




Re/integration of trafficked persons: developing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms 2009

Issue paper #3

**Trafficking Victims Re/integration Programme
(TVRP)**





Re/integration of trafficked persons: developing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms 2009

Issue paper #3

**Trafficking Victims Re/integration Programme
(TVRP)**

An initiative of the King Baudouin Foundation, Belgium

Rebecca Surtees
NEXUS Institute, Washington



COLOPHON

Re/integration of trafficked persons: developing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms

Issue paper #3, 2009

Trafficking Victims Re/integration Programme in Southeast Europe (TVRP)

A joint publication of the King Baudouin Foundation
Rue Brederode 21, B 1000 Brussels
and the NEXUS Institute,
Washington

AUTHOR Rebecca Surtees, Senior Researcher
NEXUS Institute,
Washington

COORDINATION Gerrit Rauws
Director, King Baudouin Foundation

Fabrice de Kerchove
Project Manager, King Baudouin Foundation

Michèle Duesberg
Assistant, King Baudouin Foundation

GRAPHIC CONCEPT PuPiL
LAYOUT Jean-Pierre Marsily
PRINT ON DEMAND Manufast-ABP, a non-profit, special-employment enterprise

This publication can be downloaded free of charge from www.kbs-frb.be
A printed version of this electronic publication is available free of charge:
order online from www.kbs-frb.be, by e-mail at publi@kbs-frb.be or call King
Baudouin Foundations' Contact Center +32-70-233-728, fax + 32-70-233-727

LEGAL DEPOSIT: D/2893/2009/44
ISBN-13: 978-90-5130-678-1
EAN: 9789051306781
ORDER NUMBER: 1950

December 2009
With the support of the Belgian National Lottery

FOREWORD

This paper was developed in the context of the King Baudouin Foundation's trafficking assistance programme in South-Eastern Europe, the Trafficking Victims Re/integration Programme (TVRP), which funds NGOs in several countries of the region. In addition to direct funding, the TVRP provides technical assistance and capacity development for partner organisations.

Meaningful re/integration is a complex and costly undertaking. It requires a full and diverse package of services for the individual (and often also the family) to address the root causes of trafficking as well as the physical, mental and social impacts of their exploitation. Obstacles to sustainable recovery and re/integration for trafficking victims are myriad and often specific to the socio-cultural, economic or political situation in the country where re/integration takes place.

Central to any assistance programme must be a victim and human rights centred philosophy with sustainable re/integration as the measure of success. This philosophy lies at the core of the Foundation's strategy which aims not only to support different models and approaches to re/integration in different countries but also to analyse the strengths of the various strategies as well as any inhibitors to full re/integration success.

This paper is the third of a series that aim to shed light on good practices in the area of re/integration as well as important lessons learned. With its focus on monitoring and evaluation, it addresses one of the most challenging and under-considered aspects of re/integration work. Often perceived simply as paperwork that needs to be done in order to meet donors' requirements, monitoring and evaluation is put forward here as a major tool to systematise re/integration work and to ensure that assistance is appropriate and effective.

The Foundation would like to express its gratitude to the author Rebecca Surtees, of the NEXUS Institute, for her insightful perspective on many aspects of re/integration as well as to the TVRP partner organisations in South-Eastern Europe for sharing the lessons from their daily practice.

King Baudouin Foundation
December 2009

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Re/integration is one of the most important and yet complex aspects of assistance and protection for trafficked persons. Monitoring and evaluating (M&E) this work is equally challenging. The overall dearth of information on M&E of anti-trafficking assistance, particularly re/integration work, constitutes a significant gap in efforts to combat trafficking in persons. Too little is known about how to most effectively and efficiently monitor and evaluate re/integration efforts which, in turn, impacts the ability to capitalise on successful strategies and address problems faced.

As such, I would like to begin by thanking the King Baudouin Foundation (KBF) for its efforts to build M&E capacity through its Trafficking Victims Re/integration Programme (TVRP), including in commissioning this paper on monitoring and evaluating re/integration work. This paper is the third in a series of issue-based papers related to the re/integration of trafficked persons. In particular, my thanks to Fabrice de Kerchove, TVRP project manager, who oversees the programme and has worked closely with NEXUS Institute on all aspects of its technical assistance, including providing valuable assistance and inputs into the TVRP issue paper series and the M&E component of the programme. Thanks also to Michèle Duesberg for her work in organising the TVRP partners meetings in Brussels in 2008 which provided a forum for discussing monitoring and evaluation, her assistance with all TVRP publications and her on-going work on the TVRP.

I would also like to acknowledge the important work and contribution of TVRP partner NGOs which have contributed to this paper through their participation at TVRP partners meetings in Brussels, Belgium in 2008 and Durres, Albania in 2009 as well as through conversations and email correspondence about M&E work and inputs into earlier drafts of this paper. Their day to day experiences and re/integration work form the foundation of this paper. I am particularly grateful for their candour in discussing the many issues, frustrations and "failures" they have faced. It is this transparency which will contribute to better understanding how best to undertake M&E for re/integration programmes. Thanks to all TVRP partners – Different and Equal (Albania), Tjeter Vision (Albania), Animus (Bulgaria), Nadja Centre (Bulgaria), Centre for Protection of Victims and Prevention of Trafficking in Human Beings (Kosovo), Open Gate (Macedonia), Adpare (Romania), Young Generation (Romania) and Atina (Serbia).

In addition, a number of individuals reviewed this paper and provided helpful inputs and suggestions. The paper benefits substantially from their expertise. Thanks are due to Mike Dottridge (Independent consultant), Ruth Rosenberg (Independent consultant), Claire Cody (Oak Fellow, UHI Centre for

Rural Childhood, Perth College), Maria Antonia di Maio (Advisor on Child Protection, Save the Children, Italy), Tinne Vandensande (Advisor, King Baudouin Foundation) and Susan Somach (Independent consultant).

Finally, my thanks to Stephen Warnath, Director of the NEXUS Institute, for his on-going support and assistance on KBF's TVRP programme, particularly in the drafting of and revisions to the issue paper series. This current paper benefits substantially from his insights and suggestions.

Rebecca Surtees
Senior Researcher
NEXUS Institute Washington

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AT	Anti-trafficking
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
D&E	Different and equal
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
KBF	King Baudouin Foundation
GAO	Government Accountability Office (United States)
GO	government organisation
IO	international organisation
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MER	monitoring, evaluation and research
MOU	memorandum of understanding
NGO	non-governmental organisation
PVPT	Centre for Protection of Victims and Prevention of Trafficking in Human Beings
SEE	South-eastern Europe
THB	trafficking in human beings
TIP	trafficking in persons
TRP	temporary residence permit
TV	Tjeter Vision
TVRP	Trafficking Victims Re/integration Programme
UN	United Nations
UNOHCHR	United Nations Office of the High Commission of Human Rights
VoT	victim of trafficking

CONTENTS

Foreword	3
Acknowledgements	4
Acronyms and abbreviations	6
Executive summary.....	9
Samenvatting	11
Synthèse	13
1. Introduction	15
2. Considering monitoring and evaluation	19
2.1 Defining terms and concepts	20
2.2 Balancing M&E with programme implementation	21
3. Monitoring anti-trafficking re/integration programmes	23
3.1 About monitoring.....	23
3.2 How to monitor re/integration programmes	25
3.3 Some issues and considerations in monitoring re/integration programmes	34
4. Evaluating anti-trafficking re/integration programmes	39
4.1 About evaluations	39
4.2 How to evaluate re/integration programmes	42
4.3 Some issues and considerations in evaluating re/integration programmes	46
5. Beneficiary participation and involvement in M&E	51
5.1 Beneficiary participation in monitoring and evaluation.....	52
5.2 Considerations in beneficiary participation.....	58
6. Moving forward – some conclusions, some recommendations.....	63
7. References Cited.....	67
Appendices	
Appendix 1: Organisations working on re/integration through KBF’s Trafficking Victims Re/integration Programme (TVRP) in SEE.....	71
Appendix 2: Working terms and definitions	75
Appendix 3: Sample from Matrix #1. Monitoring individual re/integration plans of trafficked persons	77
Appendix 4: Sample from Matrix #2. Monitoring re/integration services ...	85

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Re/integration refers to the process of recovery involving economic and social inclusion following a trafficking experience. This inclusion is multifaceted and must take place in social, cultural and economic arenas. Given the complexity of the re/integration process, it is particularly important that efforts are made to monitor and evaluate programmes in order to assess whether re/integration has been achieved as well as how to more effectively work toward re/integration of trafficked persons. The dearth of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) information on anti-trafficking assistance in general and re/integration work more specifically constitutes a significant gap in efforts to combat trafficking in persons. Unless re/integration programmes are monitored and evaluated on a regular and on-going basis, service providers, policy makers and donors are without the information needed to design, adjust and implement effective programmes and policies.

This paper explores issues related to the M&E of anti-trafficking re/integration programmes and, as such, aims to contribute to the body of knowledge on this subject. It is the third in a series of issue-based papers focusing on the re/integration of trafficked persons, developed in the context of the King Baudouin Foundation (KBF) Trafficking Victims Re/integration Programmes (TVRP) in South-eastern Europe (SEE).

Overall, M&E should enhance the conceptual and practical knowledge of re/integration organisations in ways that improve programmes and service delivery. This paper discusses on the one hand, how monitoring should take place within re/integration programmes, including the identification of indicators and development of systems to collect, analyse and mobilise information in on-going work. On the other hand, the paper explores various aspects of evaluation work, including different types of evaluations and different approaches in undertaking evaluations of re/integration programmes.

Equally important is the role of programme beneficiaries in planning, monitoring and evaluating re/integration efforts. Beneficiary participation ensures that programmes and policies are created according to their needs, interests and opinions. It also potentially facilitates the empowerment of beneficiaries and forms part of a process of accountability on the part of anti-trafficking organisations and institutions – to beneficiaries, donors, governments and civil society. Systems of intervention and assistance which are designed, implemented and adjusted in a participatory manner are more effective, efficient and appropriate for beneficiary needs and interests.

Overall the paper makes clear that far more time and attention needs to be given to the M&E of re/integration efforts. Recommendations include:

- Make M&E an essential component of all re/integration work;
- Monitor not only the re/integration plans of individual victims but also re/integration services themselves;
- Regularly conduct evaluations of re/integration programmes – before, during and after programme implementation;
- Use both qualitative and quantitative information in monitoring and evaluating re/integration work;
- Involve beneficiaries in monitoring and evaluating re/integration services and programmes;
- Follow ethical principles in M&E work;
- Make M&E a “safe” and comfortable process for staff and beneficiaries;
- Balance the costs and benefits in undertaking M&E work;
- Train staff in M&E, including recognising its value in programme work;
- Apply the lessons from M&E in on-going re/integration efforts in order to bring about positive change; and
- Fund and undertake both M&E and research.

SAMENVATTING

Re/integratie verwijst naar het proces van herstel dat moet leiden tot economische en sociale integratie na een ervaring met mensenhandel. Die integratie heeft veel facetten en moet gebeuren op sociaal, cultureel en economisch vlak. Gezien de complexiteit van het re/integratieproces is het van uitzonderlijk belang dat er inspanningen gebeuren om deze programma's te monitoren en te evalueren, om na te gaan of er inderdaad sprake is van re/integratie en ook hoe er meer doeltreffend kan worden gewerkt aan de re/integratie van mensen die het slachtoffer zijn geweest van mensenhandel. Het gebrek aan gegevens uit monitoring en evaluatie (M&E) van de bijstand aan slachtoffers van mensenhandel in het algemeen en van het werk op het vlak van re/integratie in het bijzonder vormt een groot tekort in de inspanningen voor de bestrijding van mensenhandel. Wanneer re/integratieprogramma's niet op regelmatige en permanente basis worden gemonitord en geëvalueerd, beschikken dienstverleners, beleidsmakers en donoren niet over de informatie die nodig is om doeltreffende programma's uit te stippelen, aan te passen en uit te voeren.

Deze paper verkent thema's die verband houden met de M&E van re/integratieprogramma's om mensenhandel tegen te gaan en probeert op die manier een bijdrage te leveren aan de kennis over dit onderwerp. Het is de derde in een reeks van thematische papers over de re/integratie van slachtoffers van mensenhandel, die tot stand komen in het kader van het programma van de Koning Boudewijnstichting voor de re/integratie van slachtoffers van mensenhandel (TVRP – Trafficking Victims Re/integration Programmes) in Zuidoost-Europa.

Algemeen gesproken zou M&E de conceptuele en praktische kennis van organisaties voor re/integratie moeten bevorderen en op die manier moeten bijdragen tot betere programma's en een betere dienstverlening. Deze paper bespreekt enerzijds hoe de monitoring moet gebeuren binnen re/integratieprogramma's, zoals het identificeren van indicatoren en de ontwikkeling van systemen om informatie over lopend werk te verzamelen, te analyseren en te mobiliseren. Anderzijds verkent de paper diverse aspecten van het evaluatiewerk, zoals verscheidene vormen van evaluatie en verscheidene benaderingen bij het opzetten van evaluatiewerk.

Even belangrijk is de rol van de begunstigden van de monitoring en evaluatie van het re/integratiewerk. Participatie van de begunstigden zorgt ervoor dat programma's en beleidslijnen worden afgestemd op hun noden, belangen en meningen. Participatie bevordert ook de empowerment van de begunstigden en maakt deel uit van een proces van aansprakelijkheid vanwege de organisaties en instellingen die strijden tegen mensenhandel ten opzichte van hun begunstigden. Interventies en bijstand die worden ontwikkeld,

uitgevoerd en aangepast op participatieve wijze, zijn effectiever, efficiënter en beantwoorden uiteindelijk meer aan de noden van de belanghebbenden.

