

Judith Kelley, Ph.D., Andrew Heiss, and Miguel Guevara ■ May 2015

Prepared for sharing preliminary results with NGO respondents ■ Not for citation or distribution

■ Executive Summary

This report summarizes the responses from a survey of over 500 nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) active in fighting human trafficking in 133 different countries worldwide. The survey sought to understand the activities of NGOs around the world, their perceptions of policy players in their countries, and their views about the US efforts in their countries. The survey targeted 1,100 NGOs worldwide, of which 506 organizations responded.

This report focuses on (1) the global makeup and activities of the NGO sector in fighting human trafficking, (2) the work and influence of relevant actors on human trafficking policies in the countries they target, and (3) the impact of the United States in influencing and supporting anti-trafficking efforts including the perceptions of the US State Department's annual Trafficking in Persons (TIP) Report.

This survey reflects the truly inter-sectional and international character of the global fight against human trafficking, with NGOs engaging in a wide array of initiatives spanning 133 different countries worldwide. Such initiatives—focused in particular on sex and labor trafficking—include prevention, victim protection, and prosecution of traffickers. The survey also highlights broad international collaboration and cooperation between various actors, institutions, and governments on issues and initiatives related to human trafficking. In particular, the data shows that NGOs and civil society organizations (CSOs) are the most consistent and active actors engaged in combatting human trafficking.

However, the majority of these organizations have nominal influence over actual human trafficking policy in the countries they work in. Governments play a more significant role in the actual creation and implementation of trafficking policy. Specifically, foreign governments and embassies—primarily those of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, France, Norway, and others in the European Union—have a powerful impact in influencing policy and combatting human trafficking. The survey results contain more than 650 references to foreign-backed anti-trafficking programs across the majority of the countries where NGOs engage in advocacy. The United States is the most powerful and significant foreign actor in framing human trafficking issues and initiatives, accounting for 78% of survey responses in regards to foreign actors active in fighting human trafficking.

Finally, in addition to its work in framing human trafficking policies and efforts, the United States has had a significant impact in the fight against human trafficking through its annual release of the Department of State's TIP report, which is regarded as a vital tool by national governments and NGOs alike, and which serves as a comprehensive point of reference for the wide range of actors who participate in human trafficking issues.

May 19, 2015
Durham, North Carolina, USA

A word from the principal investigator

It is with great pleasure that I share this report with the many non-governmental organizations that graciously took time to speak with us or fill out our survey. This report is part of a larger effort to study the effectiveness of the United States' effort to combat human trafficking around the world. The research is funded by the National Science Foundation, but has been carried out entirely independently of any US government influence by my team and myself. As scholars at Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, our inquiry is scholarly and driven by a desire to understand the nature of the global fight against human trafficking with a particular focus on the efforts conducted by the United States, since they appear to be so pervasive.

This report has been several years in the making. We first spent about a year putting together a comprehensive database of human trafficking NGOs in the field. In the summer of 2014 we fielded the survey over a three-month period, and during the fall and spring we cleaned and analyzed the data. What we share with you here is a preliminary report only. This is why we ask you not to distribute it outside of your own organization. The plan is for the results of the survey, as well as many of the additional insights that respondents wrote in greater detail, to be published in a journal article as well as part of a forthcoming book that I am working on about the human trafficking diplomacy of the United States. In these publications we will also delve deeper into the data, for example to understand views of different organizations depending on whether they receive funding from the US and so forth.

When we initially asked you to respond to the survey, we told you we would share the database on human trafficking NGOs. To make our data accessible to everyone, we partnered with a US-based NGO that was also in the process of assembling a database on NGOs around the world. By sharing our NGO names and addresses with them, together we were able to build a larger database that everyone can access at globalmodernslavery.org. We have kept the responses of any individual organization anonymous.

We hope you find the report interesting and we thank you deeply for the time you took to cooperate with us to create it.

