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Introduction to the Consultative Workshop Process

The United Nations Inter-Agency Project on Human Trafficking (UNIAP), in collaboration with the six countries of the Greater Mekong Sub-Region (Cambodia, China, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam) who together form the Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Trafficking (COMMIT), convened a Consultative Workshop on 23-24 April 2013 in Bangkok, Thailand for the Strategic Visioning of Post-2013 Coordinated Efforts in Anti-trafficking work in the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS).

This workshop brought together key anti-trafficking stakeholders including representatives from the UNIAP Regional Management Office and Country Offices, ministerial representatives from the COMMIT Task Force, UN agency representatives from the UN Development Programme (UNDP), the International Organization on Migration (IOM), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF). The workshop also included Non-Governmental Organization representatives from Save the Children, World Vision and MTV Exit, as well as donor country representatives from Australia, New Zealand, Sweden, Norway and the United States.

UNIAP was established in 2000 with a central focus on combatting trafficking in persons, and a mandate to facilitate a stronger and more coordinated response to trafficking in persons in the GMS. Over the past 13 years, the focus of the region’s anti-trafficking community has adapted and evolved with the changing landscape of human trafficking in the region. In order to prepare a vision for coordinated anti-trafficking work within the GMS beyond 2013, UNIAP has embarked on a consultation process with a wide range of stakeholders. This process has taken place through a series of consultative workshops at the national level in five COMMIT countries, and concluded with this regional workshop and the final national consultation being held in Myanmar the following week. These visioning consultations have been conducted to maximize the inclusiveness of the process in order to gain widest possible range of perspectives and inputs from the foremost trafficking experts in the region.

The goal of this process is to develop a new strategic vision for anti-trafficking work in the GMS covering a five year period through a participatory and transparent consultation process that includes a clear, well defined direction and focus for trafficking work, strengthened government ownership, improved bi-lateral and multi-lateral cooperation between all trafficking stakeholders, and programming that includes more robust monitoring and evaluation (M&E) indicators to understand the progress being achieved in the region’s fight against human trafficking.

Background Situatro to the Consultative Workshop

United Nations Inter-Agency Project (UNIAP)

UNIAP was established in 2000 to facilitate a stronger and more coordinated response to human trafficking in the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS) and with the aim of creating an ‘overarching mechanism’ for the co-ordination of anti-trafficking initiatives by a wide range of stakeholders.
UNIAP is managed by a regional management office in Bangkok, with country project offices in the capitals of Cambodia, China, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam. UNIAP has been implemented over three consecutive phases that illustrate the Project’s evolution over time:

- **UNIAP Phase I (2000 - 2003)**
  The first phase of UNIAP concentrated on creating linkages between the range of different organisations involved in combating trafficking, using its broad and responsive mandate to address emerging issues, and supporting new small-scale pilot initiatives.

- **UNIAP Phase II (2004 - 2006)**
  The second phase of UNIAP was viewed as a consolidation of its work and achievements under the first phase. It was dominated by the project’s work in facilitating the development of a sub-regional Memorandum of Understanding between the six governments of the GMS, accompanied by a Plan of Action to help governments fulfil the commitments made under the MoU - a process now known as the Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Trafficking (COMMIT).

- **UNIAP Phase III (2007 – 2013)**
  The third and current phase of UNIAP is aimed at building on the achievements of the first two phases, combining support for further consolidation and institutionalisation of current approaches. This phase is due to end in December 2013.

### The Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Trafficking (COMMIT)

COMMIT has fuelled major progress in anti-human trafficking efforts since its inception in 2004. In 2004, the six Governments of the GMS signed a historic Memorandum of Understanding against Trafficking in Persons. This MoU, signed at the Ministerial level, committed the governments to a response to human trafficking meeting international standards, highlighting the need for multi-lateral, bi-lateral, and government-NGO cooperation to fight human trafficking.

UNIAP serves as Secretariat to the COMMIT Process, and as such is mandated to provide technical, financial, monitoring, reporting and logistical support to activities under COMMIT. Based on its existing work and mandate as an inter-agency coordinating body, UNIAP is able to draw on its extensive network of partners throughout the region to provide technical and financial assistance to all aspects of the COMMIT Process, and also works with partners to ensure that programmes and activities are aligned with government priorities in the COMMIT Sub-regional Plans of Action and National Plans of Action.

### Introductory Statements

The workshop’s opening remarks were delivered by Mr. Clifton Cortez, the HIV, Health and Development Practice Leader for the UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Centre, and UNIAP Project Manager, who welcomed the attendees and thanked them for their participation in the visioning process.

He informed the participants that UNIAP’s third and final phase would be drawing to a close at the
end of 2013, and that the strategic visioning process was an important step in determining what coordinated anti-trafficking efforts could follow after UNIAP. He emphasised the importance that this visioning process would play in establishing the priorities and areas of focus for the region’s anti-trafficking efforts as a whole for the next five years. He stated that up to this point, five national visioning workshops had been held, with the last workshop to take place in Myanmar the following week. He wished the participants good luck, and hoped for many substantive discussions over the coming two days.

Mr. Geoff Manthey, the event’s facilitator, opened the visioning workshop by reflecting on his experience so far as facilitator for the national workshops held in China, Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand and Lao PDR. He then explained that the participants taking place in the regional workshop included ministerial representatives and UNIAP National Project Coordinators from all the COMMIT countries, as well as representatives from the UNIAP Regional Management Office, other UN agencies, NGOs, donor embassies and civil society.

Mr. Manthey expressed his hope that the government representatives and NPCs would bring their experiences and knowledge gained in their respective national consultations to the regional workshop. He stated that the previous external evaluation and ongoing internal review of UNIAP, as well as the wealth of experience gained by the participating expert practitioners over the past years would all feed into the end result of the two-day workshop. The focus for the workshop would be on regional issues, which is why the participants had been selected as a representative cross-section of the region’s anti-trafficking community. He reminded all of the participants that the issues prioritized during the course of the workshop would feed into the development of the vision statements that will constitute the end product of the regional consultation.

After opening the visioning workshop, Mr. Manthey asked everyone to be open, honest and to ‘have fun’ in the interactions throughout the sessions. He invited all the participants to introduce themselves and asked them to explain their respective ‘dream goals’ related to human trafficking. He also said he hoped the visioning processes that had already occurred in the national consultations would help influence the discussions over the coming two days.

Before the consultation began, Dr. Saisuree Chutikul, Senior Advisor to the Royal Thai Government, asked for clarification on the difference between ‘planning’ and ‘visioning’. She enquired whether the goal was to establish the priorities for the next five years, or if the intention was to develop an anti-trafficking vision for the next five years. Mr. Manthey clarified that the goal was not to develop work plans or projects, but rather to brainstorm ideas through the collective expertise at the workshop, in order to identify areas of human trafficking that still require attention, and find root causes of gaps in current trafficking structures.