Deze paper maakt algemeen duidelijk dat er veel meer tijd en aandacht moet gaan naar de M&E van re/integratie-inspanningen. De aanbevelingen stellen onder andere dat het belangrijk is om:

- van M&E een essentiële component te maken van alle re/integratiewerk;
- niet alleen de re/integratieplannen van individuele slachtoffers te monitoren, maar ook de diensten voor re/integratie zelf;
- de re/integratieprogramma's regelmatig te evalueren;
- zowel gebruik te maken van kwalitatieve als kwantitatieve informatie bij het monitoren en evalueren van het re/integratiewerk;
- de begunstigden te betrekken bij de monitoring en evaluatie van de re/integratiediensten en -programma's;
- de resultaten van M&E te benutten bij lopende inspanningen op het vlak van re/integratie;
- van M&E een "veilig" en comfortabel proces te maken voor de medewerkers en de begunstigden;
- een evenwicht te bewaren tussen de kosten en baten bij het uitvoeren van M&E-werk;
- de medewerkers op te leiden om aan M&E te werken.

SYNTHÈSE

La ré/intégration fait référence au processus de rétablissement et d'inclusion économique et sociale suite à une expérience de traite. Cette inclusion comporte de multiples facettes et doit s'opérer dans les domaines social, culturel et économique. Étant donné la complexité du processus de ré/intégration, il est particulièrement important de superviser et d'évaluer les programmes mis en œuvre, afin de vérifier s'ils ont contribué à la ré/intégration et d'étudier comment travailler plus efficacement à la ré/intégration des victimes de traite. La pénurie d'informations relatives au monitoring et à l'évaluation (M&E) de l'assistance aux victimes de traite en général et, plus particulièrement, du travail de ré/intégration constitue une lacune importante dans les efforts déployés pour combattre la traite des êtres humains. Si les programmes de ré/intégration ne sont pas supervisés et évalués régulièrement, les prestataires de services, les décideurs politiques et les donateurs ne disposeront pas des informations indispensables pour concevoir, ajuster et mettre en œuvre des programmes efficaces.

Ce document explore les problèmes liés au M&E des programmes de ré/intégration des victimes de la traite des êtres humains et, ce faisant, vise à contribuer à l'ensemble des connaissances sur ce sujet. Il est le troisième d'une série d'explorations sur la ré/intégration des victimes de traite, réalisées dans le contexte du Programme de réintégration des victimes de traite (TVRP – Trafficking Victims Re/integration Programmes) de la Fondation Roi Baudouin en Europe du Sud-est.

Globalement, le monitoring et l'évaluation devraient améliorer les connaissances conceptuelles et pratiques des organismes de ré/intégration et faire en sorte qu'ils puissent améliorer leurs programmes et les services prestés. Ce document étudie, d'une part, la manière dont le monitoring devrait s'effectuer au sein des programmes de ré/intégration; il y inclut l'identification d'indicateurs et l'élaboration de systèmes permettant de collecter, d'analyser et d'exploiter l'information au profit du travail en cours. Il explore, d'autre part, différents aspects de l'évaluation, en passant en revue différents types et approches de ce travail d'évaluation.

Le rôle des bénéficiaires dans le monitoring et l'évaluation du travail de réintégration est tout aussi important. La participation des bénéficiaires permet de s'assurer que les programmes et les politiques sont élaborés en fonction des besoins, des intérêts et des opinions des clients. Cette participation contribue aussi à l'empowerment des bénéficiaires et fait partie d'un processus de responsabilisation des organisations et des institutions de lutte contre la traite à l'égard de leurs clients. Les systèmes d'intervention et d'assistance conçus et mis en œuvre de manière participative sont plus efficaces et au bout du compte plus adaptés aux besoins des bénéficiaires.

Dans l'ensemble, ce document met en lumière la nécessité d'accorder beaucoup plus de temps et d'attention au M&E des efforts de ré/intégration. Il recommande de:

- Faire du M&E une composante essentielle de tout travail de ré/intégration;
- Contrôler non seulement les plans de ré/intégration des victimes individuelles mais aussi les services de ré/intégration eux-mêmes;
- Évaluer régulièrement les programmes de ré/intégration;
- Utiliser des informations à la fois qualitatives et quantitatives pour contrôler et évaluer le travail de ré/intégration;
- Impliquer des bénéficiaires dans le monitoring et l'évaluation des services et des programmes de ré/intégration;
- Exploiter les résultats du M&E au profit des efforts de ré/intégration en cours;
- Faire du M&E un processus 'sûr' et confortable pour le personnel et les bénéficiaires;
- Équilibrer les coûts et les bénéfices en entreprenant le travail de M&E;
- Former le personnel à ce travail de M&E.

1. INTRODUCTION

Re/integration refers to the process of recovery following a trafficking experience and re/integration programmes and services are often central to the recovery of trafficked persons. The lack of social support networks amongst some victims and the inadequacies of social services in many countries where trafficking takes place means that re/integration programmes are often the main (and possibly sole) form of support for many trafficked persons. This makes it all the more important that adequate efforts are made to monitor and evaluate programmes in order to assess whether re/integration has been achieved and to improve the effectiveness of future re/integration work. Moreover, with limited resources available for re/integration work, such knowledge is also necessary for donors and policy makers in order to advise on the most effective programme models and, by implication, provide guidance in terms of funding choices.

The need for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of anti-trafficking efforts has been highlighted in guiding documents such as the United Nation's *Recommended Principles and Guidelines on Human Rights and Human Trafficking* which, in guideline 1, section 7, recommends:

Establishing mechanisms to monitor the human rights impact of anti-trafficking laws, policies, programmes and interventions. Consideration should be given to assigning this role to independent national human rights institutions where such bodies exist. Non-governmental organisations working with trafficked persons should be encouraged to participate in monitoring and evaluating the human rights impact of anti-trafficking measures (UNOHCHR 2002: 5).

With human rights impacts as a core principle, a number of elements are to be considered in conducting M&E that will contribute to individual re/integration projects and progress on the issue as a whole.

Nevertheless, M&E has been typically under-considered in anti-trafficking work, including in terms of re/integration assistance.¹ A 2006 assessment of victim assistance in south-eastern Europe (SEE), commissioned by the King Baudouin Foundation (KBF), found that,

¹ *The United States Government Accountability Office (GAO 2007: 3-7, 23, 27) found that AT project documents generally include monitoring elements such as overarching goals and related activities but they often lack other monitoring elements such as targets for measuring performance and measurable indicators and procedures for setting up and modifying targets. Further, little attention is generally devoted to evaluation design at the start of projects – for example, questions related to determining a control group, the type of design for impact evaluation, the data that would be collected and the analytical methods that would be most suitable. A review of programmes for the recovery and re/integration of children found that, "although some projects and programmes monitor and/or measure outcomes at some level, surprisingly few appear to have embedded evaluation and monitoring in the project design. Consequently, the basis on which claims of improved effectiveness are made is not clear" (Asquith and Turner 2009: 20).*

With few exceptions, service provision in the region (and counter-trafficking work generally) has been undertaken with little monitoring and evaluation of implementation or impact. There is a strong need for independent programme evaluations to assess where programmes and organisations are (and are not) being effective in their work (Surtees 2006: 32).

More specifically in the area of re/integration, there are few examples of effective M&E. Existing tools and manuals are typically quite general and provide little practical guidance for the implementation of anti-trafficking re/integration programmes. There are no generally agreed upon indicators for re/integration programmes and those which do exist have not been tested in terms of their effectiveness and relevance over the long term.² Moreover, very little monitoring of services and professional capacity has taken place in the re/integration field.

This is due, at least in part, to the nature of re/integration work which is complex and requires a sustained long term effort. Re/integration work requires time (often a matter of years, rather than months) and very few evaluations have tracked individuals who have been re/integrated into their community, not least because of the myriad ethical, practical and security issues involved in tracking former trafficked persons over time. Re/integration also requires multi-sectoral expertise (e.g. legal, health, social services, medical, etc.) at different stages of the post-trafficking continuum (i.e. crisis, transition and re/integration phases) and the impact of these services needs to be tracked as part of the M&E process. An additional complication is the diversity of programme beneficiaries³ – for example, children and adults, males and females, nationals and foreign nationals and persons exploited for different forms of trafficking, typical and “difficult” cases – for whom different indicators will likely be required.

These complexities and difficulties notwithstanding, the need for more evidence-based programme is pressing. That is,

Until a body of evidence to enable comparisons exists, planners will be forced to make “best guesses” and there is a danger of approaches being adopted simply because they have been promoted by particular bodies or agencies, require fewer resources, or are fashionable (Asquith & Turner 2009: 23).

Because of shortcomings in the application of M&E to current anti-trafficking programmes, one of the primary recommendations of KBF’s 2006 evaluation of anti-trafficking interventions in SEE was to incorporate monitoring and evaluation (M&E) components into NGO programmes (Surtees 2006: 34). While recognising that strengthening the monitoring and evaluation of re/integration work involves significant challenges,

² Some organisations collect statistics on the success of victim re/integration (e.g. through employment rates, educational reinsertion rates, returns from abroad) as part of case management. However, this is costly and time consuming and tracking trafficking victims over time can be difficult. It is also a problem of to whom to compare target beneficiaries and, thus, how to determine successful project implementation (GAO 2007: 24, 27). In a review of USAID anti-trafficking assistance projects in Europe and Eurasia, most indicators which tracked victim protection were output oriented – for example, number of persons assisted – and did not measure impact of programmes – for example, the number of victims still employed one year after receiving vocational training (Rosenberg 2008: 34).

³ “Beneficiaries” refers to the individuals/persons that anti-trafficking reintegration service providers work with and for and who benefit from their programmes. Other terms used in this context include service users, clients and rights-holders.

KBF has nonetheless made M&E one of the main foci of its Trafficking Victims Re/integration Programme (TVRP) in SEE.⁴

Monitoring and evaluation of re/integration programmes requires a clear definition of and framework for “successful re/integration”. Within the TVRP, re/integration is defined as:

*...the process of recovery and economic and social inclusion following a trafficking experience. This inclusion is multifaceted and must take place in social, cultural and economic arenas. It includes settlement in a stable and safe environment, access to a reasonable standard of living, mental and physical well-being, opportunities for personal, social and economic development and access to social and emotional support. It may involve returning to one’s family and/or community of origin; it may also involve integration in a new community and even in a new country. A central aspect of successful re/integration is that of empowerment, supporting victims to develop skills toward independence and self sufficiency and to be actively involved in their recovery and re/integration.*⁵

As such, among the key aims of re/integration support is for trafficked persons to regain control over their own lives; to access rights and services to the maximum extent possible and to access opportunities to realise their potential. This is achieved through combining services and interventions that address the inner/personal and external factors which hamper or facilitate this process.

The term “reintegration” is not without problem as it implies a return to the victim’s community of origin, which may not always be advisable and which might, in some cases, work against social inclusion in the long term. Moreover, the term implies that the individual was integrated in society prior to being trafficked, which is not always the case. Many trafficked persons experience social, economic or cultural marginalisation prior to trafficking. As a result, some organisations (including some TVRP partners) chose to frame their work in other terms – for instance, as social inclusion and integration. In the context of the TVRP, we use the framing of “re/integration”, a linguistic formulation which attempts to capture both integration and re-integration, while, at the same time, conforming to re/integration terminology which is commonly used in the anti-trafficking assistance framework. However, the articulation of appropriate terminology is an on-going discussion within the TVRP.

This paper was authored by the NEXUS Institute in the framework of the TVRP, being implemented in six countries in SEE from 2006 to 2011.⁶ It is the third in a series of issue-based papers focusing on the re/integration of trafficking victims, developed in the context of the TVRP,⁷ and is intended as a starting point for dialogue

⁴ This is consistent with increased recognition of the need for M&E in the anti-trafficking field generally. See e.g. EC’s 2007 manual on Measuring responses to Trafficking in Human Beings in the European Union: an assessment manual, GAO’s 2007 report on Monitoring and evaluating of international projects are limited but experts suggest improvements and IOM’s 2008 Handbook on performance indicators for counter-trafficking projects. A handbook for project managers, developers, implementers, evaluators and donors working to counter trafficking in persons.

⁵ This definition was developed in the framework of KBF’s TVRP programme. Please see Surtees, R. (2006) *Re/integration programmes in SE Europe—a background paper for the King Baudouin Foundation*. Brussels: KBF.

⁶ Please see appendix 1 for a description of TVRP partner organisations in SEE.

⁷ Topics for the issue paper series were identified in discussions between KBF, NEXUS Institute and TVRP partner organisations. Additional issue papers will appear in the forthcoming phase of the TVRP.

and discussion of M&E practices in anti-trafficking re/integration work. The paper is primarily based on the direct experience of service provision by KBF's TVRP partner organisations. Information was collected by the author through personal interviews, telephone conversations and email correspondence with partners as well as during TVRP partners meetings in Brussels, Belgium in 2008 and Durres, Albania in 2009. This information is further supplemented by the author's previous research and work on re/integration for the NEXUS Institute⁸ and a review of relevant literature.