Sincerely,



Judith Kelley
Kevin D. Gorter Professor of Public Policy and Political Science
Duke University Sanford School of Public Policy

■ Profile of Human Trafficking NGOs

Global makeup

In the summer of 2014, the Sanford School of Public Policy surveyed 1,100 NGOs working in the fight against human trafficking. Of these, 506 unique organizations completed the survey, yielding a response rate of 45.59%.




Figure 1 Countries where NGOs reported advocacy work




Figure 2 Responses to the question “In how many countries has your organization done most of its advocacy work over the past 10 years?”

However, the global reach of these organizations is wider than the organizations surveyed. Because some respondents answered the survey for more than one country in which they worked, the final survey data contains 588 responses covering 133 countries (see Figure 1). A little more than half of the NGOs surveyed (253, or 56%) reported working in only one country, with 28% working in two to four countries, and 16% working in five or more (see Figure 2). This suggests an opportunity may exist to expand mid-range NGOs to fill in gaps at a regional level, such as Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos in Mainland Southeast Asia.




Figure 3 Countries where NGOs are headquartered

Though the United States has enormous influence in the global campaign against trafficking, the vast majority of civil society-based advocacy originates outside the US, with 88% of respondent NGOs reporting non-US headquarters (see Figure 3). In general, NGOs work close to their fields, with approximately three-fourths headquartered in the countries they work in. A third of these NGOs also report working outside the country where their organization is headquartered.

Actions and efforts

On average, the NGOs surveyed reported spending 57% of their time and resources on some sort of human trafficking advocacy, with 12% focused solely on anti-trafficking issues (see Figure 4). This highlights the inter-sectional nature of both the crisis of human trafficking and the NGOs participating in the fight against it. For example, many NGOs cited inter-sectional interests related to human trafficking such as organized crime, education, employment, and other related interests.




Figure 4 Responses to the question “About what percent of your organization’s time and resources are spent on fighting against trafficking or helping victims of trafficking?”




Figure 5 Responses to the question “Which human trafficking issues is your organization most involved with?”

The majority of NGOs (85%) reported a focus on sex trafficking advocacy, followed by labor trafficking (61%; see Figure 5). Additionally, 35 organizations cited organ trafficking and 14 cited child trafficking as a focus. Though sex trafficking is a focus for a significant number of NGOs surveyed, the focus of NGOs on child victims compared to adult victims is comparable, with 70% citing children and 66.5% citing adults as a focus of their efforts.




Figure 6 Responses to “Which efforts does your organization focus on most?”

NGOs also report a variety of programming efforts. Out of 479 responses, 398 organizations (83%) cited focusing on prevention and education (see Figure 6). This does not include an additional 41 organizations citing advocacy as a major effort. A further 39%, or 188 organizations, cited focusing on prosecutions and legal issues. NGOs also work closely with victims, as 340 organizations (71%) reporting working on victim assistance, and 248 (52%) focusing on victim protection. Furthermore, 21 organizations claimed to work on rescue operations and reparations as a primary program.




Figure 7 Responses to “How much does your organization know about human trafficking policy in (country X)?”




Figure 8 Responses to “How often does your organization work directly with the government of (country X)?”

Most NGOs closely follow the domestic policies of the countries they work in. Out of total of 553 responses in this category, 411 organization (75%), claimed to know “a lot” about human trafficking policy in their countries (see Figure 7). In contrast, only 21 organizations (4%) claimed very little to no knowledge of trafficking policy.

This wide knowledge base is consistent with the significant level of direct engagement between NGOs and the governments of the countries they work in, with 81%, or 439 organizations claiming to working directly with the government, in contrast to 20% citing that they rarely or never work with the government (see Figure 8). NGOs tend to work with their host governments on a regular basis, with 42%, or 231 organizations claiming to do so on at least a monthly basis. 90% of all organizations reported working directly with the government on at least one occasion.

Government oversight

NGOs around the world are largely free to conduct their work without government oversight or interferences. For example, only 7.5%, or 41 of 545 responses report having a member of government sitting on their board and off these, and approximately two-thirds of those responses say that this government involvement is not a legal requirement.