UNIAP Regional Project Manager Ms. Annette Lyth elaborated that the anti-trafficking community in the region must develop a plan post-2013. She referred as an example to the current vision for COMMIT; the COMMIT Process began with a vision, but after ten years a new vision for future anti-trafficking cooperation should be developed together. She asked where the anti-trafficking community in the region wanted to go with its work over the next five years.
Dr. Saisuree explained that ‘planning’ is when you start with problems, and develop activities to address those problems; but ‘visioning’ is working towards sustainability. She further explained that working towards ending UNIAP would constitute visioning, and that anti-trafficking stakeholders should work towards ensuring the sustainability of COMMIT while working UNIAP “out of needing to exist”. Dr. Saisuree took issue with the statement that this visioning process was “for the regional anti-trafficking community”. She stated that there is no difference between the regional and national anti-trafficking communities and that there is already regional integration between the six COMMIT countries. She asked for clarification about what meant by regional trafficking cooperation.

Mr. Manthey clarified that the focus was regional, and the information gathered from the regional consultation would be combined with the national consultations to develop a complete anti-trafficking vision. He added that this was not intended to undermine the workshops that had been held at the national level. The representatives from each country had been specifically invited to the regional consultation in order to make sure that the national visions were represented accurately and would feed into the regional visioning.

**Identifying Main Problems**

Mr. Manthey stressed the importance of mixing the audience so that all participants could share their variety of experiences and interact with other practitioners with whom they do not work on a day-to-day basis. He divided the participants into four groups for a brainstorming session to identify the main issues currently affecting the anti-trafficking community in the region.

After the brainstorming session, the four groups presented the main issues they had identified as being the most serious problems currently affecting the anti-trafficking sector:
Group 1 - Issues Identified:

1. Bilateral repatriation mechanisms between China/Myanmar, China/Vietnam, Lao PDR/Thailand.
2. Law enforcement cooperation and criminal justice cooperation, extradition of traffickers (currently gaps in agreements that are in place).
3. Less reliance on victims of trafficking in the criminal justice process, more victim-centred approach (i.e. victim testimony must not lead to victim having to stay in destination country for too long).
4. Greater focus on compensation for victims.
5. Safe migration policy, procedure and practice in place. Victims need greater access to legal migration channels.
7. Minimise unnecessary delays in victim shelters in destination countries.
8. Factors that affect demand for forced marriage, forced labour, forced sexual exploitation must be better addressed and understood.
9. Increased cooperation with non-GMS countries (i.e. Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore and the Middle East).
10. Improve information sharing between countries of origin and destination countries.
11. Increased joint prevention programmes along the GMS border areas.
12. Bali Process, COMMIT Process: different processes need to be better coordinated to avoid overlap and conflicting goals.
14. Weaknesses still exist in engaging the private sector. The private sector needs to be encouraged to be part of the solution by ensuring trafficking free supply chains. They should also be encouraged to contribute greater resources and expertise.
15. Need more evidence for data-driven anti-trafficking strategies and interventions, as well as to inform government policies.
16. Need a permanent coordinating body to function as “secretariat” between all anti-trafficking actors.
17. Government, donors, civil society, UN and NGO’s have different perspectives on how to combat trafficking – joint response incorporating all these perspectives needs to be improved.
18. The tools of media and information technology are not being maximised in current anti-trafficking efforts.
19. Different laws in each country lead to ineffective prosecutorial response, greater criminal justice coordination is needed.
20. Prosecutors and judges need to increase capacity to prosecute trafficking cases.
21. Current anti-trafficking agreements (MLAT, etc.) have no real implementation mechanisms in place. It is unclear who the focal points will be to drive them forward.

Group 2 - Issues Identified:

1. Cross-border investigations, improved evidence use and prosecutions.
2. Victim ID and (re)integration.
3. Regional research – improved data and M&E.
4. Improved cooperation and coordination on criminal justice response.
5. MLAT implementation.
7. Recruitment agency regulation and increased accountability in destination countries.
8. Mechanisms to protect migrant workers.
9. Regional research/recognition of unintended negative consequences caused by interventions with trafficking victims.
10. Linking infrastructures to protection issues, ensuring protection discussions are part of the dialogue for donors supporting infrastructure/business development.
11. Regional considerations for gender dimensions of trafficking victims (lack of shelters for men, victims over 16 years of age).
12. Improving awareness on all sides of trafficking dynamics (consumer awareness raising, exploitation in tourism, private sector engagement, etc).
13. Regional glossary/translation of accepted definitions of terms (government approved) to facilitate improved regional discussion and decision-making.
Group 3 - Issues Identified:

1. Lack of prioritisation in government budgets.
2. Need for results-based approach and government ownership of those results.
3. Need for sustainable mechanisms to support operationalization.
4. Lack of collaborative prevention based on actionable/relevant behaviour change promotions.
5. Increased measurement of effectiveness.
7. Lack of incentives for governments to step up.
8. Protection: lack of connecting/shared case management systems.
9. Paternalistic attitudes towards victims – (re)integration efforts vs. harmful practices with good intentions.
10. Replication of good practice of government supporting victim services organisations that provide alternatives for (re)integration.
11. Lack of agreed upon criteria for prioritising.
13. Lack of strategic focus by all anti-trafficking agents including NGO/privately-funded corporate actors.
14. Lack of shared regional government regulations of non-government agencies (e.g. ASEAN guidelines).
15. Need for concrete steps from governments to move towards self-sustainability in their fight against human trafficking.
17. Increased government support (financial, space, personnel) of non-government organisations.
20. Lack of law enforcement cooperation.
22. Lack of shared messages for prevention.
23. Non-implementation of existing MoUs, bi-lateral agreements, SOPs.
24. Lack of political will and follow through.
25. Uneven government efforts to combat trafficking at the regional level.
26. Lack of evidence and data sharing.
27. Different priorities between sending and receiving countries.
28. Existence of discriminatory practices and values.
29. Over-reliance on victims for enforcement, differences in procedures.
30. Need to harmonise legal procedures at the national level in line with international standards.
31. Lack of linking (re)integration/rescue with prosecution efforts.

Group 4 – Issues Identified:

1. Lack of cooperation in criminal justice response across the board:
• Too much focus on domestic efforts
• Unevenness in the implementation of rule of law
• Too few joint investigations
• Formal cooperation too slow

2. Victim protection challenges across the board
• Limited coordination of support
• Risk factors for trafficking not addressed.