The paper serves as an analytical accompaniment to KBF's forthcoming TVRP monitoring manual – Monitoring anti-trafficking re/integration programmes. A manual – which aims to provide practical tools and guidance in monitoring re/integration work based on experiences in SEE.⁹

8 These studies have focused on various aspects of assistance and protection for trafficked persons including victim's experience of identification, return and assistance in SEE (Surtees 2007); why some trafficking victims decline assistance (Brunovskis & Surtees 2007); assistance and protection for trafficked men (Surtees 2008c&d); an analysis of the shelter model and alternative assistance options (Surtees 2008e); intersections between domestic violence and trafficking (Warnath (2007); methods and models for mixing services for victims of domestic violence and trafficking (Surtees & Somach 2008); issues in reintegration of trafficking victims (Surtees 2008a&b); assistance to trafficked children (Surtees 2006b) and an evaluation of victim assistance in SEE (Surtees 2006a).

9 This forthcoming manual proposes and outlines two aspects of monitoring – 1) how to monitor individual re/integration plans and 2) how to monitor re/integration services – and is considered from the perspectives of both re/integration professionals and programme beneficiaries. For each of these components a matrix has been developed, comprised of indicators and the associated means of verification, to measure the impact and success of individual services and, cumulatively, the various stages of re/integration. The manual was developed collaboratively by the King Baudouin Foundation (KBF), NEXUS Institute and partner NGOs in the context of KBF's TVRP in SEE during its first phase (2006-2008). In the TVRP's phase II (2009-2011), TVRP partner NGOs have refined, tested and are currently piloting the indicators. Based on this piloting phase, the manual will be revised and formalized into a working tool for re/integration organisations. See Surtees forthcoming. In its current form, this manual should be considered a "work-in-progress". Please see appendix 3 and 4 for a sample of the draft matrices.

2. CONSIDERING MONITORING AND EVALUATION

M&E is essential for all anti-trafficking work, to measure the degree to which a programme has realised its objectives and outputs. It provides the basis for accurate reporting and allows for the identification of lessons learned and obstacles faced, which can be used to plan new programmes as well as to adjust and tailor existing programmes. It is also a valuable planning and management tool – building monitoring systems and envisaging evaluations at the outset of the programme helps to design and review objectives, anticipate resources, etc. M&E also supports the process of continuous learning which should be shared both internally within the organisation and externally with practitioners, policy makers and donors.

Box #1: Why M&E?

- *To determine whether the programme is doing to right things to address the problem at hand;*
- *To assess who is benefiting from the programme (including how much they are benefiting or if they are not benefiting);*
- *To determine whether beneficiaries are active participants in this process;*
- *To identify problems (and their causes) in programme work;*
- *To suggest possible solutions to these identified problems;*
- *To raise questions about assumptions and strategies which underpin programmes;*
- *To provide programme-valuable information and insight which can be acted upon;*
- *To assess whether the programme can be sustained in the long term;*
- *To be accountable to programme beneficiaries and donors;*
- *To be able to demonstrate and share results and lessons learnt;*
- *To support continuous learning and professional development;*
- *To determine whether optimum outputs are realised for the least possible inputs.*

In sum, M&E allows organisations to assess the quality and impact of their work, against their action plan and objectives, and assess whether resources are used efficiently. Impacts include positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by an intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended (DAC 2002: 24). As such, it allows organisations to identify where they may have failed to have an impact or even where they have had a negative impact (Shapiro nd: 6, 13).

The above points notwithstanding, there are some questions that may not be able to be answered purely by M&E. Given the complexity of rights-based programming and the re/integration process, monitoring and evaluation alone cannot satisfy all information needs. Research is also needed as a complementary approach to respond to those questions that cannot be answered by the regular monitoring and evaluation. Research seeks to answer specific questions, bring in contextual issues and theoretical models, and may (or may not) be tied to projects or programmes (Plan 2009b: 36). M&E cannot replace the role of research in terms of identifying a particular problem/issue, in understanding the needs of trafficked persons or in identifying a range of other issues which are relevant in the lives of trafficked persons, whether from the perspective of prevention, protection or prosecution. Moreover, independent research serves an important role in guiding the design of re/integration programmes as well as in exploring issues identified during or following the completion of the programme.

2.1 Defining terms and concepts

- **Monitoring** refers to the continuous oversight of the implementation of programme activities, assessing progress, identifying operational difficulties and recommending actions. Monitoring is aimed at improving the efficiency and effectiveness of a programme and ensures that activities are transformed into results/outputs. It is undertaken during the course of the programme.
- **Evaluation** involves determining, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, effectiveness and impact of activities in light of programme objectives. Evaluation enables judgments and improvements of programme effectiveness and/or generation of knowledge to inform decisions about future programmes (IOM 2008: 12). Evaluations also assess (or facilitate the assessment of) the costs and benefits of different programmes as well as positive and negative impacts and, thus, can be helpful in future programming (Surtees 2006: 34). It is generally undertaken upon completion of the programme (an ex post evaluation) and looks at what the programme sets out to do, what the programme has accomplished and how it was accomplished. However, evaluations may be undertaken at different stages of a programme – for example, mid-term evaluations, which measure the programme mid-stream, allowing for adjustments and changes; ex-ante evaluation, which is performed before implementation of a development intervention to ensure appropriate programme design (DAC 2002:21-23).
- **Monitoring vs. evaluation:** Whereas monitoring focuses on the implementation of the programme (i.e. on the different activities undertaken), evaluations are more concerned with the consequences of programme activities and focus on the overall programme itself. In this way, monitoring functions on the activity level whereas evaluations function more on the programme level.

Box #2: What is M&E?¹⁰

Put simply, monitoring and evaluation is about considering the following criteria:

- *Relevance.* Are we doing the right thing?
- *Effectiveness.* Are we doing the right thing well?
- *Equality and non-discrimination.* Are we missing anyone?
- *Efficiency.* Are we getting the most results for our inputs?
- *Accountability.* How does the programme contribute to accountability to beneficiaries?
- *Sustainability and impact.* What would happen if we left? Is our work sustainable?
- *Scale and innovation.* What is the potential for reaching large numbers of the target population?
- *Learning.* How do we learn from our experience and improve our programming?

2.2 Balancing M&E with programme implementation

Although M&E regimes are essential in making informed decisions about anti-trafficking efforts, the application of M&E practices should not work at cross purposes with effective programme implementation. M&E work should enhance the conceptual and practical knowledge of re/integration organisations in ways that improve programmes and service delivery but M&E itself should not be allowed to supplant service delivery as the focus of a programme's efforts. As Lindgren (2001: 286) argues, using specific measures of performance, while essential for M&E work, implies an administrative culture that focuses on the achievement of results. While no one would argue against a focus on results, there is a risk that if measures diverge too much from the programme's inherent values and objectives (in this case, re/integration services for trafficking victims and successful re/integration of trafficked persons), the wrong activities may be emphasised.¹¹

Certainly within the TVRP there are clear "values", which are partially illustrated in how the re/integration model and approach is framed by KBF and its partners. The TVRP operates with the overall recognition that re/integration is a complicated and multi-layered process. It is not linear or direct; it can involve "failures" along the way; and it differs radically for each person and circumstance. Many victims face substantial difficulties in the re/integration process, which, in some cases, are a consequence of trafficking and, in other cases, are factors and characteristics which preceded trafficking and may have contributed to the persons' vulnerability (Surtees 2008a: 9). These "values" and perspectives are also manifested in how the term re/integration is defined within TVRP, as:

¹⁰ This list is adapted from Plan 2009c: 34-35.

¹¹ Performance measures, focused as they are on efficiency, carry values borrowed from the private sector, which are not easily integrated with public sector and non-profit cultures. Thus, market-and efficiency-oriented performance measures may be at odds with the values of the project which, in turn, may result in the risk for goal displacement (Lindgren 2001: 287). In re/integration work, performance measures which are too focused on efficiency and results may conflict with the values of programmes which focus less on how many services are offered and more on how services contribute to social and economic integration in the long term and in a meaningful, sustainable way.

the process of recovery and economic and social inclusion following a trafficking experience. This inclusion is multifaceted and must take place in social, cultural and economic arenas. It includes settlement in a stable and safe environment, access to a reasonable standard of living, mental and physical well-being, opportunities for personal, social and economic development and access to social and emotional support. It may involve returning to one's family and/or community of origin; it may also involve integration in a new community and even in a new country. A central aspect of successful re/integration is that of empowerment, supporting victims to develop skills toward independence and self sufficiency and to be actively involved in their recovery and re/integration.

There are a range of other values prioritised by the various organisations which work under the framework of KBF's TVRP. These values are, in some cases, ethical principles in terms of caring for and protecting trafficked persons and, in other cases, are standards of care which are needed to ensure the recovery and long term well-being of beneficiaries. These "values", listed in Box #3 below, are embedded in how TVRP funded programmes are designed and managed as well as how they are to be monitored and evaluated.

Box #3: TVRP programme values and principles

- *Informed consent*
- *Confidentiality*
- *Privacy*
- *Anonymity*
- *Safety and security*
- *Non-discrimination*
- *Empowerment*
- *"Do no harm"*
- *Beneficiary participation*
- *Rights-based approach*
- *Sensitivity*
- *Sustainability*
- *Gender sensitivity*
- *Accountability*
- *Evidence-based approach*
- *Age appropriateness*
- *Child protection and the "best interests of the child".*

3. MONITORING ANTI-TRAFFICKING RE/INTEGRATION

3.1 About monitoring

As noted above, “monitoring” is the continuous oversight of the implementation of programme activities, assessing progress, identifying operational difficulties and recommending actions. Monitoring helps agencies determine whether the programme is meeting its goals; update and adjust interventions and activities as needed; and ensure that funds are used responsibly. Accordingly, monitoring keeps track of daily programme activities on a continuous basis and serves as the basis for change as well as planning for other programmes. Monitoring is vital for all programmes, whether successful or facing problems. Without monitoring, successful programmes may proceed unreflectively even though the situation (and the needs of beneficiaries) may change and require different responses (Shapiro nd: 38). Monitoring programmes which face obstacles can help to refocus and guide the programme in more constructive and responsive ways.

Box #4: Why monitoring?

- *To determine whether the programme is meeting its goals;*
- *To keep track of daily programme activities on a continuous basis;*
- *To update and adjust interventions and activities as needed;*
- *To plan future or additional activities or interventions;*
- *To document the results achieved;*
- *To ensure that funds are used responsibly.*

There are essentially two types of monitoring: process monitoring and impact monitoring. Process monitoring documents actions and activities (the output), while impact monitoring documents the results of actions and activities (the outcome). Each matrix includes indicators for monitoring the actions and activities (process indicators) as well as for monitoring the outcome (impact indicators).

Two aspects of re/integration work need to be monitored, requiring two distinct and separate monitoring frameworks, two sets of indicators (process and impact indicators) and different individuals/institutions to undertake monitoring.¹²

1. **Monitoring individual re/integration plans.** In this instance it is the individual victim's re/integration success that is being monitored, beneficiary "success" being measured against set criteria (outcomes) which cumulatively constitute "successful re/integration". As such, the first matrix in the monitoring manual includes the following impact indicators:

- 1) safe and affordable accommodation,
- 2) legal status,
- 3) professional/employment opportunities,
- 4) education and training opportunities,
- 5) security and safety,
- 6) healthy social environment (including anti-discrimination and anti-marginalisation),
- 7) social well-being and positive interpersonal relations ,
- 8) economic situation,
- 9) physical well-being,
- 10) mental well-being,
- 11) access to services and opportunities,
- 12) motivation and commitment to re/integration process,
- 13) legal issues and court proceedings,
- 14) well-being of secondary beneficiaries – e.g. family and dependents of trafficking victims (VoTs), community members where re/integration takes place, etc.¹³

Monitoring individual re/integration plans is the responsibility of the individual case worker (and supervising case manager) within the relevant assistance programme. Case workers enter data regularly about the individual case and the progression of the re/integration process. It is on-going work over the course of the individual's assistance.

2. **Monitoring re/integration services.** The second matrix focuses on monitoring the range of services (outputs) offered by re/integration programmes. These services should be monitored in terms of criteria such as scope, nature, accessibility, efficiency, appropriateness, quality, etc. Monitoring is done from the perspective of beneficiaries as well as by anti-trafficking professionals – those who work directly on re/integration programmes as well as, wherever possible, professionals who provide different forms of assistance within the context of the overall re/integration work – for example, doctors and nurses who provide medical services or lawyers who provide legal advice and representation. The various services (outputs) include:

¹² These indicators are outlined in the KBF TVRP monitoring manual – *Monitoring anti-trafficking re/integration programmes. A manual.* One matrix has indicators for monitoring the individual re/integration plans of trafficked persons; the other matrix monitors the re/integration services themselves. The manual, currently in draft form, is being tested by re/integration organisations and will be finalised in the forthcoming phase of the TVRP programme, 2009-2011. See: *Surtees forthcoming.* That being said, monitoring tools such as this should, arguably, always be "works-in-progress" given that successful re/integration involves the efficient and ethical provision of services and assistance to beneficiaries whose needs are diverse, complex and often changing.

¹³ See Appendix 3 for a sample of the draft matrix.

- 1) accommodation,
- 2) legal assistance,
- 3) medical assistance,
- 4) psychological assistance,
- 5) education and professional/vocational training,
- 6) economic opportunities – e.g. job placement, micro/small business, income generating activities,
- 7) family mediation and counselling,
- 8) case monitoring and follow-up,
- 9) assistance to secondary beneficiaries – e.g. family and dependents of VoTs, community members where re/integration takes place, etc.¹⁴

Monitoring re/integration services is the responsibility of service providers. Such monitoring might be undertaken internally when an NGO is reviewing its own services or by the government which is responsible for monitoring the quality and availability of social services of NGOs and GOs.¹⁵ In some cases, NGOs may conduct independent monitoring of services (from other NGOs, GOs or IOs) in determining what services are appropriate and of a satisfactory nature, scope and quality for their beneficiaries.