Most NGOs face few—if any—restrictions on their work. In total, about 58%, or 318 of 545 responses in this category, reported that their work was not restricted or very little restricted by government regulations, with 37%, or 200 of 545 respondents, citing no restrictions to their work (see Figure 9). In contrast, nearly 24%, or 184 of 545 responses in this category, cited moderate to severe restrictions to their work, but only 7.5%, or 41 of 545 respondents felt very restricted.




Figure 9 Responses to “How much is your organization’s work restricted by government regulations in (country X)?”

■ Critical In-Country Actors

This section of the report analyzes the significant actors and institutions that actively combat human trafficking in states with ongoing NGO country observations documented in the survey. According to the data, anti-trafficking campaigns are not isolated campaigns with little outside assistance or coordination. Rather, anti-trafficking advocacy and policies are the result of cooperation between numerous institutions, including national, state, and municipal actors at the state level, international coordination from foreign governments and embassies at the international level, and an array of NGOs and civil society organizations (CSOs) at the local level.

As seen in Figure 10, these three categories of actors—(1) national governments, (2) NGOs and CSOs, and (3) international organizations and foreign governments—constitute the most significant and consistent institutions active against human trafficking.

NGOs and CSOs

Of all the institutions within these three categories, NGOs and CSOs demonstrate the most consistent efforts against human trafficking in the nations surveyed, with over 95%, or 524 organizations, of the 551 registered responses in this category citing them as active in anti-trafficking campaigns over the past 10–15 years (see Figure 10). It should be noted that this figure might present a bias and selection effect considering that the survey was tailored to NGO and CSOs. Of course, there is no intrinsic link between whether the surveyed responses reflect the efforts of the NGO itself or of that organization’s sentiment about which institutions have been most active in fighting human trafficking. The write-in responses in this category provide some detailed examples of such organizations. This includes quasi-nongovernmental organizations, such as Denmark’s Center for Human Trafficking, a center borne out of the Danish government’s national action plan to combat human trafficking in 2011 and receives funding from the Danish Foreign Ministry. Other organizations cited included for-profit organizations such as Geneva Global, a philanthropic consulting firm providing anti-trafficking solutions in India, as well as the Freedom Fund, a comprehensive private donor organization active in anti-slavery interventions and other efforts against modern slavery.




Figure 10 Responses to “In (country X), which of these institutions have been active in fighting human trafficking over the last 10–15 years?”

National governments

Efforts conducted by national governments comprise the second most consistent institution, with some 68%, or 374 organizations, of 551 responses citing their efforts in trafficking policy (see Figure 10). Though NGOs are primarily active in advocacy work, education and prevention, and victim assistance, governmental action at the national level consists of direct operations, including primarily legal enforcement, as well as coordination and enforcement of national legislation through national agencies. Such actions are reflected in the write-in responses in this category with 34 respondents citing domestic anti-human rights efforts at the national, state, and municipal government level. Additionally, 15 respondents report the efforts of national agencies and law enforcement by local police and by special anti-human trafficking police units.

The establishment of national agencies in particular, usually borne out of and working in tandem with national anti-trafficking legislation, have become a useful tool for many national governments in combating human trafficking and coordination a national response. This includes the inception of such agencies as Romania’s Agential Națională Împotriva Traficului de Persoane (National Agency for Trafficking in Persons; ANITP), Ireland’s Anti-Human Trafficking Unit of the Department of Education and Justice, and Nigeria’s National Agency for the Prohibition of Trafficking in Persons (NAPTIP). Among the 15 write-in responses citing national agencies and law enforcement institutions, NAPTIP was cited four times, two from organizations operating in Nigeria, and two from organizations located in Denmark and Cameroon, demonstrating the cross-border nature of national efforts and action plans. Like NAPTIP, the national agencies cited in the survey can be characterized by three main traits. First, such agencies are largely borne out of the adoption of national anti-trafficking legislation and national action plans. This applies to Ireland’s Anti-Human Trafficking Unit, following the adoption of Ireland’s National Action Plan to Prevent and Combat Trafficking in Persons in June 2009, as well as NAPTIP, following the adoption of Nigeria’s Trafficking in Persons (Prohibition) Law Enforcement and Administration Act of August 26, 2003. Second, national agencies are primarily responsible for the coordination of efforts across governmental departments, agencies, and law enforcement for the implementation of legislation and national action plans. Third, although these agencies primarily coordinate governmental efforts and participate in investigations and prosecutions of human traffickers, they do not participate in direct law enforcement, usually deferring to police forces or specific crime units.