3. Need for monitoring (re)integration and sharing with destination countries.
4. Keep victims informed of prosecution process.
5. Language barriers for victims trying to access the legal system.
6. Uneven development in the region.
7. Strengthen cooperation among countries:
   • Law enforcement
   • Prevention, cooperation sending and receiving victims
   • Standardised rehabilitation efforts.
9. Lack of effective mechanisms for migration management
   • Risks exist at deportation sites for re-trafficking of victims.

Once all of the groups had presented the issues they had listed as having the greatest impact on current anti-trafficking efforts, Mr. Manthey invited the participants to examine the problems identified by each group. He asked them to consider the issues from a regional perspective, and reminded them that there would be time throughout the day to build on all of the ideas being put forth, and to develop a way forward for the future of anti-trafficking work in the GMS. While the participants were examining the identified issues, Mr. Manthey asked them to select the three issues they considered the most pressing ones facing the anti-trafficking community in the GMS today, in order to isolate the main thematic issues. He accomplished this by asking each of the participants to place a coloured sticker beside the three issues they considered to be most important.

The votes were then tallied, and based on the issues that garnered the most votes, five main overarching thematic areas were extrapolated from all of the problems identified.

**Organizing and Prioritizing Main Problems**

- Victim ID, Protection and (Re)integration
- Regional Cooperation
- Political Will and Implementation Mechanisms
- Research and Evidence Based Anti-trafficking Work
- Migration Management
Problem Analysis

Mr. Manthey began the second session by dividing the participants into five groups and asking them to create problem trees based on the thematic areas that emerged from the first brainstorming session. He asked the participants to define the main issue through a problem statement and then to identify the causes of that problem and the effect that that particular problem creates on anti-trafficking work in the region.

After the brainstorming session, the groups were asked to present and explain their problem trees. A discussion followed each presentation.

Group 1 - Victim ID, Protection and (Re)integration

Problem Statement:
Victims are not always identified, protected or successfully (re)integrated.

Causes:

- Lack of common definition and interpretation.
- Weak protection systems in some areas.
- (Re)integration services often are not comprehensive.
- Procedures are not always followed.
- Victims do not want to be identified.
- Language barriers.
- Different definition of human trafficking law across countries.
- Interpretation of the law is different within countries.
- Limited budget allocation.
- (Re)integration services only available in certain locations.
- Negative attitudes and lack of empathy towards victims.
- Some countries have lengthy justice processes and periods of mandatory shelter stays for victims.
- Quantity and quality of interpreters is lacking.
- Lack of legal interpretation of the law within countries.
- Different perceptions of individuals interpreting the law.
- Limited capacity of on protection and (re)integration.
- Lack of knowledge, procedures by government officials.

Effects:

- Uneven support provided.
- Potential victims are not notified to law enforcement.
- Victims do not receive the assistance that they need.
• Confusion amongst service providers on definition.
• Increased re-trafficking.
• Weak protection services lead to weak programming for prosecution/prevention.
• Lack of trust by victims in authorities/service providers.
• Implementation of the law is not fully effective.
• Human trafficking is less identified.
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- Increased re-trafficking
- Potential victims are not notified to law enforcement
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- Lack of knowledge, procedures by government officials
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- Different perceptions of individuals interpreting the law
- Language barriers
- Lack of legal interpretation of the law within countries
- Human trafficking is less identified
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- Lack of trust by victims in authorities/service providers
- Weak protection services lead to weak programming for prosecution/prevention
- Implementation of the law is not fully effective
- Victims do not get assistance that they need
- Different definition of human trafficking law across countries
- Procedures are not always followed
- Reintegration services only available in certain locations
- Reintegration services often are not comprehensive
- Weak protection systems in some areas
- Some countries have lengthy justice processes and periods of shelter stay for victims
- Lack of common definition and interpretation
- Limited budget allocation
- Negative attitudes and lack of empathy towards victims
- Interpretation of the law is different within countries
- Quantity and quality of interpreters is lacking
**Problem Tree Discussion:**

Mr. Manthey began the discussion by reiterating the problem statement and asking if all of the participants agreed with it.

IOM representative Mr. John McGeoghan raised some of the problems faced by anti-trafficking practitioners including the lack of a standard definition of (re)integration. He questioned the criteria for reintegration and the definition of reintegrated victims. He stressed the need for harmonisation of approaches in the region, of laws and minimum standards of protection, and the need to decide on the end result of reintegrating a trafficking victim. He stated that the end result must be that victims are returned home with a minimal risk of being re-trafficked, are reintegrated into society, have stability and are secure, and that their needs are being met. He also raised the issue of capacity disparities between the different countries that acts as an additional challenge to developing a regional (re)integration definition.

The representative from World Vision Mr. John Yoon requested clarification about the inclusion of corruption as a factor. Mr. Manthey elaborated that corruption is not an immediate cause, but an underlying factor that affects many aspects that contribute to human trafficking. He further added that corruption is a widespread challenge in many different areas of human trafficking work.

The Chinese government representative Mr. Chen Shiqu, asked about the specific link between corruption and (re)integration. Group 1 clarified that corruption was mentioned in relation to victim identification, but wasn’t necessarily meant to inform the discussion in the context of (re)integration.

Mr. Chen Shiqu sought further clarification asking if corruption referred to bribery (i.e. the bribery of officials or trafficking victims). UNIAP Technical Specialist Mr. Paul Buckley responded that corruption could refer to many trafficking scenarios, such as officials taking payoffs to not conduct inspections where there are cases of forced labour. He added that it is quite widely accepted that many trafficking patterns are facilitated by corruption.

Mr. Manthey explained that corruption could relate to anything from procedures not being properly implemented, or the small scale turning of a blind eye, to more serious cases of corruption where large quantities of money change hands between brokers and border officials, or in the form of payoffs to keep factory raids from occurring.

Mr. McGeoghan mentioned another aspect of corruption that affects anti-trafficking is transparency in the ministries that receive anti-trafficking funding. A crucial aspect of providing services to victims is to ensure that lower levels of government have access to the money they need to provide those services. Transparency in the financing of different levels of government is needed to combat trafficking, and to ensure government money dedicated to anti-trafficking reaches the people who need it to finance counter-trafficking activities.

Mr. Manthey focused the discussion back to the problem statement asking if everyone was in
agreement with the statement as written. The participants all agreed to the problem statement.

**Group 2 - Regional Cooperation**

**Problem Statement:**

MoUs in place both regionally and nationally, but implementation is not always reflective of the commitments made, and there are no standard operating procedures for implementation.