3.2 How to monitor re/integration programmes

Setting up a monitoring process involves five main steps, as outlined below.¹⁶

Box #5: Monitoring re/integration programmes

Step 1: Identifying indicators

Step 2: Establishing systems to collect information about the indicators

Step 3: Collecting baseline information to measure subsequent changes in the indicators

Step 4: Analysing information according to the indicators

Step 5: Using information in day-to-day management

¹⁴ See Appendix 4 for a sample of the draft matrix.

¹⁵ There are other initiatives that many organisations undertake as part of their re/integration programming which are not reflected in this monitoring matrix – for example, advocacy work, capacity-building, networking with other organisations, sharing tools and learning, etc. Outcomes – which might include changes in policy and legislation, levels of awareness, etc. – also contribute to the impact of re/integration programmes and re/integration success. For example, just as the provision of shelters can positively impact re/integration options and success, so too can a policy change that results in government funding being allocated for shelters. However, considering this aspect of re/integration work requires a separate M&E matrix which has not been developed in the context of the TVRP at this stage.

¹⁶ These steps have been adapted from Shapiro nd: 7.

Step 1: Identifying indicators

Indicators are the quantitative and qualitative ways of measuring change which result from programme activities.¹⁷ These answer questions of efficiency, effectiveness and impact, they assess whether the programme achieves the desired results, they are objectively verifiable.¹⁸ Indicators make it possible to ask and answer questions such as: Who? How many? How often? How much? This, in turn, allows for meaningful monitoring and assessment of programme performance.

Both quantitative and qualitative indicators are needed to measure programme outcomes and outputs. There are limits to what can be learned from quantitative indicators; numbers don't always (or fully) show the real situation or the nature of programme "success" or "failure". They may give a sense of the scale of change or improvement but do not explain why this change or improvement took place. The number of beneficiaries who received medical care reveals only the quantity of services provided but not the quality of these services and how, cumulatively, these did (or did not) contribute to re/integration. Qualitative information provides essential complementary detail toward fuller understanding and assessment. Qualitative indicators can, for example, assess whether the medical personnel were sensitive and professional in their attitude to beneficiaries, followed established assessment and referral protocols, provided comprehensible information for the patient, etc. And while qualitative information may be subjective, standard measures can still be used.

Importantly, there is a difference between an impact indicator, which verifies if the desired outcome(re/ integration) was achieved and a process indicator which verifies that the process (output) has been realised in the programme. The matrices in the TVRP monitoring manual contain both impact and process indicators.

- **Impact indicators** verify if the desired outcome (re/integration) was achieved. Ideally verification would not be done at a single point of time but whether the impact indicators were maintained over time. Because the re/integration process must be considered according to the range of issues associated with recovery and social and economic inclusion, there are a set of impact indicators which cumulatively constitute "successful re/integration".
 - For matrix 1, "impact indicators" refer to the different aspects which are essential to foster and support victims' sustainable re/integration – for example, safe and affordable accommodation, legal status, professional/employment opportunities, education and training opportunities, security and safety, healthy social environment, etc.
 - For matrix 2, "impact indicators" are the services required for successful re/integration programmes which include accommodation, legal assistance, medical assistance, psychological assistance, education and professional/vocational training, economic opportunities, family mediation and counselling, etc.

17 Quantitative indicators might consider, for example, the level of effort and intensity of resource allocation, while qualitative indicators would consider the quality of implementation, adjustment to change in the environment, management style and stakeholder response (Huntington 2002: 29).

18 Different organisations propose different criteria for indicators. IOM (2008: 17) states that indicators need to be consistent with the SMART framework. That is, **specific** (in terms of scope, time and proposed result); **measurable** (able to measure the change resulting from the activity); **attainable** (that data about the indicators be reliable and accessible); **relevant** (able to measure the effect of the intervention); and **trackable** (from available data). USAID proposes to assess indicators according to the following seven criteria; that they are 1) direct, 2) objective, 3) adequate, 4) quantitative, if possible, 5) disaggregated, where appropriate, 6) practical and reliable (USAID 1996). Another USAID document – a compendium on M&E of VAW programmes – suggests that indicators should be valid, specific, reliable comparable, non-directional, precise, feasible and programmatically relevant (Bloom 2008: 24).

Measuring whether an impact indicator was realised involves considering the cumulative impact of the relevant process indicators. That being said, realising an impact indicator – for example, mental well-being – it is not only about counting the different services – for example, that a beneficiary has attended 16 therapy sessions. It is about the end result, the impact of these sessions (and various other services) on the individual.

- **Process indicators** verify that the process was realised – that is, how it was done. Process indicators for re/integration programmes might include: Were inputs – like services (e.g. medical care, psychological assistance) or materials (e.g. humanitarian assistance, housing subsidies) – properly allocated and distributed? Were guidelines, policies and procedures followed? Did inputs – whether services or materials – reach the target beneficiaries? For each of the impact indicators, the matrix contains a number of process indicators. For example, in matrix 1, “professional and employment opportunities” is one impact indicator for which there are the following (qualitative and quantitative) process indicators:
 - # of total beneficiaries who have received information and professional counselling about employment opportunities;
 - # of total beneficiaries have found employment (and retained the position for more than six months) and/or # of total beneficiaries have found a second employment;
 - # of total beneficiaries whose employment offers sufficient salary and benefit to support an independent life (including care of any dependents);
 - # of total beneficiaries whose employment offers a safe and satisfactory work environment and reasonable work conditions.

Indicators should capture the perspective and assessment of both beneficiaries and service providers, both those working directly in the re/integration programme and those providing different types of re/integration services. They should also reflect the different models of assistance and services provided as well as different profiles of beneficiaries and different trafficking experiences. For example, there may be substantial differences in the process indicators needed for:

- **Persons assisted within residential and non-residential programmes.** E.g. assessing safety and security issues in a shelter programme, which typically has security protocols, will be different than for a beneficiary who lives with their family and only attends day activities or off-site services.
- **Children vs. adult; and children at different ages and stages of development.** E.g. children may require the appointment of a legal guardian; referral to specialists like child psychologists, etc. At the same time, some services for adults may be more appropriate for older children (e.g. vocational training and job placement) than service for younger children (e.g. educational reinsertion).
- **Persons who have suffered different forms of exploitation.** E.g. Victims of labour may require medical services like physiotherapy to address physical violence or occupational injuries, whereas victims of sexual exploitation may require more extensive sexual, reproductive and maternal health services.
- **Foreign and national VoTs.** E.g. foreign nationals will require legal assistance for issues such as processing identity document but also in the provision of temporary or permanent residence options; educational/training needs will need to include not only formal and professional training but also language training, cultural orientation and life skills training tailored to how to adapt to life in a new country.

The choice of indicators will also be informed by the scope and nature of individual re/integration programmes as well as the national and local contexts in which they operate. Where an organisation works primarily on the crisis and/or transition phase and then refers beneficiaries to partners in other organisations/regions for the re/integration period, it may not be possible to collect full information about beneficiaries at all three stages. Similarly, re/integration organisations which access a range of state services – e.g. medical care, legal aid, etc. – may not have access to information about these aspects of the re/integration plan or some of the individual services. The choice of indicators will also be informed by ethical and legal consideration. That is, indicators which may lead to ethical and legal breaches – for example in terms of privacy, confidentiality or safety – must be carefully considered and, where needed, excluded.

Step 2: Establishing systems to collect information about the indicators

It is important to determine how relevant information is collected (by whom and in what ways) as well as how often it is to be collected and analysed in the monitoring process. Thought should also be given, on an on-going basis, to the actual use of all data collected – that is, information that cannot be analysed and used should not be collected. Where data is collected and used, its collection and storage must be in conformity with legal and ethical obligations. Methods for gathering this information on an on-going basis must be built into action planning and programme development to ensure that the time and resources are sufficiently anticipated.

For each indicator, it is important to have a means of verification – that is, external and objective sources of information that measure each proposed indicator and whether they have realised their objective. For example, to verify the number of beneficiaries who are reinserted into the mainstream school system, means of verification might include: registration forms, student report cards, school attendance lists, case worker notes and interviews with individual students/beneficiaries. To document how many beneficiaries consider shelter accommodation to be satisfactory, the means of verification might include: an interview with the beneficiary, an evaluation form upon exit of the shelter, group discussions with shelter residents (past and/or present), case manager's notes, etc. In some cases, it may be the combination of information sources rather than one individual source which is used as verification.

There are many different possible sources of information, depending on the indicator. This information might come from the beneficiary (for example, a questionnaire, an interview, etc.) or from the organisation's staff (for example, case manager files, beneficiary progress reports, etc.) or from other professionals assisting in the re/integration process (for example, a state social worker, a job counsellor or a doctor). In some cases, information may also come from the beneficiary's social environment – for example, from friends, family or community. However, contact with the beneficiary's social environment should only take place with his/her informed consent and where it does not pose risks for the beneficiaries.¹⁹ Moreover, service providers must be aware of what information the beneficiary has (and has not) divulged within their social environment in order that their interactions do not breach ethical principles such as confidentiality, privacy, anonymity, safety/security, "do no harm", informed consent, participation, sensitivity and non-discrimination.

¹⁹ While information from family and community may be helpful when monitoring the re/integration process and service provision, it may not always be appropriate or indeed ethical or safe. In many situations, trafficked persons have not divulged their trafficking experience to their family and/or community and, even where their experience is known or assumed, the full extent of their exploitation may not be known. Thus, involving families and communities in evaluations may "out" victims (or aspects of their experience) which, in turn, may result in discrimination and stigma (Brunovskis & Surtees 2010). Where services are presented more generically – for vulnerable persons – there may be ways to involve the family but this will require vigilance so as not to reveal private information about victims in the process.

Box #6: What information?

Possible ways to collect information in the context of re/integration programmes might include:

- *Case studies;*
- *Recorded observation;*
- *Beneficiary and staff diaries (with their informed consent);*
- *Case files and case workers notes (with their informed consent);*
- *Recording important incidents;*
- *Questionnaires, evaluations and feedback forms for staff and/or beneficiaries;*
- *Multi-disciplinary meetings amongst assistance/re/integration professionals;*
- *Reports and feedback from other service professionals involved in re/integration;*
- *Interviews or focus group discussions with staff and/or beneficiaries;*
- *Regular weekly meetings of all programme staff.*

While there are many types and sources of information which might verify an indicator, in practice, it is not always possible to access and use these in monitoring work. In some cases, this is a function of time and resources – for example, an NGO does not have the staff time or financial resources to contact all of the different professionals providing services to the trafficked person. There may also be legal and ethical considerations – for example, restrictions on sharing confidential information like medical files and psychological assessments. And there may also be constraints linked to cooperation and coordination between different organisations – for example, when state social workers are not legally permitted to share case information or when service providers are not willing to share information with others. As such, in some cases, indicators (even very good indicators) may not be feasible. Indicators are only feasible when the organisation has (legal and ethical) access to the information needed to verify the indicator.

Because monitoring is essentially one aspect of programme oversight, it is undertaken during the course of the programme and by programme staff. However, determining which programme staff should be involved in this process is important. Some organisations have a separate unit tasked specifically with monitoring functions. Such an approach has the advantage of separating the task of monitoring from implementation. At the same time, many organisations do not have sufficient resources for a separate unit, which means that service providers are commonly involved in monitoring activities.

While the assisting organisation is responsible for monitoring, other professionals engaged in the re/integration process potentially have a role to play as sources of information about both individual cases and re/integration services – for example, law enforcement, social workers, psychologist, medical workers and so on. For example, a doctor or hospital administrator might be involved in monitoring the implementation of assessment tools, evaluating the quality and sufficiency of medical services or assessing the sensitivity of medical professionals to trafficked persons and their needs. At the same time, there may be limits to what these organisations can

share – from a legal or ethical perspective and also given logistics issues involved in collecting a lot of case information. Involving other service providers in the monitoring of re/integration programme can bring a new angle or perspective and valuable insights based on their specific expertise of area of work. It can also facilitate disclosure – for example, by beneficiaries who have a relationship of trust with this professional or who may be reluctant to criticise the re/integration organisation with whom they have regular contact and on whom they rely for services. How information might be shared between the various service providers working on re/integration will likely need to be negotiated on a case-by-case basis. Organising this process to meet monitoring needs may involve, for example, multidisciplinary work meetings and/or standard procedures for information exchange between relevant professionals. However this is done, careful attention is needed to the legal issues associated with data protection and ethical principles such as confidentiality, privacy, safety and security, etc.

As important as how data is collected is how systems are maintained. Data protection and security must be built into all monitoring systems in accordance with the national legal framework. Re/integration organisations must ensure that principles such as confidentiality, safety/security, informed consent and privacy are not violated, even where this impedes monitoring efforts. For example, while monitoring and tracking individual cases over time provides information about what services are (and are not) useful to beneficiaries, it is not always possible to keep in touch with beneficiaries in the long term – sometimes for logistical reasons (for example, change of address, no telephone) and sometimes because beneficiaries do not wish to continue this contact. Lack of access to longitudinal information serves as a constraint in the monitoring process and yet it remains paramount that monitoring be done only with the beneficiary's full knowledge and consent. Case files should be managed with the requisite level of ethical rigour to ensure that principles like confidentiality or privacy are not compromised. Many organisations have faced pressure to share case files with state authorities, which they have resisted out of concern for confidentiality and privacy of beneficiaries. One organisation working under the TVRP reported a situation in which it was legally obliged by the state social services to share case files of their child beneficiaries. However, the staff subsequently learned that these case files had not been securely and confidentially filed and stored but rather had been left in boxes in the corridors, accessible to anyone who wished to access them.