Within the frame of direct law enforcement 6 of the 34 write-in responses in this category mentioned the efforts of the police and associated crime units. One specific example cited in this category is that of the Anti-Human Trafficking Unit of the Ghanaian police force, formed following the adoption of Ghana’s Human Trafficking Act passed in 2005, and amended in 2009 to align the definition of human trafficking with that set out by the UN TIP Protocol of 2000.




Figure 11 Responses to “In your view, how hard is the government of (country X) working to combat trafficking in persons?”




Figure 12 Responses to “Would you say that the government of (country X)’s efforts to combat trafficking over the past 10–15 years have...”

The data on national governmental efforts and actions as reported in Figure 10 is consistent with the data shown in Figure 11, in which 40%, or 220 out of 548 respondents claimed that the national government was working “somewhat hard” at fighting human trafficking. More than 20% of respondents claimed that the government had worked “extremely hard,” or “very hard,” while 36% reported that the government had worked “not too hard,” or “not hard at all.” In total, 80% of respondents in the survey cited the national government as having a positive role in fighting human trafficking.

Despite the varying views of whether the government has been working hard at combating human trafficking in their countries of focus, 61%, or 337 of the 552 country-level respondents surveyed agree that government efforts to combat human trafficking have improved over the last 10–15 years (see Figure 12). Meanwhile 18%, or 98 respondents, thought that government activity had remained constant, and only 14%, or 76 respondents, claimed that the government had slowed down slowing down” over the past 10–15 years. This finding makes sense in light of the increased focus on TIP since the creation of the Palermo Protocol.

International organizations

Although the efforts of national governments have been integral in combating human trafficking, a significant amount of domestic efforts carried out by these governments are closely associated with non-national actors—including international organizations and foreign governments—for aid, assistance, training, and funding.

Many NGOs reported the consistent efforts of international governmental organizations (IGOs), with 12%, or 11 organizations out of 90 write-in responses in this category citing IGOs as being active in combating human trafficking. The write-in responses within this category demonstrate a wide array of IGOs active in anti-trafficking efforts, including the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the International Organization on Migration (IOM), the United National Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), as well as supranational and regional IGOs such as the European Union (EU), and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS).

Specific to foreign governmental action, including efforts and aid coordinated by foreign embassies, 42% of surveyed responses in this category, or 231 organizations out of 551 responses, cited foreign governments as consistently active institutions in fighting human trafficking.

Embassies or foreign governments

NGOs report that foreign governments and embassies also participate actively in the fight against human trafficking. NGOs were invited to write the names of as many embassies they knew to be active against trafficking in their countries. In total, 333 respondents made 657 separate mentions of embassies covering 64 different foreign governments. This exhibits the cross-sectional and inter-sectional cooperative nature of the global fight against issues in human trafficking.




Figure 13 Embassies or foreign governments NGOs reported as active partners in the fight against human trafficking

Twelve foreign embassies were mentioned ten or more times. The clear outlier was the United States, with over 78%, or 260 out of 333 total responses citing the US government and its embassies as being active in anti-trafficking in the respondent's country (see Figure 13). The United States was mentioned six times more often than the next most common country, the United Kingdom, which was mentioned by 43 respondents (13%).

Other commonly mentioned embassies include the Netherlands with 10.51%, France with 9.01%, the European Union with 7.81%, Norway with 7.81%, Switzerland with 7.21%, Sweden with 6.31%, Australia with 5.71%, Germany with 5.11%, Italy with 5.11%, and Canada with 3.6% of surveyed respondents.