**Causes:**

- Different economic, political status among COMMIT members
- Different interests of sending and receiving nations
- Geopolitical factors
- Limited resources to implement national policy
- Limited coordination at all national levels
- International standards or definitions not accepted or implemented in all countries
- Weak governance, weak administration
- Insufficient national budgetary resources allocated to human trafficking
- Problems related to resource allocation
- Trafficking may not be a national priority
- Limited acknowledgement of the realities of the problem and roles that should be played
- Uneven political will among COMMIT members
- Conflicting political priorities and economic interests.

**Effects:**

- Limited implementation of MoUs/SOPs across the 4 P’s
- Differing standard levels of counter-trafficking efforts
- Differing perception of the problem
- Donor interest declining (sustainability issues)
- Limited follow up, M&E, knowledge management
- No feedback into policy development
- Achievement of outcomes
- Limited potential for regional cooperation
- Continued impunity, people still exploited
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Problem Tree Discussion:
Mr. Manthey launched the discussion by reiterating the problem statement and asking if all the participants agreed with it.

Mr. Chen Shiqu mentioned that China has bi-lateral and multi-lateral MoUs and agreements in place, but the Chinese government is not always aware of why implementation efforts are ineffective. He expressed that workshops and discussions such as these help the governments to understand issues in greater depth.

The participants debated the nature of regional coordination issues. They discussed whether the main problem was that insufficient mechanisms were in place to facilitate regional coordination, or whether there were enough mechanisms in place, but those mechanisms were ineffective. The group debated the issue and arrived at the consensus that the regional coordination mechanisms in place for implementation were inadequate.

Group 3 - Political Will and Implementation

Problem statement:
Patchy and uneven responses –
Three separate issues: political will, lack of mechanisms and problems with implementation

Causes:
- Difference in legal frameworks
- Different level of commitment and capacity of government
- Lack of understanding of MoUs at the functional working level
- Lack of specialised government officials
- Lack of financial support
- Content of MoUs too broad
- Not all six GMS countries have bi-lateral MoUs
- Central authorities are different among GMS countries
- Country focal points are different.

Effects:
- No standardised victim identification procedures/criteria
- Inadequate involvement of non-government and private sector
- Difficulty in rescuing and repatriating victims
- Barriers in procedures for implementation
- Too many steps and levels delay implementation
- Cross-border information sharing is slow and inefficient
- Some victims remain unassisted
- Some traffickers remain unprosecuted.
Regional Strategic Visioning Workshop
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- Some traffickers remain unprosecuted
- Barriers in procedures for implementation
- Difficulty in rescuing and repatriating victims
**Problem Tree Discussion:**
Mr. Manthey invited the participants to discuss the issue, and stated that ‘political will’ would be difficult to assess and define as an issue.

After presenting the causes and effects, Mr. McGeoghan elaborated that political will had “become very political”. Some donors include language referring to “political will” into proposals as a prerequisite, but to assess political will is problematic due to the differences between countries in terms of political and socioeconomic development. He added that regardless of the political will to act, these differences in capacity have a far greater impact on a government’s ability to combat trafficking, despite their desire to do so. Mr. McGeoghan further explained that every country’s national experience would determine its ability to work effectively at the regional level. Countries have different perceptions of the problem of trafficking, and that once again raises the issue of the lack of data on human trafficking.

Mr. Manthey pointed out the group’s emphasis of the linkages between all the different problem trees. He drew attention to the linkages between the issues identified in political will to those identified in the problem trees for migration management and evidence-based anti-trafficking work. He highlighted the common linkages between all these issues and reminded the participants that these factors should not be looked at in isolation, but rather as interconnected issues.

Mr. Chen Shiqu made the suggestion that political will should be examined in combination with the theme of regional cooperation. He added that if a country signs an MoU in the GMS, then it is a demonstration of that county’s political will. He further suggested that the focus should be on problems with regional cooperation, rather than political will in the national context.

The Vietnamese government representative Senior Lieutenant Vo Thi Hong Ha stated that he did not agree with the statement “lack of political will”. He suggested that there was a great deal of political will in all the six GMS countries, demonstrated by the agreements and activities that each of the countries have committed to. He added that there was also the ASEAN declaration on human trafficking, and that all of the countries have implemented NPAs and have national steering committees on human trafficking. He reminded the participants that the concern should be with the effectiveness of the implementation of those agreements rather than the political will to do so.

Mr. Manthey informed the participants that while political will was difficult to assess, it was also the single issue that received the most votes in the first brainstorming session. He added that this was clearly an issue that all participants have identified as a problem in need of further discussion. He stressed that raising the issue of political will was not a value judgment on the efforts made by each country, but rather an attempt to tackle a complex and delicate question and examine it in greater depth. He reminded the participants that Group 3 clearly identified in their problem tree presentation that it was not a lack of political will at issue, but rather a combination of many other contributing factors. He congratulated the government representatives on their boldness in discussing this difficult issue, and for their willingness to listen to different views in order to understand some of the complexities surrounding it. He suggested that the fact that the governments are all represented here was, in and of itself, an expression of political will.
The representative from ILO Ms. Anna Olsen suggested there was perhaps some confusion on the concept of political will. She said that political will involves more than simply the signing of documents or the participation in workshops, but that true political will can be seen in the decisions made by those in power to affect the lives of trafficking victims. She added that where anti-trafficking programmes can have greatest impact on political will was through the encouragement of people who make bold decisions to help victims, while ensuring programmes have repercussions for those who lack the will to do so.

The facilitator asked the participants to move on to the next group, but reiterated that all of the issues raised should guide thinking for the visioning session undertaken the following day. He said the participants would have the opportunity to suggest changes they would like see regarding issues like regional cooperation, including greater political support for anti-trafficking efforts.

**Group 4 - Research and Evidence Based Anti-trafficking Work**

**Problem Statement:**
Anti-trafficking work is often not evidence based

**Causes:**
- Lack of evidence to begin with
- Unrealistic expectations of what it takes to generate proper research
- Anti-trafficking culture that “we already know what needs to be done”
- No agreed upon set of priorities for research
- Lack of openness to real data
- Challenge in assessing how research can be integrated into ongoing programming
- Research dissemination has been weak, with little follow up
- Certain key target audiences lack access to information and ways to input
- Lack of consolidated research and data that is reliable and easily accessible
- Political and economic sensitivities in analysing the reality of the problem
- Lack of clarity on how sensitive information should be shared without ethical issues
- Lack of funding for research
- Donor attitudes and priorities are prioritised over research.