Step 3: Collecting baseline information to measure indicators

Monitoring also involves the collection of baseline data – that is, information about the situation before the programme began – against which indicators can be considered. Baseline data provides a reference point for assessing change and understanding progress (or lack of progress) toward achieving programme objectives. The more specific and exact the baseline is, the easier it is to measure change.

- ***Baseline for individual re/integration:*** In monitoring re/integration plans for individual victims (as outlined in matrix 1, see appendix 3), this baseline information would essentially be the individual's situation at the time of entry into the programme. This might involve utilising a standard in-take form/interview which collects information like demographic data (e.g. age, nationality, place of permanent residence, marital status, profession, etc); individual history (e.g. major life events, family history, relationships, disabilities, health status); and individual needs (e.g. beneficiary's self-stated problems, case manager assessments).
- ***Baseline for re/integration services:*** Baseline data for re/integration services (as outlined in matrix 2, see appendix 4) would involve assessing these services before the re/integration programme began – for example, in terms of scope, nature, quality, accessibility, appropriateness and efficiency. This might

involve mapping what services exist and how many beneficiaries have been served; it might equally involve sampling past beneficiaries to gauge their satisfaction with said services and sampling professionals to assess adherence with national standards.

If baseline data is not collected before the programme starts, there are some (albeit imperfect) means of collecting information which could be used as an alternative. One option is to reconstruct the baseline – for example, by interviewing persons involved in the programme, consulting case files and reviewing reports (Shapiro nd: 28-9). In the case of re/integration work, this might involve retroactively constructing beneficiary case files or completing beneficiary in-take forms to, as accurately as possible, reflect their situation when they entered the programme. As much as possible, this should be done with staff and beneficiaries. This type of “triangulation” can be helpful in working toward the most accurate information.

Step 4: Analysing information according to the indicators

Organisations must be able to regularly and effectively analyse the information collected. Steps in the analysis process might include:

1. the development of a structure for analysis based on relevant issues and themes;
2. the organisation of data by issues and themes;
3. identifying trends, patterns and interpretations; and
4. writing up findings, conclusions and recommendations (Shapiro nd: 34).

Analysis is the process of turning this detailed (and often highly individual) information into an understanding of trends and patterns and behaviours and, finally, the transformation of that understanding into insights for real-world improvements. Analysis of what data “mean” is an important part of providing coherence to the effort. Keeping one eye on the ultimate need to transform the information into “action” helps to keep the entire endeavour on track, making it less likely that organisations collect data just for the sake of collecting bits of information.

As such, the analytical capacity and efforts of re/integration programmes is paramount. Different data can have potentially different meaning depending on how it is read and understood. For example, on one level, finding employment is an important step toward re/integration. However, the meaning and relevance of finding employment will differ from case to case and depend upon the stage of re/integration. That is, the focus on employment in the initial stages may serve a therapeutic rather than practical/economic function. Therefore, it may not in fact be a “failure” when the beneficiary does not keep this particular job in the long term. Moreover, there are some jobs which are not good (e.g. those with bad pay, poor work conditions) and the decision to leave a job may, in fact, reflect beneficiary empowerment and the availability of other/better options. There may also be other factors that come into play in terms of how, when and why beneficiaries seek employment. In some programmes, trafficked men seem more likely to seek and find employment very early in their assistance due, at least in part, to social pressure for men to work to provide for their families. Thus, while the indicators are valuable in providing the core data, it takes analytical skill to capture the complexity of and variation in meaning.

Patterns of satisfaction (and dissatisfaction) amongst beneficiaries must also be analysed within the context of their stage of re/integration and their individual psychological state. For example, inputs from beneficiaries may be clearer in the transition or re/integration phases when trauma has been addressed and the individual

is more stable and able to analyse their situation. Similarly, some beneficiaries have personal characteristics which inform the inputs provided – for example, a beneficiary who has cleanliness phobias would not be an objective source for assessing the cleanliness of a shelter facility and any such comments would need to be weighed alongside those of other beneficiaries as well as the extent to which the shelter adheres to national standards.

Also, what constitutes “success” will differ. There are some indicators which are easier to monitor and will have higher success rates – for example, all victims will have acquired legal status during the re/integration process, most likely in the crisis or transition phase. However, other indicators show gaps in the legal system – for example, the lack of compensation to trafficking victims. Thus, whereas a 30 per cent success rate for acquiring documents would be unacceptably low and constitute a “failure”, 30 per cent success in attaining compensation would constitute a substantial improvement over the current situation where few or no victims receive compensation.

Data collected can be analysed to allow learning not only about beneficiaries being assisted but also those who are not assisted – for example, if an organisation does not assist foreign victims, this may be for different reasons (e.g. because they do not have access to them, because of the legal framework, etc.); if contact breaks with a beneficiary after twelve months there may be different reasons for this (e.g. she is re-trafficked, she is satisfied with the services, she is unhappy with the programme, etc.).

Moreover, while analysis focuses on the system of data set up for the monitoring process, other (external) variables may come into play and not all “outcomes” can be read directly. Greater contextual information – such as personal and socio-economic factors which impact re/integration– must be taken into account in monitoring. For example, if fewer beneficiaries are finding and retaining work, this may be a function of the re/integration programme. However, it might also be linked to an economic crisis in the community or country, unwillingness of state employment agencies to assist trafficked persons, etc. While ideally such considerations would be identified during the design of the programme and targets set accordingly, there may be factors which come into play over the course of programmes – for example, legislative change like the implementation of temporary resident permits or compensation for trafficking victims.

It is also important to consider the role of the broader anti-trafficking framework and how these policies and interventions may inform re/integration beyond the work of individual organisations. For example, the increased number of beneficiaries accessing re/integration services may be the result of greater outreach on the part of programme staff. However, it could equally be the result of increased identification and referral efforts on the part of anti-trafficking authorities like law enforcement.

Moreover, re/integration programmes may have unintended (and even negative) consequences which should be identified and analysed in order to move toward improvements. For example, re/integration assistance may create dependency amongst beneficiaries in ways which undermine autonomy and long term re/integration. Service providers are regularly grappling with the need to balance the provision of sufficient support with the risk of beneficiaries becoming dependent on staff of services.²⁰ Monitoring allows service providers to identify instances where beneficiaries manifest such behaviours and who this can be addressed. Identifying negative

²⁰ For a discussion of the tension between building autonomy and addressing dependency in re/integration, please see Surtees 2008b: 33-36.

impacts and/or unintended consequence is vital for the monitoring (and adjustment) process – to determine programme effectiveness and how best to provide services to trafficking victims.²¹

Finally, analysing monitoring data allows us to identify new issues or patterns that may arise during the implementation of the programme but which were not anticipated in the programme design. These new issues or trends may have substantial impact on the programme and its implementation. For example, if more trafficked men are identified, re/integration programmes may need to consider how they can provide appropriate (and different) services as well as track over time the extent to which services do (and do not) meet the needs of trafficked men (and men trafficked for different forms of exploitation). Equally, the identification of more trafficked children necessitates important shifts and changes in re/integration efforts.

Step 5: Using information in day-to-day management

Monitoring results offer organisations guidance in terms of any needed changes and how to capitalise on successes. It has little value if organisations do not act on the findings; monitoring should lead to action and change. Re/integration organisations should consider how best to mobilise monitoring information – for example, by establishing target dates for making required programme adjustments. Management must ensure that monitoring results feed into on-going programme implementation.

Of course, acting on the results of monitoring is not uncomplicated. Programmes may face resistance to change from different corners – from the organisation and its staff, from programme beneficiaries, from government agencies/partners and/or from donors. As such, part of this final step is to help stakeholders to accept the monitoring results and the value in programmatic adjustment (Shapiro nd: 40).

Staff may resist monitoring – for example, because they are worried about the additional burden of work, complicated procedures, too much bureaucracy and red tape – but organisations have typically found staff more responsive to this approach when they have seen the (positive) results of this process, many of which serve to improve their work and programme. Often changes are not resisted because they are solutions to problems that staff and beneficiaries have identified in their everyday work and interactions. Organisations described how major changes have been a direct result of monitoring work – for example, the introduction of a regular manager’s staff meeting to review and discuss cases; procedures for multi-disciplinary work; protocols for financial procedures; standard operation procedures for case management; and so on – changes which were welcomed by staff because they responded to their needs. Where there has been resistance – for example, in cases where beneficiaries find some programme rules or procedures constraining – organisations have worked to make the rules/procedures understood and valued. This has, in some cases, involved on-going discussion between staff and beneficiaries about rules, rights and responsibilities as well as about any changes needed to better suit the needs of beneficiaries.

²¹ While it is worthwhile identifying negative impacts in the monitoring process, this issue is more a part of evaluation work than monitoring, except at the level of individual case management, when it is important that negative impacts be noticed (and addressed) early on.

3.3 Some issues and considerations in monitoring re/integration programmes

Beyond the points raised above, there are also some overarching issues and considerations which should be borne in mind when developing a monitoring plan. These include those flagged in Box #7 and discussed in the subsequent pages.

Box #7: Considerations in monitoring re/integration programmes

- *Different organisations have different monitoring approaches;*
- *Availability of monitoring information;*
- *Ethical and legal considerations in monitoring work;*
- *Risk of bureaucratisation and formalisation;*
- *Monitoring "difficult" cases;*
- *The costs of monitoring work.*

- ***Different organisations; different monitoring approaches***

There is a wide range of information which could be collected in the monitoring process and a large number of indicators which could be used. However, not all information will be equally relevant and valuable for all organisations. Each organisation must assess what information is appropriate, relevant and possible based on the scope and nature of their programmes as well as the national and local contexts in which they work. For example, organisations working primarily on crisis and/or transition will not have access to information about the re/integration phase. Similarly, re/integration organisations which access services from other NGOs and GOs (e.g. medical care, legal aid, etc.) may not have access to information about these services because of confidentiality issues. For organisations which assist large numbers of victims and/or have few staff members, it will be important to consider how to ensure adequate monitoring while not overburdening staff, which might involve using only a limited number of indicators.

- ***Availability of monitoring information***

Not all information which might be used to monitor re/integration work is available in practice. This may be a function of the legal/administrative framework of a country (e.g. laws on data protection, regulations on information sharing, confidentiality of medical records), ethical consideration (e.g. principles of confidentiality and consent), lack of time and resources (e.g. to collect data from all service providers involved in each case), and cooperation and coordination between organisations (e.g. between state and NGOs, between NGOs). Thus, part of setting up monitoring systems is determining what information is (and is not) available. This may involve testing indicators and then adjusting and changing these over time based on the availability of relevant information.

- **Ethical principles and legal considerations**

Re/integration organisations must ensure that ethical principles (e.g. confidentiality, privacy, “do no harm”, safety/security, informed consent, etc.) are not violated, even where this impedes monitoring efforts. The principles stressed within the TVRP are listed in Box #8. Special care must be taken in the case of children to ensure that they are afforded all of the protections that their age and experience requires.

Box #8: Ethical and legal principles in monitoring work

- *Informed consent*
- *Confidentiality*
- *Anonymity*
- *Privacy*
- *“Do no harm”*
- *Non-discrimination*
- *Safety and security*
- *Sensitivity*
- *Beneficiary participation*
- *Data protection (during collection, retention, storage and use/analysis)*
- *Child protection and the “best interests of the child”*

In many cases, such principles are mandated by national legislation, making their safeguarding not only an issue of ethics but one of legal requirement. For example, there is a range of legal issues associated with the collection, transfer and sharing of sensitive data, like that which may be collected in the context of monitoring.²² In some cases, monitoring may be governed by multiple legal and ethical codes – for example, those of the country of the organisation managing the programme, the country where the programme is being implemented (if different from the former) and/or the country funding the programme (Schenke & Williamson 2005: 7, 66-69).²³

22 Most countries in SEE have legislation on data protection which with all monitoring efforts should be in conformity. See Surtees 2007a: 42. In the absence of national legislation, it is recommended that countries refer to the principles and the letter of the EC Directive on Data Protection (Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data. For a discussion of the legal and ethical issues associated with collecting data about trafficked persons, please see Surtees 2007a: 33-42 and Surtees 2009: 52-68.

23 While programme monitoring may not be legally bound by the strict requirements of formal ethical review that apply to research, programme managers are still responsible for ensuring that information gathering activities are carried out ethically. Programme managers should strive to uphold the same high standards of formal ethical supervision that apply to research activities (Schenke & Williamson 2005: 7, 66-69), especially when working with vulnerable groups like trafficked persons.

Box #9: Ensuring ethical principles

Ways in which ethical principles are safeguarded in the monitoring process include:

- Ensuring the confidentiality of case files within the organisation;
- Including beneficiaries in the monitoring process at all stages;
- Gaining beneficiaries' informed consent when case file information is shared with other professionals (within or between organisations);
- Consider any potential risks to safety or security which may be caused by monitoring work (e.g. interviewing beneficiaries in their communities, discussing the case with family members, etc);
- Educate programme and monitoring staff in child participation;
- Consider the best interests of the child in all stages of monitoring;
- Anticipate and avoid any monitoring activities which may cause harm to beneficiaries;
- Feeding back information and results to persons involved in monitoring activities – whether beneficiaries or professionals – in an appropriate and accessible format.

