- lead and coordinate the evaluation process and oversee the tasks of the second evaluator;
- implement quantitative tools and analyze data;
- triangulate data and test rival explanations;
- ensure that all aspects of the terms of reference are fulfilled;
- participate in selected missions, if any;
- draft an evaluation report in line with UNODC evaluation policy, handbook, guidelines and templates; clearance IEU;
- finalize the evaluation report on the basis of comments received; clearance IEU;
- include a management response in the final report;
- present the findings and recommendations of the evaluation at the different stages of the evaluation.

Roles and Responsibilities of the second Evaluator:

- assist the Lead Evaluator in all stages of the evaluation process, as per the respective TOR;
- provide methodological evaluation quality assurance throughout the evaluation process;
- comment on and contributes to all deliverables of the evaluation team;
- join some of the planned missions, if any and apply methodological tools.

(More details will be provided in the job descriptions in Annex 1.)

(b) Logistical support responsibilities, such as arrangements for transportation, translation, office space etc.

Project Managers at UNODC Headquarters will be in charge of providing logistical support to the evaluation team including arranging the field missions of the evaluation team. For the field

missions, the evaluation team liaises with the UNODC Regional/Field Offices and mentors as appropriate.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES

The lump-sum payment correlates to deliverables – three installments are foreseen (25%, 25% and 50% of total fees):

- The first payment (25 per cent of the consultancy fee) upon receipt of the Inception Report and clearance by IEU;
- The second payment (25 per cent of the consultancy fee) upon receipt of the Draft Evaluation Report and clearance by IEU;
- The third and final payment (50 percent of the consultancy fee, i.e. the remainder of the fee) only after completion of the respective tasks, receipt of the final report and clearance by UNODC/IEU and presentation of the findings in Vienna.

75 percent of the daily subsistence allowance and terminals is paid in advance, before travelling. The balance is paid after the travel has taken place, upon presentation of boarding passes and the completed travel claim forms.

11. ANNEXES³⁷

Annex 1. Job descriptions of evaluators

Annex 2. List of background documents for the desk review

Annex 3. List of CLP Members (names and titles)

Annex 4. UNODC standard format and guidelines for evaluation reports

³⁷ Not included.

ANNEX II. EVALUATION TOOLS: INTERVIEW GUIDES AND EVALUATION MATRIX

II.1 GLOX42 Interview Guides

Interviewer name: _____

Respondent title: _____

Date: _____

INTRODUCTION AND INFORMED CONSENT

As you know, an independent evaluation team is working with UNODC to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the project ‘Management of the Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children’ (GLOX42). The evaluation seeks to: learn lessons about the management of the Trust Fund that could help to improve the way the Trust Fund operates in the future; provide accountability to donors on whether resources are being wisely used; help identify the value added of the Trust Fund; and formulate recommendations for improvement.

Confidentiality

As part of the evaluation, I would like to ask you some questions about the UNVTF and about your work related to this Fund. 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 individual perspectives with UNODC or other project staff, donors, or anyone outside of the research team.

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?

Interview Guide - UNODC Staff and Board Members (former and current)

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Could you please give me your official title and a brief description of your work?
2. Could you please describe your work relating to the UN Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking (UNVTF)?

II. RELEVANCE

Development

3. How was UNVTF developed?
4. Was it developed in response to a specific problem, challenge, or issue? If so, what problems, challenges, and/or issues?
5. Who was involved with its development?
6. To what extent do you consider that the activities of the UNODC project ‘Management of the Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children’ (GLOX42) as designed and implemented contribute to the desired objectives of the UNVTF?
7. How were the thematic priorities of the 2011 and 2014 SGF calls established (through which mechanism and according to which criteria)?
8. To what extent do you consider the thematic priorities reflect priorities on the ground?

2011 Thematic priorities:

1. Cross-border and inter-regional activities providing direct humanitarian, legal and/or financial assistance to victims.
2. Effective remedies for victims of human trafficking, including, but not limited to, legal support, access to justice and compensation.