**Effects:**
- Inaccurate understanding of the real magnitude and nature of human trafficking
- Prevention messaging ineffective, wrong and often misleading
- Victims are not identified and perpetrators not punished
- Trafficking networks become entrenched
- Weak, poorly targeted programming not evidence based
- Collateral damage: perpetuating gender stereotypes and stigmas
- Less effective research utilisation or even misallocation
- Money wasted with little to no impact.
Research and Evidence Based Anti-trafficking Work
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- Donor attitudes and priorities are prioritized over research
- Inaccurate understanding of the real magnitude and nature of human trafficking
- Prevention messaging ineffective, wrong and often misleading
- Victims are not identified and perpetrators not punished
**Problem Tree Discussion:**

Mr. Manthey began his discussion by reiterating the problem statement and asking if all of the participants were in agreement.

Mr. Chen Shiqu mentioned that in the GMS, research has played a vital role in combatting human trafficking. He added that research in the region should be targeted to the specific circumstances in each country.

The participants agreed that research and M&E need to be elevated in anti-trafficking programming to the same level of importance given to other activities, in order to better target activities and gain a better understanding of the outcomes of the work being done.

The representative from the Embassy of New Zealand Ms. Juthathip Subhaswasdikul expressed the concern from donors that when reports were received from UNIAP, they generally outlined the activities performed with little analysis of the outcomes of those activities. She stressed that donors prefer to see programming implemented with strong M&E mechanisms to identify outcomes, regardless of whether the outcomes are positive or negative. She added that many of the donors provide core funding that is not based on the specific activities carried out. While some donors only want to support specific projects, most prefer to support the organisation itself and would simply like to have measureable outcomes to reinforce that support.

Mr. Manthey said the discussion should try to focus on general regional anti-trafficking work rather than any specific UNIAP or COMMIT activities or issues. He reminded the participants that the topic at hand was that, in general, anti-trafficking work operates largely without being research based. He then reiterated the point that Group 4 had expressed: research needs to be prioritised to an extent that it receives funding first, and then programming can be based on the outcomes of that research in order to have informed, well targeted and effective activities.

Mr. McGeoghan stated that programming usually results from evaluation, which is a type of baseline research that is usually sufficient to inform programming. He suggested that it was more important to build robust M&E indicators into activities in order to generate a greater understanding of the outcomes of those activities. This allows for a comprehensive understanding of an issue to be built gradually over time.

Mr. Manthey stated that it was in large measure the systems around research that are the issue, and that there were existing bodies of research available that are not being utilised effectively. Group 4 agreed that the compartmentalisation of research is also a major issue. The data had to be mined from each organisation conducting research separately and painstakingly, as there were no effective data sharing mechanisms in place. They added that there were serious issues with research quality, as each source of data must be assessed for its value without existing review systems in place to ensure a base level of quality for anti-trafficking research.

Mr. McGeoghan stated that programming should be implemented with effective mechanisms for
M&E and data sharing, ensuring that quality data can be utilised by others. He added that without these mechanisms in place, programming would simply be ineffective, with activities that cannot be evaluated or be of benefit to other practitioners.

Group 4 reminded the workshop that programming couldn’t be effectively designed in the first place without a strong body of existing research preceding it to inform that design.

Mr. Chen Shiqu pointed out that each GMS country tends to focus on its own national research and programming and that greater emphasis is needed on regional research, and the implementation of transnational information sharing mechanisms.

UNIAP Thailand National Project Coordinator Ms. Pidchaya Pariyanithiroj stated that the problem statement might too broad and that requiring a high standard of prior research to all anti-trafficking work could be impractical.

Mr. Manthey summarised the discussion as follows: as trafficking work evolves, there is a need for a much stronger evidence base to inform programming overall, and more robust M&E indicators built in to determine the effectiveness of that programming.

Group 5 - Migration Management

Problem statements:
1) Migration management systems are not comprehensive, holistic or worker-centred.
2) Undocumented workers often don’t fall under worker protections.
3) Time, cost and understanding of legal migration channels is too difficult for migrants to access.

Causes:
- Emigration and immigration systems need to be streamlined to make them easier to follow.
- Current information on migration processes are not clear/transparent/promoted.
- Migration policies/regulations are not in languages of migrant workers.
- Complaint mechanisms are either non-existent or difficult and expensive to access.
- Lack of monitoring/accountability for employers and recruitment agencies.
- Business (not worker) driven system development.
- Bi-lateral and regional understandings are limited.
- Policy makers are disconnected from migrant realities and international standards.
- Insufficient evidence/information on migrant experience.
- Domestic laws are not appropriate to migrant situations.
- Coordination among ministries at national level is problematic.
- National and regional response to gender issues is lacking.

Effects:
- Employers cannot access legal workers required – the system fails to fulfil demand.
• The system fuels demand for irregular workers.
• Migrants are exploited.
  (the above three points are connected)
• Migrant workers have poorer health and justice outcomes than national workers.
• Migrant workers are vulnerable to trafficking because they cannot access documents required for legal migration.
• Legal migration – migrants don’t have the time, money or understanding of legal requirements.
Migration Management

Migration management systems are not comprehensive, holistic, or worker-centred. Undocumented workers often don’t fall under worker protections. Time, cost, and understanding of legal migration channels is too difficult for migrants to access.

- Migrants are exploited
- Migrant workers are vulnerable to trafficking workers cannot access documents required for legal migration
- Domestic laws are not appropriate to migrant situations
- Insufficient information on migrant experience
- Policy makers disconnected from migrant realities and international standards
- Insufficient information on migrant experience
- Bilateral & regional understandings limited
- Business (not worker) driven system development
- No monitoring or accountability for employers and recruitment agencies
- Migration policies/regulations not in language of migrant workers
- Complaint mechanisms either non-existent or difficult and expensive to access
- Current information on migration processes not clear or promoted
- Emigration and immigration systems need to be streamlined to be easy to follow
- Legal Migration: migrants don’t have the time, money or understanding of legal requirements
- Migrant workers have poorer health and justice outcomes than national workers
- Employers cannot access legal workers required – fails to fulfil demand
- Fuels demand for irregular workers

Regional Strategic Visioning Workshop
**Problem Tree Discussion:**

Mr. Manthey began the discussion by reiterating the problem statement and asked if all of the participants agreed with it.

UNIAP Cambodia NPC Mr. Tith Lim asked for clarification about whether all of the identified effects in the problem tree were linked to all three of the problem statements, or whether some effects were limited to one specific problem. Group 5 responded that these problem statements were the most important that they had identified, and that some effects are the product of a single problem while others have multiple linkages to all three of the problems, as well as to many of the problem statements identified by other groups.

Mr. Manthey steered the discussion back to whether the participants would like to make changes to the three identified problem statements. Consensus was reached that the problem statements were comprehensive as they stood.