- **Risk of bureaucratisation and formalisation**

While no one would argue against systems of accountability, it is important that such systems do not translate into an excessive focus on monitoring, at the expense of service delivery. There is a risk of bureaucratisation and formalisation which comes with the development of monitoring systems. There are also problems when re/integration organisations are obliged (e.g. by donors or government agencies) to implement a complex and time consuming monitoring system to legitimise their re/integration efforts, without being provided with requisite resources or where programmes are funded by multiple donors which requires multiple reporting systems. Where monitoring translates into an administrative culture that focuses primarily on documenting "results", programmes may become too bureaucratic which, in turn, may mean that the wrong activities are being emphasised. For example, where staff are required to spend a great deal of time documenting indicators, they may have insufficient time to spend working with beneficiaries (such as counselling, providing life skills, etc.) or in working toward improvements in the assistance framework in the country (such as advocating for services or policy change, developing standards, etc.). Moreover, staff may be concerned that an "excessive" emphasis on monitoring will not only involve more work but also change the atmosphere of the programme and miss the complexity and richness of the re/integration process which cannot be easily quantified (Admira 2005: 6).

- **Monitoring "difficult" cases**

Re/integration organisations often assist in very complex and "difficult" cases. Not only is the re/integration process itself a complicated terrain but many beneficiaries face personal circumstances which further complicate re/integration – for example, serious and/or chronic medical conditions, mental health problems, the lack of family support, substance abuse, having many dependents, past experiences of violence, coming

from a socially marginalised group and so on.²⁴ “Successful re/integration” in such cases often requires more services, resources and staff time than more “typical” cases. This raises questions about whether assistance to “difficult” cases should be monitored differently than for “typical” cases; “success” or “failure” in such cases may need different measures and indications. For example, one impact indicator of individual re/integration is “physical well-being” and one of the associated process indicators is the “number of beneficiaries who are in an improved physical condition” (see matrix 1). However, realising this physical well-being in a “typical case” – for example, someone who requires treatment of sexually transmitted infections (STIs) – is less intensive and requires less medical intervention than when working with a “difficult” case – for example, a beneficiary who requires drug detoxification and treatment for Hepatitis C and STIs. In addition, some indicators may be more or less relevant in the context of difficult cases. Finding appropriate employment for a beneficiary with serious mental health issues is extremely difficult and, thus, indicators about job retention become less relevant than, for example, issues of stigma and discrimination within the social environment.

- ***The costs of monitoring work***

Resources (both human and financial) are needed to ensure that adequate investment is made in tracking programme developments and, similarly, making any requisite changes. Monitoring efforts must be appropriate to the amount of resources expended on evaluation vis a vis the programme and its intended impact. The use of resources for extensive monitoring may mean that, in practical terms, there are fewer resources available for the actual programme implementation – for example, to provide services, employ staff and/or train staff and partners. At the same time, monitoring cannot simply be dismissed as “too expensive”, “too time consuming” or “too complicated”. It is not possible to know if the programme is effective and appropriate without sufficient attention to monitoring. In establishing monitoring mechanisms, then, organisations need to find a balance between these two features. That is, what constitutes the optimum balance between programme costs and monitoring expenditure? Equally relevant is a consideration of whether service providers should be implementing programmes which they do not have the resources to monitor.

²⁴ For further discussion of these “difficult” cases, please see: Surtees, R. (2008) *Re/integration of trafficked persons: handling “difficult” cases*. Brussels: King Baudouin Foundation (KBF) & Washington: NEXUS Institute.

4. EVALUATING ANTI-TRAFFICKING RE/INTEGRATION PROGRAMMES

4.1 About evaluations

Evaluations assess programme impact, effectiveness and efficiency. They test to what extent the expected results were achieved and what these results mean to those involved in or affected by the programme, including to what extent results are attributable to the programme (Rachel 2006: 6; Shapiro nd: 7). Evaluations also assess the positive and negative impacts of a programme including where there have been unintended consequences (Surtees 2006: 34). The ultimate intention is to improve a programme's current operations by identifying programme's strengths and achievements as well as toward planning more effective future programmes and interventions (IOM 2008: 12). The results can also be helpful feedback to staff – toward improving skills and knowledge and in building professional confidence (Admira 2005: 6). In addition, evaluations are valuable and relevant at a broader level in that they provide an analysis of programme performance and conclusions, which, in turn, can be helpful in the design and implementation of future programmes (IOM 2008). Evaluations must be considered as part of programme design – to define the programme's proposed impact and how this impact will be measured including plans for collecting relevant information.

Whereas monitoring focuses on the implementation of the programme (i.e. on the different activities undertaken), evaluations are more concerned with the consequences of programme activities and focuses on the overall programme itself. That is, evaluations look at the cumulative effect and results of programme activities and individual cases and, from this, draw conclusions about whether the organisation and programme is working well.

Box #10: Why evaluations?

- *To assess programme impact, effectiveness and efficiency;*
- *To test to what extent the expected results were achieved;*
- *To consider what programme results mean to those involved in the programme;*
- *To determine to what extent programme results are attributable to the programme;*
- *To improve a programme's current operations;*
- *To test underlying assumptions of a programme;*
- *To assess the costs and benefits of a programme;*
- *To identify positive and negative results of programming;*
- *To plan more effective future programmes and interventions;*
- *To feedback to staff and beneficiaries about the programme successes (and failures).*

Focusing on programme objectives assumes that they have been crafted ambitiously and accurately enough to address the problem of human trafficking in a meaningful way. Therefore, evaluations must also consider the underlying assumptions within the programme and whether these hold true. For example, a programme may look to see if beneficiaries have remained in their family or community of origin twelve months after return. But if a beneficiary of a reintegration programme migrates abroad again after a few months, is this necessarily a “failure” of reintegration work? Could it not be that they the assistance they received – e.g. vocational training, education, life skills, rights training – has equipped them with the skills to migrate safely and realise their professional and economic aspirations? Part of an evaluation, then, is to consider and test where the assumptions underpinning programme are valid and what adjustments may be needed.

Beyond evaluating programme objectives, evaluations play a very important role in determining whether programme results/outcomes mesh with the overall anti-trafficking objectives in a larger sense. It is vitally important to consider how a programme fits into the bigger picture of what a country, for example, needs to accomplish in its anti-trafficking work.

There are different types of evaluation:²⁵

- **Process evaluations** measure the quality and integrity of the programme by demonstrating whether the programme has been implemented as planned. Process evaluations focus on programme implementation (an organisation’s policy instruments, service delivery mechanisms, management practices, and the linkages among these), assessing “the how” (how the programme achieved its results) rather than desired results or outcomes. Information from a process evaluation can be used to make mid-course corrections to improve a programme’s effectiveness. Process evaluations must occur at frequent enough intervals to allow changes to be made, but after a sufficiently long period to demonstrate what is needed. Process evaluations are an important tool for improving service delivery and gauging programme effectiveness by assessing whether activities conform to programme design.
- **Outcome evaluations** measure whether or not the desired change or result has been attained. They focus on demonstrating whether or not programme objectives have been reached. Data used for this type of evaluation usually comes through a special study and are collected periodically. The goal of an outcome evaluation is to show that the changes observed in the target population occurred as a result of the programme. Outcome evaluations are used to assess changes in knowledge, behaviour, skills, community norms and utilisation of services. In order to measure change, baseline data from the target population is needed to compare with data collected after the programme took place, making planning vital in evaluation design.
- **Impact evaluations** assess the net effect of a programme by comparing programme outcomes with an estimate of what would have happened without the programme. That is, it shows how much of the change can be attributed to the programme. It is also through impact evaluations that it is possible to measure any other changes which may be due to the programmes, including those which were planned and unplanned, positive and negative. Impact evaluations require very specific study designs to measure the extent of the observed change in the desired outcome that can be attributed to the programme. These evaluations often require the technical assistance of someone who specialises in their design and analyses.

²⁵ Definitions from Bloom 2008 and GAO 2007.

In the context of re/integration work, a process evaluation would measure the implementation of the programme (e.g. what services have been provided and to whom); an outcome evaluation would measure the provision of services and the success of individual re/integration cases; and an impact evaluation would measure the effect of the programme on overall policies and programmes of re/integration within the given context.

In spite of the differences, these three types of evaluation are not necessarily separate approaches. Process, outcomes and impact are interrelated and all are vital in understanding how to evaluate and assess re/integration work.²⁶

Evaluations can be undertaken in two ways; both internally within the programme and externally by evaluation experts.²⁷

- **Internal evaluations.** This is an internal activity, carried out by those directly concerned with the design, appraisal, approval, implementation or supervision of the programme. There are different types of internal evaluations including self evaluation (when the organisation assesses its own work as a way of learning and improving practice) and participatory evaluation (which typically involves programme staff and beneficiaries working together on the evaluation).
- **External evaluations.** External evaluations are undertaken by external experts who are not involved in programme implementation.²⁸ Decisions about the use of an external evaluator will likely depend on who is the audience for the evaluation. An external evaluation may have more authority in that it is independent and arguably more objective, which may be important to donors or governments. There is also the advantage that comes when a new or different perspective is brought in to consider the strengths and weaknesses of a programme. An external evaluation can be particularly helpful when the process of “evaluation” is associated with terms of “success” and “failure”, which may be threatening for staff and beneficiaries who may be concerned about potential negative consequences for the programme/organisation if predefined objectives are not achieved.

Finally, it merits mentioning that evaluations can be undertaken at different stages of the programme – for example, ex-ante evaluation is performed before implementation of a development intervention to ensure appropriate programme design; mid-term evaluations measure the programme mid-stream, allowing for adjustments and changes; ex-post evaluations assess the intervention after it has been completed etc (DAC 2002: 21-23). To date, there have been very few ex-ante evaluations which, to some extent, constitutes a significant gap in AT programming and policy. A part of all programme planning should be a determination of what types of evaluations are needed, when they should be done and by whom.

26 Most anti-trafficking evaluations to date have focused on process rather than impact (GAO 2007: 22-23).

27 For a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of internal and external evaluations, please see Shapiro nd: 9.

28 A variation on this approach might be a peer review system of evaluation where similar organisations evaluate each other's services, the advantages being that they already have the expert knowledge in the area, are (theoretically) impartial and, in the process, can gain experience in M&E techniques which could help them monitoring their own work. Such an approach, however, would not work in contexts where agencies are competing with one another for funds, have different (and sometimes diametrically opposed) approaches, do not have adequate evaluation skills and/or do not have a productive/constructive professional relationship.

4.2 How to evaluate re/integration programmes

Undertaking a programme evaluation involves five main steps and activities, discussed below.²⁹ To a large extent, these five steps are similar in nature to the steps in the monitoring process which have been described in detail in section 3.2: *How to monitor re/integration programmes*. However, how each step is undertaken, by whom and of what is, at least in part, a function of the evaluation approach itself – whether internal or external; whether a process, outcome or impact evaluation; and whether ex-ante, mid-term or post-ante.

Box #11: Evaluating re/integration programmes

Step 1: Defining evaluation goals and related questions;

Step 2: Setting criteria to assess efficiency and effectiveness;

Step 3: Designing and implementing the evaluation procedure and data collection schedule;

Step 4: Analyzing the data;

Step 5: Reporting and using evaluation results.

Step 1: Defining evaluation goals and related questions

This step involves identifying which questions need to be explored and answered in the context of re/integration programmes. Programme evaluations should answer key questions such as:

- Is the programme needed?
- Is the programme doing what it promised it would do?
- How can the programme be adjusted to be more effective?
- Did the programme achieve its objectives?
- What effect/impact did the programme have on the beneficiaries?

An evaluation of re/integration work might be framed around questions such as those presented in Box #12.

²⁹ These steps have been adapted from *Admira 2005: 7*.

Box #12: Some questions to ask in evaluating anti-trafficking re/integration?

- *Is there a need for re/integration services in the area where the programme works?*
- *Is the programme working on re/integration and contributing to the re/integration of trafficked persons?*
- *Did the programme provide services to the appropriate beneficiaries?*
- *Did the programme provide appropriate re/integration services to these beneficiaries?*
- *Have re/integration services been available, appropriate and of a high standard?*
- *What are (and are not) appropriate services for beneficiaries at the three stages of re/integration?*
- *What skills and capacities are needed by professionals to offer these re/integration services?*
- *Have beneficiaries successfully re/integrated?*
- *Was re/integration success sustained over time? If yes, how? If no, what were the reasons?*
- *What changes are needed to more effectively and efficiently support the re/integration of trafficked persons and/or support the development of re/integration services?*

To evaluate a programme, a clear definition and framework of what constitutes “successful re/integration” is essential, including results considered across an appropriate timeframe. It is not sufficient that trafficked persons have received re/integration assistance; they must also have been successfully re/integrated as a result of these services and assistance.

In the context of the TVRP, “successful re/integration” is realised when the impact indicators in matrix 1 are realised. These impact indicators” refer to the different aspects which are essential to foster and support victims’ sustainable re/integration – for example, when the individual has access to safe and affordable accommodation, when his/her legal status has been established/clarified, when s/he has access to sustainable professional/employment opportunities, when s/he has received and mobilised education and training opportunities, when s/he is secure and safe in the long term, when his/her social environment is healthy, etc. This success will differ from case to case and will be realised at different stages of their post-trafficking lives.

Step 2: Setting criteria to assess efficiency and effectiveness

This step is similar in many ways to the identification of indicators outlined in monitoring work. Criteria should be both qualitative and quantitative in nature and capture the perspective of both beneficiaries and service providers. The choice of criteria will be impacted by what type of evaluation is being conducted (e.g. impact, outcome or process), who is conducting the evaluation (e.g. external or internal), when it is being conducted (e.g. ex-ante, mid-term, post-ante), the scope and nature of the specific re/integration programme being evaluated (whether residential or non-residential, assisting children or adults, etc.) and the national and local contexts in which programmes operate.