In addition to being asked which embassies had been active, respondents were also asked which embassies had been most active. Once again, the US was mentioned by far the most with nearly 71%, or 187 out of 265 responses. This is 14 times more frequently than the next highest mention, being the European Union with merely 5%, or 13 out of 265 responses, and the only other entity having double-digit references within this category. Another 16 countries were cited as being most active in fighting human trafficking in more than one country, including the Italy, Australia, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, the Philippines, Sweden, the Netherlands, Norway, France, Finland, Romania, Latvia, Spain, Germany, Denmark, and Nigeria.

■ Influence of the United States

Influence over human trafficking policy

In general, most NGOs reported (65%, or 343 of 531 responses) that the US has been very active in their countries over the past 10–15 years. Indeed, only 7%, or 39 response reported that the United States has not been active in fighting human trafficking (see Figure 14). While 28% of respondents reported having no information on the United States' role in trafficking, this is not indicative of US inactivity—only that these NGOs are not *aware of* significant actions or assistance from the United States.




Figure 14 Responses to “Over the last 10–15 years, has the United States or its embassy been active in the fight against human trafficking in (country X)?”

The survey data reveals that the NGO community perceives the United States as an active supporter in the fight against human trafficking due to its provision of material assistance, aid funding, training, direct governmental advocacy and legislative consolation and collaborations, and the annual State Department TIP report on human trafficking conditions and governmental efforts to address such issues around the world.

Table 1 Responses to “Has the United States or its embassy been involved in any of the following activities in (country X)?”

Answer	Responses	%
Asking for legislation	164	30.94
Convening conferences or workshops	207	39.06
Raising awareness	213	40.19
Providing resources or funding	210	39.62
Increasing government attention	216	40.75
Training government officials	146	27.55
Contributing to a government action plan	113	21.32
Other	43	8.11
Don't know	26	4.91
The US has not been involved in trafficking issues	166	31.32
Total responses	530	—

NGOs believe that the United States has helped raise awareness of human trafficking issues at the domestic and local, state, and national governmental levels. About half of the respondents cited the United States as active in increasing government attention to human trafficking or raising awareness of human trafficking in that country, or both (see Table 1). In regards to support, NGOs reported a broad range of logistical, fiscal, and professional US activities in their countries including providing resources and funding, convening conferences and workshops, and training government officials. Nearly 40% of respondents stated that their organization had received some US funding. Roughly the same percentage knew of trafficking-related conferences or workshops convened by the US in their country, while nearly 28% were aware that the US had trained government officials.

Many NGO respondents were aware of US efforts to promote policy changes in their countries of anti-trafficking legislation in work-countries around the world. Nearly 31% reported that the United States had asking for legislation in their country, while 21%, or 113 of 530 respondents claimed the United States had contributed to a government action plan for addressing national issues in human trafficking. NGOs also reported that the United States participates in all stages of policy formation including the direct lobbying of embassy staff with government officials, supporting proposals in legislatures, providing technical assistance to legislative technical groups, support in passing legislative acts, and the continued monitoring and provision of recommendations for the strengthening of

existing legislation. Finally, the US government provides comprehensive, inter-sectional assistance in its efforts to influence and promote anti-trafficking legislation within work countries. The organizations that often assisted with these initiatives include the Office of Overseas Prosecutorial Development, Assistance, and Training (OPDAT), and the International Criminal Investigative Assistance Program (ICITAP), under the US Department of Justice.

The United States has exerted a great deal of influence in crafting and promoting legal and legislative acts throughout the countries these NGOs work in. NGOs around the world, including Togo, Sierra Leone, Iraq, Tajikistan, and Malaysia described examples of how they or the national government interacted with the US. They describe the US as being active in organizing workshops, pressuring the government to take action, pushing for legislation and national action plans, and training civil society and government officials, and much more. Generally the discussions are positive, but some NGOs also note the difficulty of sustained impact of some of these efforts.