2014 Thematic priorities:

1. Direct, effective and sustainable remedies for victims of human trafficking, with an emphasis on assistance delivery by grassroots organizations, including, but not limited to, housing, food, legal aid, access to justice, psychosocial support, medical care, training and sustainable livelihoods.
2. Humanitarian, financial and/or legal assistance to victims of cross border and interregional trafficking, with an emphasis on activities in developing countries.)
- 3.

Response to need

9. How does the UNVTF assess the extent to which it is relevant to the victims it aims to assist?
10. How does the Fund ensure that SGF priorities are relevant for specialised NGOs?
11. To what extent do you consider the UNVTF relevant for the victims it aims to assist and the specialized NGOs eligible for its grants?

Value-added

12. What other funding mechanism and instruments are available for organizations supporting victims of trafficking?
13. What distinguishes UNVTF from these other funding sources?
14. How do you understand the UNVTF comparative advantage/value-added vis-à-vis these other similar initiatives (including OHCHR Slavery Fund)?
15. In your opinion, should the Trust Fund keep its scope of reaching out to the victims through NGOs or should it consider widening its scope and involve other international organizations working with victims of trafficking in the direct delivery of assistance?

III. EFFICIENCY

Efficiency/cost-effectiveness

16. In your opinion, what factors contribute to the efficiency or inefficiency of the Trust Fund implementation?
17. To what extent do you consider the mechanisms to select projects for funding under the SGF to be efficient?
18. What do you consider could be learned from similar UN Trust Funds (OHCHR) for the UNVTF's future decisions?

Management

19. To what extent in your view are there clear roles and responsibilities assigned and followed by the Board of Trustees and the UNODC Secretariat of the Fund?
20. In your understanding, what are the roles of the Board?
21. In your understanding, what is the role of UNODC as Fund Manager?
22. What, if any, differences exist between the roles of the Board and Fund Manager as laid out and the roles in practice?

IV. PARTNERSHIPS AND COOPERATION

23. To what extent have partnerships/synergies been sought between the UNVTF and
 - a) UN agencies (Inter-agency Coordination Group against Trafficking in Persons (ICAT));
 - b) Other UN Trust Funds assisting victims of human trafficking (OHCHR);
 - c) NGO networks working on human trafficking;
 - d) Private sector partners willing to help in fundraising or contributing to the Trust Fund?
24. How has UNVTF coordinated its activities with these groups?

V. EFFECTIVENESS

Monitoring

25. What systems are in place for monitoring the implementation of SGF projects?
26. How effective do you consider the UNVTF in monitoring the implementation of the grant projects?
27. To what extent do you consider that the UNVTF is meeting its objective to provide humanitarian, legal and financial aid to victims of trafficking in persons? (How do you understand this objective?)

Fundraising

28. How effective do you consider is the Trust Fund to be in raising funds?
- Does the UNVTF have a fund-raising strategy?
 - What elements of the UNVTF fund-raising efforts to date would you describe as effective? Ineffective?
 - What have been the main fund-raising challenges?
 - How have they been overcome?
29. How has the UNVTF promoted itself since its inception?
- Does the UNVTF have a marketing strategy?
 - If so, to what extent do you consider that this strategy has proved effective?

VI. SUSTAINABILITY

30. To what extent do the criteria for the selection of SGF projects address the issue of sustainability beyond SGF funding?
31. Does the UNVTF have any mechanism in place to monitor grant results beyond the life of the grant?
32. What, if any challenges, exist in ensuring sustainability of victim assistance activities such as those supported by UNVTF?

VII. LESSONS LEARNED

33. What were the main lessons learned from the first SGF round of call for proposals?
34. How have these lessons informed the second round?
35. What other lessons have been learned and what changes have they resulted in?

RECOMMENDATIONS

36. What recommendations would you make to improve the functioning of the UNVTF in the future?
37. What recommendations would you make to the UNVTF to ensure that it fulfills its overall objective of providing direct humanitarian, legal and financial assistance to victims of trafficking?

Interview Guide - NGOs

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Could you please give me your official title and a brief description of your work?
2. Could you please describe your work relating to the UN Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking (UNVTF)?