Step 3: Designing and implementing the evaluation procedure and data collection

This step involves identifying what information is needed to assess the criteria and questions outlined in step 1 & 2 and then setting about to collect this information.

Methodologies must mesh with the programme and its objectives. The small scale, highly individualised context of care characteristic of re/integration activities suggests that qualitative and participatory research methods are needed in addition to standardised survey techniques (Huntington 2002: 30). Combining quantitative and qualitative approaches in an evaluation of re/integration work potentially has multiple benefits – it will provide a more complete, finer-tuned and broader understanding; it is well suited to programmes, like re/integration assistance, which involve contextual complexity; it suits situations where time and resources are limited in that it permits the triangulation of information collected from smaller samples; and it strengthens the validity and reliability of evaluation data (Rachel 2006: 34).

The type of data to be collected will depend on what specifically the evaluation is looking at but might include reviewing a wide range of primary and secondary resources and data sources such as those listed in Box #13. Data is needed before, during and after the implementation of the programme to determine what works best (GAO 2007: 10, 28; Rachel 2006: 6).

Box #13: What data?

- *Books, studies and reports*
- *Programme documents*
- *Formal questionnaires or evaluation forms*
- *Interviews with staff or beneficiaries*
- *Focus group discussions*
- *Direct or participatory observation*
- *Expert opinion*
- *Case files and case studies (where beneficiaries have consented)*

That being said, not all evaluators will have equal access to data sources. Where evaluators are called in toward the end of the programme, access to appropriate data can be problematic. Secondary data can be difficult to find – for example, data from national or regional surveys may not be available or sufficiently disaggregated; baseline data, when available at all, may be inappropriate due to revisions in programme strategy or to technical shortcomings in the study; staff turnover can limit the availability of institutional memory; etc. (Rachel 2006: 10). The lack of access to data can inhibit an evaluators work and what can be learned from an evaluation.

Step 4: Analysing the data

Analysis involves transforming the data collected into an understanding of how successful a programme was and what improvements are needed in going forward. Steps in the analysis process include:

1. the development of a structure for analysis based on relevant issues and themes;
2. the organisation of data by issues and themes;
3. identifying trends, patterns and interpretations; and
4. writing up findings, conclusions and recommendations (Shapiro nd: 34).

Data analysis is discussed in detail in section 3.2: *How to monitor re/integration programmes, Step 4: Analysing information according to the indicators*. Many of these issues are equally relevant when analysing evaluation data. However, there are also some issues worth bearing in mind which are more specific to evaluation data.

- **External variables and factors:** It is not only about the information collected but how that information fits within the wider context. External variables can impact programme outcomes in different ways such as:
 - Developments in the broader anti-trafficking field – e.g. legislation, policies and programmes which impact the programme being evaluated;
 - Changes in how trafficking takes place in, through and to a country – e.g. increases or decreases in numbers of cases, changes in the forms of trafficking, a shift from being a country of destination to one of origin.
- **Negative/unintended consequences:** Identifying negative impacts and/or unintended consequence is vital in evaluating programmes – to make adjustments to programmes, as a barometer of programme effectiveness and for future planning. Evaluations should look specifically for both the positive and the negative outcomes of the programme. For example:
 - While shelters are vital in many victims' recovery and reintegration, in some settings shelters have been found to identify (and by implication isolate and stigmatise) trafficking victims in ways which jeopardise their re/integration success (Huntington 2002: 22, Surtees 2008e: 11-14).
 - Re/integration organisations have identified patterns of dependency on services, particularly amongst child victims, victims who lack family support, etc (Surtees 2008b: 33-36).
- **Consider underlying assumptions:** Analysis must consider whether a programme's underlying assumptions are correct – for example, that long term employment will prevent re-trafficking, that family mediation/counselling will result in a healthy and sustainable living environment for trafficked persons, etc. This highlights the importance of focused research as a compliment and supplement to M&E work.
- **The broader context:** Analysis should also take into account to what extent the programme has contributed to broader anti-trafficking efforts – for example, how a programme fits into the bigger picture of re/integration and anti-trafficking in the country or a network of agencies, whether it is a sustainable approach, etc.

Step 5: Reporting and using evaluation results

Evaluation results and findings should be shared publicly and in a format accessible to interested stakeholders, particularly those persons who have participated in the evaluation process (e.g. programme staff, beneficiaries, donors, government stakeholders, other service providers). This is essential in terms of giving feedback to individuals who have provided information or comments during an evaluation, particularly beneficiaries who are still involved in a programme in some way. Therefore, adequate time and resources need to be set aside for preparing and sharing evaluation reports and materials, to ensure that future re/integration efforts can capitalise on lessons learned (Admira 2005: 18, Rende Taylor 2008: 44-45).

How and when results are shared should take into account different issues including:

- The target audience (e.g. whether beneficiaries, policy makers or professional staff, educational background, language considerations, age appropriateness, cultural sensitivities, etc.),
- An accessible format for the target audience (e.g. reports, summary of findings, policy paper, verbal presentations, child friendly material, etc.),
- An appropriate and ethical format for sharing sensitive material (e.g. anonymising feedback, camouflaging personal information in any case studies, etc.),
- That some individuals or institutions may be resistant to the evaluation process or results (e.g. a fear of change, a fear of criticism or “failure”, etc.)

The timing of an evaluation is also worth considering. If a new project has already been planned and budgeted for before the results of the evaluation of a previous project comes out, the findings may not be able to be fed in ways that it can be most useful. Similarly, when applying for continued funding for a programme, the evaluation should be done beforehand in order that evaluation findings can be included in the proposal.

4.3 Some issues and considerations in evaluating re/integration programmes

Given that anti-trafficking re/integration work has been largely under-theorised and under-analysed, effective evaluations are all the more important. Evaluations need to take into account a range of competing pressures – the needs for sufficient rigour and firm conclusions, practical considerations of time and money, legal and ethical issues linked to participant cooperation and protection, a range of methodological considerations and so on (Rachel 2006). Such points are worth bearing in mind when considering how to undertake evaluations of anti-trafficking re/integration programmes.

Box #14: Considerations in evaluating re/integration programmes

- *Risk of bureaucratisation*
- *Ethical principles and legal considerations*
- *External factors and influences*
- *Considering evaluation costs*
- *Unintended and/or negative consequences*

- **Risk of bureaucratisation**

As with monitoring, there is a risk that too much focus on evaluating can translate into an administrative environment and bureaucratic process such that the wrong activities are being emphasised. There may be concern that “excessive” emphasis on evaluation will change the atmosphere around the programme and (negatively) influence both programme staff and beneficiaries. Service providers may also be worried that the complexity and richness of the re/integration process cannot be adequately captured in the evaluation process (Admira 2005: 6).

- **Ethical principles and legal considerations**

Ethical principles in conducting evaluations include informed consent, confidentiality, anonymity, privacy, “do no harm”, non-discrimination, safety and security, sensitivity, beneficiary participation, data protection and the “best interests of the child”.

Box #15: Ethical and legal principles in evaluating re/integration programmes

- *Informed consent*
- *Confidentiality*
- *Anonymity*
- *Privacy*
- *“Do no harm”*
- *Non-discrimination*
- *Safety and security*
- *Sensitivity*
- *Beneficiary participation*
- *Data protection (during collection, retention, storage and use/analysis)*
- *Child protection and the “best interests of the child”*

These principles should be considered paramount, even where this impedes evaluation efforts. Special care must be taken in the case of children to ensure that they are afforded all of the protections that their age and experience requires. In many cases, such principles are mandated by national legislation, making their safeguarding not only an issue of ethics but one of legal requirement.³⁰ Some evaluation work may be governed by multiple legal and ethical codes – for example, those of the country of the organisation managing

³⁰ See Surtees 2007a: 42 for a listing of data protection legislation in SEE. In the absence of national legislation, organisations should refer to the principles and the letter of the EC Directive on Data Protection ([Directive 95/46/EC](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data. For a discussion of the legal and ethical issues associated with collecting data about trafficked persons, please see Surtees 2007a: 33-42 Surtees 2009: 52-68.

the programme, the country where the programme is being implemented (if different from the former) and/or the country funding the programme (Schenke & Williamson 2005: 7, 66-69).³¹

Box #16: Ensuring ethical principles when evaluating programmes

- *Be clear about the parameters of anonymity for persons involved in evaluations (e.g. when anonymity can be guaranteed and when it cannot);*
- *Gain beneficiaries' informed consent when any case information is used as part of an evaluation;*
- *Include beneficiaries in programme evaluations but ensure that all participation is voluntary;*
- *Respect the privacy of beneficiaries who do not wish to be contacted after leaving the programme;*
- *Ensure that all data collected as part of the evaluation adheres to ethical and legal requirements;*
- *Consider any potential risks to safety or security which may be caused by evaluation efforts (e.g. interviewing beneficiaries in their communities, etc);*
- *Train evaluation staff in child participation;*
- *Consider the "best interests of the child" at all stages of evaluation;*
- *Anticipate and avoid any evaluation activities which may cause harm to beneficiaries;*
- *Share evaluation results with all stakeholders – whether beneficiaries or professionals – in an accessible format.*

- **Availability of and access to data**

The information and data required to evaluate a re/integration programme is not always available or accessible to evaluators. In some cases, this may be because of legal or administrative issues – for example, laws on data protection prohibit access to certain types of information, government regulations prohibit or restrict information sharing, the confidentiality of some types of information or records, etc. There are also ethical considerations in terms of what information an evaluator should have access to, given ethical principles such as confidentiality, anonymity, informed consent and so on. And, in some situations, access to data is inhibited by the lack of cooperation and coordination between organisations, whether between state and NGOs or between NGOs.

- **External factors and influences**

Even where data is available, it is sometimes hard to determine precisely the effects of an intervention on the individuals, groups or community. Re/integration does not happen in a vacuum; it is informed by the individual, family and community context and a range of social, economic and political factors. As such, evaluations must try to disentangle when re/integration has been successful (or failed) due (in part or in full) to external factors to ensure that good practices are not lost or that ineffective programmes are not

³¹ While programme evaluation activities are not usually bound by the legal requirements of formal ethical review that apply to research, programme managers are still responsible for ensuring that information gathering activities are carried out ethically. Programme managers should strive to uphold the same high standards of formal ethical supervision that apply to research activities (Schenke & Williamson 2005: 7, 66-69), especially when working with vulnerable groups like trafficked persons.

continued. For example, where programme are not successful in terms of the economic empowerment of their beneficiaries, this may be a function of a weak economic project or poor motivation and commitment of beneficiaries. However, it may also be a function of the poor economic situation in a city, region or country. The range of possible conclusions must be considered and validated or excluded. Case managers are valuable resources in providing this contextual information. In many organisations, case managers are encouraged to document factors which they think are having an effect on an individual case – for example, notes in an individual’s case file, case manager’s notes/diary, discussion case management meetings, etc. Programme staff can equally provide valuable contextual information regarding the broader anti-trafficking field – e.g. the development of standard operating procedures (SOPs), government efforts to close programmes, police failure to identify and refer victims, etc. Beneficiaries can also provide valuable information toward identify factors in their individual/local context which have impacted their re/integration, information about which service providers may not be aware or may not have taken into account.

- **Considering evaluation costs**

Evaluations must ensure sufficient methodological rigour in order that conclusions can be reached, but with attention to the resources required. Evaluations need to be specific to the intervention and setting and appropriate to the amount of resources expended on evaluation vis a vis the programme and its anticipated impact (Huntington 2002: 30, Rachel 2006: 7, 10). Different evaluation models require different levels of resources. For instance, an external evaluation will potentially be more costly than an internal one which draws on programme staff. Costs will also be higher where evaluations are undertaken at regular intervals – for example, annually and then upon completion of the programme. On the one hand, the use of resources for an evaluation means, in practical terms, that fewer resources are available for the actual programme and re/integration services. On the other hand, evaluations are needed to know if re/integration efforts are effective and appropriate. Unevaluated programmes may lead to wasted resources in the long term where ineffective programmes and methods continue unchecked. The expenditure of resources (both human and financial) on the evaluation of re/integration work involves consideration of its contribution to the effectiveness, appropriateness and efficiency of current vs. future resource utilisation. Important and outstanding questions remain as to what constitutes the optimum balance between programme costs and evaluation costs and, equally, whether service providers should be implementing programmes which they do not have the resources to evaluate.

- **Unintended and/or negative consequences**

Evaluations must pay careful attention to any negative impacts and/or unintended consequences or programmes – to make adjustments to programmes, as a barometer of programme effectiveness and for future planning. For example, where the provision of re/integration services translates into beneficiary dependency and unrealistic expectations about assistance options and on-going support, programmes will need to be adjusted to address this. Similarly, some types of beneficiaries who have stayed in the shelter for a long period of time face greater problems in adjusting to post-shelter life and may be more prone to continued vulnerability and/or dependency – for example, because they are children, have security problems, have no family to return to, have dependent children or are “difficult cases”. A recent publication on anti-trafficking interventions in eight countries found numerous examples of laws or policies which had negative consequences for trafficked person.³²

.....
³² For further discussion, please see GAATW 2007.