Interaction between NGOs, US embassies, and government officials

Many NGOs work and collaborate with the US embassy or government: 65% of 530 respondents claimed some form of interaction with the US. Approximately half of the organizations had had direct contact with US officials, and nearly 21% claimed to have had some form of direct cooperation (see Figure 15). Another 19%, or 101 respondents cited receiving direct funding from the US government.




Figure 15 Responses to “Over the last 10–15 years, has your organization worked directly with or had direct contact with the US embassy or government on human trafficking issues?”

The general enthusiasm about the efforts of the United States is quite large as 60%, or 309 of 520 respondents consider the US an important actor in the countries they work in, with approximately 27%, or 139 respondents, naming the US as the “*most important actor*,”




Figure 16 Responses to “Overall, how important a role would you say that the United States or its embassy have played in fighting trafficking in (country X) over the last 10–15 years?”




Figure 17 Responses to “Overall, has the US influence on human trafficking policy in (country X) been positive or negative?”

and approximately 35% citing the US as a “*somewhat* important actor” (Figure 16). In contrast, only 13%, or 68 respondents cite the US as not being an important actor—the smallest group in this category.

Furthermore, the respondents who replied that the United States had been active in their countries reported that US influence on human trafficking policy in their countries has generally been positive. Nearly 68% of organizations—or 213 of 314 respondents who claimed that the US had been influential—considered this influence positive (see Figure 17). Additionally, some 20% of organizations, or 63 respondents found US influence on human trafficking policy to be mixed. Remarkably few organizations found US influence to have a negative effect on policy, with only two respondents claiming that US efforts had been negative.

Importance of TIP report

Since the passing of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) in 2000, the United States State Department has published the annual Trafficking in Persons (TIP) Report. The organizations surveyed agreed that the TIP report is a vital tool and common measure for (1) assessing the current status of human trafficking in work countries, (2) evaluating the effectiveness of current policies to combat human trafficking, and (3) providing recommendations for national governments to adopt to strengthen their capacity against human trafficking.

Most anti-trafficking NGOs are aware of the annual TIP report (87%, or 415 of 477 respondents), and most NGOs are also aware of their country's rating in the report.




Figure 18 Responses to “Has your organization used the US State Department’s Trafficking in Persons (TIP) report to discuss trafficking issues with any of these groups?”

NGOs report that different stakeholders in their countries use the TIP report as a useful tool and common reference point in discussing trafficking issues with other actors. NGOs often discuss the TIP report with other NGOs, with some 78%, or 312 of 400 respondents citing having done so (see Figure 18). In addition, nearly 53%, or 211 respondents, claim to use the report to discuss TIP issues with their national governments. NGOs are less likely to discuss the report with foreign governments, but this likely reflects their lower likelihood of interacting with them in the first place. This is consistent with the fact that a significant number of organizations claim difficulty—or inability—to cooperate with neighboring foreign governments in order to address human trafficking issues and provide support for victims. Regardless, about 17%, or 67 respondents report using the TIP report to discuss issues with other governments, reflecting the trans-border nature of the trafficking problem and indicating that the report provides common reference points.

According to the survey data, government officials often cite their country's tier rating as a primary reference point for current anti-trafficking initiatives and improvements to

those initiatives. When asked whether organizations heard government officials mention the country's tier rating in public or private, approximately 43% of organizations (203 of 468 respondents) agreed. This figure is high given that NGOs are only privy to a small portion of government communication.

Of the 216 NGO respondents who said that they had heard officials refer to the report, most (58%) explained that this had usually been part of general assessments of the government's efforts and policies in combating human trafficking, both in public conferences and meetings and in private. Naturally, for many countries that receive unfavorable tier ratings—especially tier two watch list and tier three—mentions of the report are often framed negatively and resented by the governments receiving such ratings. This backlash accounts for approximately 15% of organizations citing mentions of the report by officials as being made in a negative context. In many of these cases, relative to the rating received, officials in those countries claim that their tier rating does not government efforts, or disagree with the rating, arguing that it is incorrect. According to survey comments, some respondents interpret such tier ratings as a general reflection of relations with the United States and with other political events that might cast the rated country in a bad light.