Mr. Manthey informed the participants that the identification of problems during the group work was not done with the explicit intention to discover solutions to those problems, but rather as an exercise to delve deeper into those issues, and in doing so, to create a greater level of understanding of the issues that need to be addressed in future anti-trafficking programming. Mr. Manthey closed Day 1 of the workshop, and remarked that Day 2 would begin with the process of envisioning a new direction for anti-trafficking work based on the problems identified on Day 1.

**Vision Statements**

Mr. Manthey divided the participants into five groups in order to brainstorm the development of a vision statement. He asked each group to develop a vision statement that provided a clear goal for the region’s anti-trafficking community to aim for over the next five-year period, to address each of the five main problems identified on Day 1. Mr. Manthey emphasized that the vision statements should be high-level goals on which the anti-trafficking community as a whole can focus their efforts.

After the brainstorming session, the participants came together to discuss the draft vision statements in order to try and achieve group consensus for each.

**Group 1 – Victim ID, Protection and (Re)integration**

**Problem Statement:**

*Victims are not always identified, protected or successfully (re)integrated.*

**Draft Vision Statement:**

“All victims of trafficking are identified according to harmonized definitions and standards, and are provided with victim-centred protection and successfully (re)integrate through quality and..."
comprehensive services and support”.

**Vision Statement Discussion:**
The facilitator invited discussion on the vision statement. UNIAP Chief Technical Advisor Dr. Lisa Rende Taylor made the point that this vision statement is not empowering, the language implies actions will be done to the victims rather than victims being offered choices and engaged in their own (re)integration.

Ms. Lyth added that trafficking victims must be offered and provided victim services and the opportunity to (re)integrate back into their society. Access to rehabilitation services should always be offered as a choice to a trafficking victim, as being empowered with choice was very important for a person emerging from a situation of powerlessness.

After a discussion emphasising the need to maintain victim-centred language for the vision statements, the facilitator reminded the participants that it was important to focus on substantive language and as much as possible to move away from anti-trafficking jargon or “catch phrases”.

The point was raised on mentioning “quality” in service provision was unnecessary because the need for quality was implicit in all anti-trafficking activities. Others disagreed, and said that quality is not always understood in programming, and that often victim services that are thought to be high quality do nothing to empower victims. Mr. Lim made the point that victim-centred programming does not always mean that the victim is making the decisions for their own care.

Mr. Yoon asked for clarification on whether they should focus on the services provided to victims, or look at the end goals and outcomes for the victims. He stated that victims are generally in need of three things: they need to get out of the trafficking situation, they need to recover from the damages caused by the experience and they need to have the power to take control of their own lives. He suggested that this approach looks at service provision from a victim’s needs perspective rather than simply looking at the services being provided to them.

Mr. Chen ShiQu added that victim protection requires three elements: first is the need for protection measures, second is the need for the timely rescue of victims and third is the need for comprehensive aftercare for rescued victims.

Mr. Manthey returned the discussion to the vision statement, asking if the participants were all in agreement on the revised version. All the participants reached consensus on the new working version of the vision statement.

**Vision Statement:**
“Victims of trafficking are removed from the trafficking situation, are offered and provided with victim-centred protection, gain power to take control over their own lives and are successfully (re)integrated through quality and comprehensive services and support.”
Group 2 – Political Will

Problem statement:
Patchy and uneven responses - Three separate issues:
Lack of political will, lack of mechanisms and problems with implementation

Draft Vision Statement:
“COMMIT governments will have strengthened efforts to effectively institutionalise counter-trafficking efforts at national and sub-regional levels.”

Vision Statement Discussion:
Mr. Manthey began the discussion by asking whether or not the vision statement should refer to just the COMMIT governments, given that there are many countries receiving trafficking victims from the GMS outside of the COMMIT framework. He asked whether or not there should be a wider geographical focus in the vision statement. Participants agreed to keep COMMIT, but elaborated on the statement by adding – “COMMIT plus other regional actors.”

Mr. McGeoghan questioned whether there would be functioning and sustainable anti-trafficking mechanisms within a timeline of five years. He noted that the issues that were being dealt with are generally related to resources and administration and suggested that there is a need to talk about raising the administration’s capacity, and providing it with the mandate and resources to do their job. He stated that if this did not happen at the national level, it could not happen at the regional level.

Group 2 asked the participants whether or not the statement should be amended to “in five years the government will have ownership of their anti-trafficking fight and sufficient resources in place at the national level which will give them the capacity to work effectively at the regional level.”

Mr. McGeoghan pointed that a vision statement should avoid specific objectives, and that it should provide an overarching vision. Stating that all mechanisms would be implemented in five years was therefore not useful because it is highly unlikely to reach this objective in such a short time span.

The participants discussed the wording of the vision statement in some detail. They debated the use of the word “strengthened” in the vision statement as they felt that it was too vague to be of real value in a definition. Suggestion was made to replace strengthened with “institutionalised”. UNIAP Myanmar NPC Ms. Ohnmar Ei Ei Chaw suggested changing the statement from “strengthened efforts” to “effective implementation mechanisms” and thereby making it concrete and measureable. The suggestion was then made to change the statement to “mechanisms are strengthened and effectively implemented.” Ms. Olsen suggested that “activated” might be a better descriptor than strengthened as the policies are already in place, but needs effective implementation.
Finally, the Lao PDR government representative Ms. Thoummaly Vongphachanh, suggested that the word “institutionalise” would be a better fit than “implement”, as implementing programmes is not effective unless there was a strong commitment and ownership from the government for that implementation. This ownership arises only when the governments effectively institutionalise the anti-trafficking work.

After much discussion, Mr. Manthey asked if the participants had reached a consensus on the working vision statement, and after the removal of COMMIT, while retaining government (to emphasise importance of government ownership), and the inclusion of “institutionalise”, the group agreed on the suggested vision statement.

**Vision Statement:**

“Governments strengthen efforts to effectively institutionalise and implement counter-trafficking.”

**Group 3 – Regional Cooperation**

**Problem Statement:**

*MoU in place both regional and national, implementation not always reflective of commitments made, and there are no standard procedures for implementation.*

**Draft Vision Statement:**

“Multi-lateral and bi-lateral cooperation are fully functional and sustainable.”

**Vision Statement Discussion:**

After the facilitator opened the floor to discussion, the immediate comment was that this vision statement was too unrealistic.

Mr. Lim pointed that while the goal should be ambitious, saying that cooperation will be “fully functional and sustainable” was not useful because those goals were unattainable. Mr. Lim suggested that the vision statement should say “better” functioning with “increased” sustainability. Mr. Buckley disagreed with the addition of “better” functioning, as it sets no goal to aspire to, and lowers the achievement bar. He mentioned that under that statement, any improvement no matter how minimal would still technically qualify as better.