II. RELEVANCE

3. Can you briefly tell us about your project that received support through the SGF? (prompt: ask also how it provided direct support to the victims)
4. How did you become aware of the UNVTF and its SGF?
5. Are you aware on how the thematic priorities of the 2011 and 2014 SGF calls were established (through which mechanism and according to which criteria)? Were you/NGOs consulted in these processes?
6. To what extent do you consider the thematic priorities reflect priorities on the ground?
 - 2011 Thematic priorities:
 1. Cross-border and inter-regional activities providing direct humanitarian, legal and/or financial assistance to victims.
 2. Effective remedies for victims of human trafficking, including, but not limited to, legal support, access to justice and compensation.
 - 2014 Thematic priorities:
 1. Direct, effective and sustainable remedies for victims of human trafficking, with an emphasis on assistance delivery by grassroots organizations, including, but not limited to, housing, food, legal aid, access to justice, psychosocial support, medical care, training and sustainable livelihoods.
 2. Humanitarian, financial and/or legal assistance to victims of cross border and interregional trafficking, with an emphasis on activities in developing countries.)

Response to need

7. To what extent do you consider the UNVTF relevant for the victims it aims to assist?
8. To what extent do you consider the UNVTF relevant for the specialized NGOs eligible for its grants?
9. To what extent do NGOs consider the SGF to be an appropriate mechanism to meet their needs? Would you have any suggestions for alternative mechanisms?

Value-added

10. What other funding mechanism and instruments are available for organizations supporting victims of trafficking?
11. What distinguishes UNVTF from these other funding sources?
12. How do you understand the UNVTF comparative advantage/value-added vis-à-vis these other similar initiatives (including OCHCR Slavery Fund)

III. EFFICIENCY

Efficiency/cost-effectiveness

13. In your opinion, what factors contribute to the efficiency or inefficiency of the Trust Fund implementation? (Please consider your experience as a grant recipient – application and selection process, disbursement of funds, reporting requirements, monitoring by UNODC etc.)

IV. PARTNERSHIPS AND COOPERATION

14. Are you aware of any efforts by the UNVTF to establish partnerships/synergies with NGO networks working on human trafficking?
15. How has UNVTF coordinated its activities with these groups?

V. EFFECTIVENESS

Monitoring

16. How does the UNVTF monitor the implementation of your grant?
17. How effective do you consider this process?

VI. SUSTAINABILITY

18. Does the UNVTF have any mechanism in place to monitor grant results beyond the life of the grant?
19. What, if any challenges, exist in ensuring sustainability of victim assistance activities such as those supported by UNVTF?

RECOMMENDATIONS

20. What recommendations would you make to the UNVTF for future improvement? (for example with regard to the relevance of the SGF criteria and priorities for victims)

Interview Guide – Donors

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Could you please give me your name and title?
2. Could you please describe your engagement with the UN Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking (UNVTF)?
3. How did you learn about the UNVTF?
4. When and how much did you contribute to the UNVTF?

II. RELEVANCE

Response to need

5. To what extent do you consider the UNVTF relevant for the victims it aims to assist?
6. To what extent do you consider the UNVTF relevant for the specialized NGOs eligible for its grants?

Value-added

7. Are you aware of other funding mechanism and instruments available for organizations supporting victims of trafficking? Do you provide support to any of these?
8. What distinguishes UNVTF from these other funding sources?
9. How do you understand the UNVTF comparative advantage/value-added vis-à-vis these other similar initiatives (including OHCHR Slavery Fund)

III. EFFICIENCY

Efficiency/cost-effectiveness

10. In your opinion, what factors contribute to the efficiency or inefficiency of the Trust Fund implementation?

V. EFFECTIVENESS

11. To what extent do you consider that the Trust Fund is meeting its objective to provide humanitarian, legal and financial aid to victims of trafficking in persons?

Fundraising

12. How effective do you consider is the Trust Fund to be in raising funds?
 - a. Does the UNVTF have a fund-raising strategy?
 - b. What elements of the UNVTF fund-raising efforts to date would you describe as effective? Ineffective?
13. What are the reasons that you as a funder have chosen to support the UNVTF?

VI. SUSTAINABILITY

14. What, if any challenges, exist in ensuring sustainability of victim assistance activities such as those supported by UNVTF?