The point was raised that by mentioning only cooperation on its own, the statement does not address what that cooperation was trying to achieve.

Ms. Chaw pointed that the vision statement only addresses government cooperation and suggested that it should also incorporate the cooperation of other non-government anti-trafficking partners.

Mr. Manthey suggested using “partnerships” in the vision statement as a way of making it more inclusive of all anti-trafficking actors. Other participants added “anti-trafficking stakeholders” to be
more specific.

Dr. Rende Taylor mentioned the importance of having a reference to the quality of the cooperation, and that cooperation for its own sake would be inefficient. She reminded everyone that the right stakeholders should be engaged in the appropriate scenario for any cooperation to be effective.

Mr. Manthey asked if a consensus was reached on the revised statement with the inclusion of “effective cooperation” and changing the language to make the goals more attainable and collaborative. With the suggested changes in place, the participants reached a consensus on the working vision statement.

**Vision Statement:**
“Multi-lateral and bi-lateral cooperation is more effective with strong partnerships and increased sustainability.”

**Group 4 – Migration Management**

**Problem statement:**
1) Migration management systems are not comprehensive, holistic or worker-centred.
2) Undocumented workers often don't fall under worker protections.
3) Time, cost and understanding of legal migration channels is too difficult for migrants to access.

**Draft Vision Statement:**
“A well regulated labour migration management system that ensures the rights of all migrant works and their families is in place so the risk of trafficking for the vulnerable is reduced.”

**Vision Statement Discussion:**
Mr. Manthey opened the discussion by asking the participants for feedback on the vision statement. Ms. Olsen mentioned that the vision statement should include language describing the dangers of exploitation as well as trafficking in order to make it more comprehensive of all the pitfalls surrounding labour migration.

The participants suggested adding language about accessibility to migration management systems and the legal system to the statement. They also addressed the fact that the language was not clear in the vision statement’s current form, and that it does not task anyone with responsibility for ensuring the protection of migrant labour. A comment was also made that any accessibility and regulation is incomplete, unless accompanied by a change in language about the enforcement of those regulations by authorities.

The facilitator asked if there was only one management system, or many systems. The participants reached an agreement that there should be a mention of regional cooperation by different migrant management systems. The group arrived at consensus about the working vision statement after language was added about accessibility and enforcement, and the importance of regional
cooperation was emphasised.

**Vision Statement:**
“Labour migration management systems that protect the rights of all migrant workers and their families and reduce risk of trafficking and exploitation, are regulated, accessible and enforced by governments and relevant stakeholders at the national and regional levels.”

**Group 5 – Research and Evidence Based Anti-Trafficking Work**

**Problem Statement:**
*Anti-Trafficking work is often not evidence based.*

**Draft Vision Statements:**
1) “By 2015, there will be a mechanism in place to upload a global professional standard for anti-trafficking research and M&E informing all major anti-trafficking programmes including COMMIT”.
2) “By 2018, all COMMIT activities (efforts) will have been implemented with evidence base”.1
3) “By 2018, 80 % of all anti-trafficking efforts will have been implemented with evidence base”.

**Vision Statement Discussion:**

Mr. Manthey opened the discussion by asking for comments on the draft vision statement.

Ms. Vongphachanh raised concern over the use of a specific percentage target for all anti-trafficking work. She asked how one would measure the 80% benchmark established by the statement. Group 5 responded that this percentage was intended as a realistic goal to set for all counter-trafficking programming five years from now. Mr. Manthey further added that this statement was intended to demonstrate the need for the COMMIT Process to have a long-term focus on programming with a strong evidence base. Members from Group 5 added that this should not just be the standard for COMMIT efforts, but that all global anti-trafficking efforts should be evidence based.

Ms. Lyth questioned the need to apply such stringent standards of evidence for all anti-trafficking activities. She referred to instances when practitioners know what is happening on the ground without a formal evidence base to support that knowledge. Ms. Lyth used the example of working on cases of sexual violence; where one needs to provide services to victims in order to gather evidence. Group 5 responded that if one knows what is happening then one must have evidence, and evidence must be more robust than just rumours. The point was made that programming does not always have to be based on a $100,000 research study, but there are many different forms of evidence that could be used to inform programming.

1 *Evidence base comprising baseline surveys; prevalence surveys; case analysis; feedback from trafficking affected beneficiaries and vulnerable target populations; vulnerability targeting to empirically establish real risk factors; rigorous M&E reporting; management of effectiveness of ongoing programming; impact assessment; and criminal justice metrics.*
Mr. Manthey mentioned that the implication of the 80% standard was that, if an issue does not have a robust evidentiary base for programming, then no work would be done to address it. He asked the group what would be done to tackle issues where there was an understanding of an issue, without necessarily having a concrete foundation of evidence to support that knowledge. Mr. Manthey used the example that there was no formal evidence that condoms prevent HIV infection, but we still promote condoms as the most effective method of stopping the spread of the virus. He said that this was not to diminish the importance of having an evidence base, but that doesn’t necessarily mean that all programming should be based on formal evidence.

Group 5 responded that perhaps the definition of evidence was the problem, and using the term “data” might be more representative of the reality of the situation. The suggestion was made to define what types of evidence would be considered robust enough as a basis for programming.

Mr. McGeoghan suggested that using common sense was a good way to assess the strength of evidence upon which to base programming. In order to receive funding, practitioners must always present some form of evidence to donors to justify why an activity is worth undertaking. He expressed the concern that setting a percentage target may stop “common sense programme implementation” that may not be supported in all cases by evidence.

Mr. Yoon reminded the participants that vision statements are not generally focused on specific targets and objectives, but are rather high-level, overarching goals to aspire to. He recommended combining the three statements into one overarching, unified vision statement on the subject, and moving the specific indicators to the results section.

The resulting discussion combined the three statements into a single vision statement, that “all anti-trafficking efforts use an evidence based approached”. With that suggestion supported by the group, Mr. Manthey asked if there was consensus on the working vision statement, and all of the participants agreed.

**Vision Statement:**

“All anti-trafficking efforts utilize an evidence-based approach in design, implementation and M&E

**Results Map**

**Group I: Victim ID, Protection and (Re)integration**

**Vision:** “Victims of trafficking are removed from the trafficking situation, are offered and provided with victim-centred protection, gain power to take control over their own lives and are successfully (re)integrated through quality and comprehensive services and support.”