RECOMMENDATIONS

15. What recommendation would you make to improve the functioning of the UNVTF in the future?
16. What recommendations would you make to the UNVTF to improve its fund-raising efforts?

ANNEX II.2: GLOX42 Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Question	Data Collection Questions	Data Sources				
		UNODC	Board Members	NGO recipients	Donors/other MSs	Document review
RELEVANCE						
1. To what extent does the UNVTF respond to a clearly identified need?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How was UNVTF 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? To what extent do the GLOX42 activities as designed and implemented contribute to the desired objectives of the UNVTF? 	X	X			X
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How were the thematic priorities of the 2011 and 2014 SGF calls established (through which mechanism and according to which criteria)? To what extent do the thematic priorities reflect priorities on the ground? 	X	X			X
2. To what extent is the UN Trust Fund relevant to its key stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is the UN Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking relevant for the victims it aims to assist? How does the Fund assess the extent to which it is relevant to the victims it aims to assist? 	X	X	X		X
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is the Trust Fund relevant for the specialized NGOs eligible for its grants? To what extent do NGOs consider the SGF to be an appropriate mechanism to meet their needs? How does the Fund ensure that SGF priorities are relevant for specialised NGOs? 	X	X	X		X

Evaluation Question	Data Collection Questions	Data Sources				
		UNODC	Board Members	NGO recipients	Donors/other MSs	Document review
3. What is the value added of the Trust Fund vis-à-vis other similar donor sources?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What other funding mechanism and instruments are available for organizations supporting victims of trafficking? • What distinguishes UNVTF from these other funding sources? • How do stakeholders understand the Trust Fund comparative advantage/value-added vis-à-vis these other similar initiatives (including OCHCR Slavery Fund) • Should the Trust Fund keep its scope of reaching out to the victims through NGOs or should it consider widening its scope and involve other international organizations working with victims of trafficking in the direct delivery of assistance? 	X	X	X	X	X
EFFICIENCY						
4. To what extent is the Trust Fund operating in a cost-effective manner (particularly in comparison to similar UN multi-donor Trust Funds addressing human rights issues)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What factors contribute to the efficiency or inefficiency of the Trust Fund implementation? • To what extent are the mechanisms to select projects for funding under the SGF efficient?³⁸ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What is the approximate proportion on the UNVTF budget that is allocated to grants? ○ How does this compare to other similar Funds? • What could be learned from lessons learned exercises made by from similar UN Trust Funds (OHCHR) for the Fund’s future decisions? 	X	X	X	X	X
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are there clear roles and responsibilities laid out, assigned, and followed by the Board of Trustees and the UNODC Secretariat of the Fund? • What are the roles of the Board? 	X	X			X

³⁸ Should take into account non-costed UN and non-UN inputs.

Evaluation Question	Data Collection Questions	Data Sources				
		UNODC	Board Members	NGO recipients	Donors/other MSs	Document review
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the role of UNODC as Fund Manager? • What, if any, differences exist between the roles of the Board and Fund Manager as laid out and the roles in practice? 					
PARTNERSHIPS AND COOPERATION						
5. To what extent have partnerships been sought and established and synergies created?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have partnerships/synergies been sought between the UNVTF and <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) UN agencies (Inter-agency Coordination Group against Trafficking in Persons (ICAT); b) other UN Trust Funds assisting victims of human trafficking (OHCHR); c) NGO networks working on human trafficking; d) private sector partners willing to help in fundraising or contributing to the Trust Fund? • How has UNVTF coordinated its activities with these groups? 	X	X	X	X	X
EFFECTIVENESS						
6. To what extent do Member States consider the Trust Fund is effective in fulfilling its objective to assist victims of human trafficking?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What systems are in place for monitoring the implementation of SGF projects? • How effective do stakeholders consider the Trust Fund in monitoring the implementation of the grant projects? • To what extent do stakeholders consider that the Trust Fund is meeting its 	X	X	X	X	X

Evaluation Question	Data Collection Questions	Data Sources				
		UNODC	Board Members	NGO recipients	Donors/other MSs	Document review
	objective to provide humanitarian, legal and financial aid to victims of trafficking in persons?					
7. How effectively is the Trust Fund being promoted to external audiences and resources being mobilized?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effectively is the Trust Fund in raising funds? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does the UNVTF have a fund-raising strategy? ○ What elements of the UNVTF fund-raising efforts to date would stakeholders describe as effective? Ineffective? ○ What have been the main fund-raising challenges? ○ How have they been overcome? • What are the reasons that funders choose to support the UNVTF? 	X	X		X	X
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How has the UNVTF promoted itself since its inception? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does the UNVTF have a marketing strategy? • If so, to what extent has this strategy proved effective? 	X	X	X	X	X
SUSTAINABILITY						
8. To what extent is the Trust Fund ensuring that results achieved through its grants are continuing after the end of the funding?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent do the criteria for the selection of SGF projects address the issue of sustainability beyond SGF funding? • Does the UNVTF have any mechanism in place to monitor grant results beyond the life of the grant? • What, if any challenges, exist in ensuring sustainability of victim assistance activities such as those supported by UNVTF? 	X	X			X
LESSONS LEARNED						
9. To what extent have lessons learned identified by the Board and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the main lessons learned from the first SGF round of call for proposals? 	X	X			X

Evaluation Question	Data Collection Questions	Data Sources				
		UNODC	Board Members	NGO recipients	Donors/other MSs	Document review
UNODC (CPS and HTMSS) been considered to make decisions for the future of the Trust Fund?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How have these lessons informed the second SGF round? • What other lessons have been learned and what changes have they resulted in? 					

Note: Within the scope of the evaluation, we are not able to address the questions relating to Impact.

ANNEX III. DESK REVIEW LIST

Document Name	Type
Global Plan of Action, UNGA A/RES/64/293	UN Resolution
Terms of Reference of the Trust Fund (2011 and 2013)	ToR
Small Grants Facility Guidelines (2011 and 2014) Lessons learned from 2011	Guidelines
2011 UNVTF Annual Progress Report	Report
2012 UNVTF Annual Progress Report	Report
2013 UNVTF Annual Progress Report	Report
Input to the SG Report to the Security Council 2013	Report
GLOX42 Project Document and budget - 2011	ProFi ProDoc
GLOX42 Project Revision - 2013	ProFi ProDoc
Certified Financial Statements 2011, 2012, 2013	Financial Statement
UN Trust Fund website www.unodc.org/unodc/human-trafficking-fund.html	Website
Draft Fundraising strategy 2011	Strategy
Draft Resource Mobilization Strategy 2014	Strategy
Private sector fundraising guidelines	Guidelines
Minutes of 10 Board Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First Board Meeting Minutes – Feb 2011 - Second Board Meeting Minutes – July 2011 - Third Board Meeting Minutes – August 2011 - Fourth Board Meeting Minutes – September 2011 - Fifth Board Meeting Minutes – February 2012 - Sixth Board Meeting Minutes – June 2012 - Seventh Board Meeting Minutes – November 2012 - Eighth Board Meeting Minutes – July/August 2013 - Ninth Board Meeting Minutes – October 2013 - Tenth Board Meeting Minutes – April 2014 	Minutes
Contributions Overview	Table
Operational Budget	Table
Monitoring templates	Forms
2011 SGF Application form – Project proposals of 11 selected NGOs	Project doc
OHCHR Anti-Slavery Trust Fund website http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/slavery/UNVTF/CF/SPages/WhattheFundis.aspx	Website
Minutes of the Meetings with OHCHR Trust Funds Representatives (2011, 2012, 2013)	Minutes
Concept Note on the Small Grants Facility for Civil Society Organizations (UN.GIFT)	Concept Note
Paper on Governance and Funding of the Trust Fund	Paper
TOR of the Mid-term Independent Project Evaluation of GLOX42	ToR
UN Democracy Fund website http://www.un.org/democracyfund/	Website
IOM Global Emergency Fund website https://www.iom.int/files/live/sites/iom/files/partnerships/docs/2012-IOM-CSOConsultations/Additional_Resources/IOM_DMM_05_FACT_SHEET_MAD_GAF.pdf	Website