**Results:**

1. Harmonised definitions of key terms in the Palermo Protocol (e.g. victims of trafficking, debt
bondage, exploitation) across the region.
2. Minimum standards of care are developed and implemented across the region in line with international guidelines and standards.
3. Professional codes of conduct are developed and enforced by reintegration service providers (e.g. social workers, shelter care providers, counsellors, health workers) in line with international guidelines and standards.
4. Regular exchange and sharing of good practices across the region.
5. Better quality of services / responses to protect victims of trafficking that empower the victims and ensure their best interest.
6. Cross-border referral system is in place.
7. Action taken against corrupt / irresponsible officials responsible for victim ID and protection.
8. Systems in place for victims' own voices / experiences to inform changes to protection efforts.

Group II: Political Will

Vision: “Governments strengthen efforts to effectively institutionalise and implement counter-trafficking.”

Results:
1. Counter-trafficking affirmed as a priority.
2. More resources allocated from national budgets to regional levels (or embassies and/or overseas missions).
3. Mechanisms implemented (COMMIT, MoUs, SOPs and NPAs).
4. Improved results in counter-trafficking verified by M&E and knowledge management.
5. Evidence of sustainability and government ownership.
6. Harmonised and standard efforts (mechanisms).
7. Increased efficiency in the handling of domestic and cross-border cases (needs assessment, (re)integration, exchanges of intelligence/evidence, arrest, prosecution, and compensation paid to victims).
8. Administrative regulations (including licensing penalties / shut down and other sanctions) for recruitment agencies and others involved in exploitative labour practices.

Group III: Region Cooperation

Vision: “Multi-lateral and bi-lateral cooperation is more effective with strong partnerships and increased sustainability.”

Results:
1. Appropriate bi-lateral MoUs and SOPs between GMS countries signed.
2. COMMIT criminal justice guidelines in place and functional.
3. Victim identification recovery and (re)integration are standardised and implemented.
4. Existing bi-lateral MoUs are fully functional.
5. Appropriate expanded multi-lateral cooperation.
6. Mechanisms for implementation of MoUs in place and functional. UN, NGOs and private sector are appropriately engaged in combating human trafficking.
7. M&E systems are in place to monitor implementation.
8. Agreements are informed and revised as needed according to M&E.

Group IV: Migration Management

Vision: “Labour migration management systems that protect the rights of all migrant workers and their families and reduce risk of trafficking and exploitation, are regulated, accessible and enforced by governments and relevant stakeholders at the national and regional levels.”

Results:
1. Well-regulated labour migration management system – laws (policies, procedures) to manage employment services (including recruitment, job placement etc.) and the migration process are enacted / enforced in both countries of origin and destination.
2. All children of labour migrants have access to education and health services.
3. Safer migration practices are promoted and replicated.
4. Complaint mechanisms are in place and migrants receive assistance and access to criminal justice system.
5. All migrants and their dependents have travel documents (passports, IDs, registration, etc.) at an affordable cost and in a timely manner.
6. Bad recruitment agencies and employers and corrupt officials are punished – law enforcement is responsive to the abuse of migrant workers.
7. Rules/laws and systems are in place to monitor the bad practices of employers / businesses and recruitment agencies.
8. Information and service about safe(r) migration are well publicised and accessible.
9. Mechanisms are in place to provide guidance / counselling.

Group V: Research and Evidence Based Anti-Trafficking Work

Vision: “All anti-trafficking efforts utilize an evidence-based approach in design, implementation and M&E.”

Results:
1. Established mechanisms are in place to uphold a global professional standard for anti-trafficking research and M&E, informing all major anti-trafficking programmes.
2. Increased donor funding to anti-trafficking research and M&E.
3. Increased quality and quantity of anti-trafficking knowledge base.
4. More programme data mined and analysed to constantly improve programmes.
5. Reduction in effective, wasteful, or poorly targeted anti-trafficking programming.
6. Agreed set of priorities for anti-trafficking research.
7. Research launch and dissemination more effectively impact policy and programming, and
reaches those responders who would benefit from the data.

8. Culture shift, increasing the professionalization of the anti-trafficking sector and its valuing of evidence.

9. All governments and policy makers accept the importance of evidence-based programming and support research initiatives - starting from data collection all the way through to dissemination to stakeholders.

10. Research / knowledge products are developed in a way which more effectively targets different audiences (e.g. general public, policymakers, practitioners etc.) and select the appropriate sampling in the research.

Conclusion

Mr. Manthey thanked all the participants for their openness and active participation in all of the discussions. UNIAP Regional Project Manager Ms. Annette Lyth also thanked everyone for their participation and reiterated that the results of the workshop would be shared with all the participants and relevant regional anti-trafficking stakeholders to inform common anti-trafficking goals and efforts in the region. She reinforced the importance of this strategic visioning process to the development of the next phase of UNIAP, and stated that all of UNIAP’s partners would continue to be closely involved and well informed about the development process for any initiatives to follow UNIAP.

The end of the second day brought the Regional Consultation Workshop on Strategic Visioning to a close. The two-day workshop was highly productive, with all of the participants contributing to the lively and informative discussions throughout. The first day focused on identifying and isolating the main problems currently affecting anti-trafficking work in the GMS region. With five overarching thematic issues identified, and problem trees created to explore the causes and effects of those problems, the second day focused on addressing those issues through the development of five vision statements to address the five main problems identified as having the greatest impact on regional anti-trafficking work. Each of the five groups developed the vision statements through brainstorming sessions that were presented to the workshop. The participants then delved into the statements through highly substantive discussions and debates, using their anti-trafficking expertise and experience to develop five finalised vision statements through the achievement of consensus as a group.

These final vision statements are the end product of the workshop. They provide regional anti-trafficking practitioners a set of five main goals to support their programming efforts in order to tackle and overcome the most pressing issues in the region’s counter-trafficking sector today.

One of the greatest obstacles identified through the two-day workshop is that is that the anti-trafficking sector often operates in a fragmented fashion, without consensus about desired outcomes. This fragmentation often leads to confusion, conflicting efforts and an ineffective overall response to the crime of human trafficking. The visions produced in this workshop are not intended to provide specific activities and objectives. They are intended to be tools providing clarity, focus
and a coordinated overall direction for the region’s anti-trafficking community as a whole. These vision statements are the future goals that the region’s foremost anti-trafficking experts have identified as being the most important to focus on in order to begin to solve the most pressing issues facing the GMS anti-trafficking community today.

The five vision statements developed in the regional workshop will be examined in conjunction with the vision statements developed from the six national consultations in order to gain a comprehensive understanding of both the national directions, and an overarching regional direction for the future of anti-trafficking work in the GMS. These visioning consultations will also play an important role in the development of a new anti-trafficking project after the end of UNIAP in December 2013, aimed at supporting the region’s anti-trafficking community attain the achievement of these visions.
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