5. BENEFICIARY PARTICIPATION AND INVOLVEMENT IN M&E

A central objective in monitoring and evaluating re/integration work is to ensure that it meets the needs of trafficked persons. Beneficiary participation plays a fundamental role in ensuring that programmes and policies are created according to beneficiaries' self-expressed needs, interests and opinions. It also forms part of a process of accountability on the part of anti-trafficking organisations and institutions to their beneficiaries and, in some cases, may serve to facilitate the empowerment of beneficiaries whose views and opinions are taken on-board alongside those of service professionals. Systems of intervention and assistance which are designed, implemented and adjusted in a participatory manner are more effective, efficient and appropriate. Indeed, the *UN Recommended Principles and Guidelines on Human Rights and Human Trafficking*, in guideline 3, section 6, specifically call for:

Recognising the important contribution that survivors of trafficking can, on a strictly voluntary basis, make to developing and implementing anti-trafficking interventions and evaluating their impact (UNOHCHR 2002: 8).

Nevertheless, trafficked persons themselves are often not actively engaged in M&E in meaningful ways. One study of victims' experience of identification and assistance in SEE found that while many anti-trafficking actors and programmes operate with the best of intentions, AT interventions, including in the area of re/integration, are not always experienced positively by intended beneficiaries. Further, few beneficiaries were consulted in the design and implementation of programmes and interventions, yet most beneficiaries felt that it was important that their views and opinions be taken into account (Surtees 2007b: 22). Similarly, a study on why some victims decline assistance found that some organisations were open, transparent and wanted to know more about the reasons behind victims decision making process to help them better design and implement their programmes. However, other organisations, operating within the same countries and assistance frameworks, were resistant to the idea that trafficking victims declined assistance and were opposed to researchers interviewing beneficiaries about their experiences and assessment of assistance (Brunovskis & Surtees 2007: 22-23). The extent, quality and value associated with "listening to victims" within anti-trafficking assistance programmes is uneven and, in some settings, attention to beneficiary inputs and feedback is limited and issues of accountability are significantly under-considered.

This raises important questions about how anti-trafficking work is evaluated and to whom professionals are accountable in terms of the provision of assistance and protection. More attention is needed to how beneficiaries – both past and present – can be more effectively and ethically engaged in M&E including in the development and design of programmes and interventions.

Participation applies not only to adults but also to children and young people. The United Nation's *Convention on the Rights of the Child* (CRC) enshrines in law the right of children to have their opinion taken into account on matters that affect them in accordance with their maturity (Save the Children 2000: 4).³³ More recently the Committee on the Rights of the Child distributed General comment #12, the right of the child to be heard, which outlines the legal framework of article 12 and the basic requirements for the implementation of this right (UN Committee on the Rights of the Child 2009).

That being said, child participation in M&E requires careful thought. The trend toward child participation has, in some contexts, led to "tokenistic" participation, which has not benefitted those involved. Meaningful child participation should be informed by a consideration of the evolving capacities of the child, based on his/her individual age, capacities and experience and should adhere in all circumstances to what constitutes the "best interests of the child". Moreover, specific expertise and skills are required to consult children, guidance for which can be found in a number of existing manuals and resources.³⁴

5.1 Beneficiary participation in monitoring and evaluation

Beneficiary participation in the context of individual re/integration is standard in most programmes. Participation starts with the initial interview when a preliminary re/integration plan is developed cooperatively by staff and beneficiary. The implementation of the re/integration plan is monitored on a regular basis in collaboration with the beneficiary. Further, the manner in which the beneficiaries' day-to-day lives are organised in many programmes reflects the value placed on participation. In some programmes, the division of domestic duties and organisation of the living space is done by beneficiaries themselves rather than determined by the professional staff. While staff may provide support to beneficiaries in achieving agreement on these issues, they do not make decisions in their behalf. Similarly, the manner in which conflicts are often managed exemplifies participation – for example, using mediation as a tool for conflict transformation focuses responsibility for problem solving on disputants themselves (Surtees 2008b). However, participation needs to go beyond participation in one's own re/integration, to include beneficiaries' assessment of the services and programmes offered within the re/integration framework, to the extent that they are willing to participate in such efforts.^{35, 36}

Re/integration organisations use different tools and techniques to engage with trafficked persons in monitoring and evaluating their services.³⁷ Each has advantages and disadvantages and the appropriateness of each tool varies according to programme, beneficiaries and context. Most organisations employ a combination of different methods, including some of those listed in Box #17.

33 Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child provides that:

States Parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those views freely in all matters affecting the child, the views of the child being given due weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child.

34 See, for example, Di Maio, Kanics & Haldorsson 2007; Plan 2009a, 2009b; Save the Children Sweden 2004; Save the Children UK 2003, 2000; Schenk & Williamson 2005; UN Committee on the Rights of the Child 2009.

35 See Appendix 4 for an example of monitoring re/integration services by service professionals and programme beneficiaries.

36 TVRP organisations typically solicit the views and inputs of beneficiaries on other aspects of their work as well – for example, during the preparation of leaflets, posters and other materials, beneficiaries are asked to provide inputs and suggestions including alternatives for logos, slogans, displays and so on.

37 See also Surtees 2008b.

Box #17: Some different tools for participation in monitoring and evaluating re/integration

- *Complaint or suggestion boxes*
 - *Anonymous evaluations or questionnaires*
 - *Group discussions*
 - *Individual interviews between staff and beneficiaries*
 - *Outside evaluators*
- **Complaint or suggestion boxes:** Such boxes may be used to comment on internal services and staff (for example, the individual re/integration programme where the box is hosted) and/or on external services and staff (for example, state services and service providers, other organisations providing services, etc.). Typically the comment box is opened on a regular basis with more than one staff member present, to ensure that all comments (negative and positive) are received and dealt with. Where an external comment box is used, this is opened in the presence of both NGO and external staff. This approach offers an opportunity for direct and open critiques and inputs. Beneficiaries can provide anonymous feedback on a range of issues by completing a form or writing an informal note, depending on how the system is arranged. Staff is typically obliged to take account of and address all comments/complaints. Disadvantages include the static nature of such inputs (they will not be as dynamic as interviews or group discussions), concerns about anonymity (some beneficiaries may worry that their handwriting will be recognised or concerns identifiable), issues of trust (some beneficiaries may distrust the complaints box procedure and those involved in its implementation), and issues of literacy (this will be difficult for beneficiaries who are not functionally literate or are not comfortable expressing themselves in written format or the dominant language). Where such an approach is used in the case of children, it must be child friendly and appropriate for different age groups.
 - **Anonymous evaluations or questionnaires:** Written forms might include anonymous questionnaires during the period that a beneficiary receives assistance, an exit evaluation upon completion of the programme, inputs forms related to different services, etc. Such a format can be used to comment on any number of issues throughout the assistance process. Anonymity may facilitate disclosure and openness to comment on a range of issues, staff behaviours and programme approaches. Nevertheless, written forms may also be uncomfortable and alienating for beneficiaries who are not functionally literate, who are not comfortable expressing themselves in written form, do not speak the dominant language, and/or who have concerns as to whether their comments might be identified to staff. In addition, the paper work involved – for both staff and beneficiaries – may be time consuming and cumbersome. Beneficiaries may not want to spend time on such forms. And the time required to process these forms may be prohibitive for small organisations and/or organisations with heavy caseloads. Thus, such mediums may not be taken seriously, particularly when previous feedback has not been dealt with in a constructive way. In the case of children any written forms or questionnaires must be child friendly and different forms may be needed for children of different ages, stages of development and experiences.
 - **Group discussions:** Discussions potentially afford a dynamic format where beneficiaries can share ideas and also draw from and comment on issues raised by other beneficiaries. This approach allows participants

to generate their own questions, issues and concepts and to flag their own priorities, on their own terms and in their own words. It allows for an examination of different perspectives within a social network. For individual beneficiaries, there may also be the opportunity to develop skills in self-expression and to learn to listen to and respect the (possibly divergent) opinions of others. And it may allow beneficiaries to learn from others in similar situations – some of whom may be at a more advanced stage of re/integration and can serve as an example. If facilitated correctly – in a comfortable environment and by creating a safe space for discussion and encouraging beneficiaries to have inputs and suggestions – it can yield a range of valuable insights and inputs. However, the lack of anonymity (*vis a vis* the staff and also other beneficiaries) may serve to silence some participants or may breach privacy/confidentiality where discussions lead to revelations about trafficking experiences. Not everyone may be equally heard in group discussions – due to dominant personalities, because of internal group dynamics and/or because of staff/beneficiaries relations. Conflicts or disagreements in the group discussion may also be a source of on-going tension and conflict between beneficiaries in their day-to-day interactions. Another feature is that discussions may trigger what some service providers describe as the “contagion of criticism”. That is, being in a group setting seems, in some cases, to empower beneficiaries to criticise and express opinions in ways that they may not feel comfortable doing in a one-on-one setting. While criticism itself must be heard, there may be situations in which this dynamic is not entirely constructive or productive for either staff or beneficiaries.

- **Individual interviews:** Individual interviews with staff potentially allows beneficiaries to express their views in a dynamic format and in a one-on-one setting, which may be more comfortable than a group format for some beneficiaries. Staff member’s knowledge of the organisation as well as individual cases may allow them to sift through what constitutes critical feedback as compared to grievances which may be linked to their stage of recovery or a particular issue which has arisen in the context of assistance. However, many beneficiaries may not feel comfortable expressing negative opinions or criticising the programme or organisation. This is particularly likely to be the case in situations where beneficiaries require or anticipate requiring on-going assistance and support, where beneficiaries are grateful to the individual/organisation and/or where beneficiaries feel a personal connection with individual staff. Moreover, programme staff may face difficulties in remaining open and objective in the face of beneficiary critique and may not sufficiently value or report issues raised in the interview.
- **Outside evaluators:** There are different types of external evaluators. Some may be independent consultants, others may be staff from state social services who are responsible for monitoring cases and evaluating reintegration programmes. Using external evaluators can potentially address concerns about anonymity and fears of appearing ungrateful to service providers. External evaluations can also encourage beneficiaries to comment on the skills and quality of programme care, feedback which may be difficult to discuss directly with programme staff. At the same time, an external person is also an “outsider” with whom some beneficiaries may not feel immediately comfortable. This may be particularly pronounced in the case of trafficked persons who commonly have issues of trust, thus requiring more than a one-off interview to gain trust, establish rapport and, therefore, access the information required. Using external evaluators also means that programme staff do not develop evaluation skills which can, in the longer term, enhance their capacity and, ideally, also their future work. Engaging an external person can also be expensive and time consuming. Using M&E staff from within the organisation but not linked to service provision is a strategy used by some organisations. It may address issue of trust and capacity but, at the same time, it may not be perceived by beneficiaries to be sufficiently “external” to be able to comfortably criticise.

Re/integration organisations report different experiences with these various mediums. One organisation faced serious problems when using a group discussion format because of a lack of comfort in sharing view points and “criticising” the programme. By contrast, another organisation reported positive experiences with this format, revising its shelter rules as a result of discussions with beneficiaries. One programme found that beneficiaries significantly preferred individual interviews over a group discussion and formal evaluation, noting that:

...the feedback and the information, gathered in the interviews, are of greatest importance to us and a significant input in adjusting the programmes we offer. In isolated cases we are using questionnaires, but our clients normally do not accept and appreciate them in the day to day practice. Suggestion boxes have been tried with no success, most probably due to some cultural specifics and the clients’ mentality (Surtees 2008b: 38).

Best methods?

Each programme and organisation will need to test and develop its own systems for participation and, in some cases, make adjustments relative to individual beneficiaries.³⁸ The choice of appropriate and effective mediums will also be linked to the programme (e.g. whether it is a residential programme, a day facility, involves outreach to beneficiaries in a family setting), the stage of re/integration (e.g. crisis, transition or re/integration) and beneficiaries themselves (e.g. adult or children, experiences of exploitation, etc.). However, ultimately it is likely by using multiple methods that service providers will be able to most effectively access a wide range of inputs from beneficiaries at different stages of the assistance process. As TVRP service providers explained:

We must have many methods [for beneficiary participation] because one beneficiary likes to talk only to me or a case worker but also many like to talk in the group. The method will depend on the case.

In order to get real opinions from beneficiary about programme, we use different methods such as complaint and suggestions box, evaluation forms, interviews by the programme coordinator (not by staff that conduct activity) and in some specific cases, free discussion with the head of [the organisation].

This, however, assumes staff capacity to use the different methods which will often require training and/or supervision. As one organisation explained:

From our point of view all the [different] methods have advantages and disadvantages, but it depends on the staff professionalism to use the appropriate method in the appropriate stage of re/integration. We have to take into account that the victim’s personality and their behaviour differs according to the exploitation period, the life before exploitation, the family role, the beneficiary’s school education, etc.

In contexts where government agencies, like social services, are responsible for monitoring and evaluating, organisations have reported instances where staff does not have sufficient training or capacity to interact with beneficiaries in sensitive and appropriate ways, as one organisation explained:

³⁸ *Lessons on service user participation can be drawn from other service movements such as the domestic violence movement, the disability movement and psychiatric service survivors. Attention to the views of beneficiaries (also known as “service users”) has also contributed to the empowerment of users in relation to a range of public services including child protection, community care, housing and health (Hague & Mullender 2006: 571).*

This case happens when we have monitoring visits from the inspectors of the state social services. They should be discrete and know better than anyone else the technique of the questions for the beneficiaries. But usually they appear to be not at the highest level they should be, meaning they ask questions when the beneficiaries are in groups or in an environment that is not a proper area (where other people are) and so on.

Many anti-trafficking assistance programmes are grappling with these various tools and approaches in an effort to more effectively engage with beneficiaries. For example, in order that beneficiaries can participate in a meaningful way, they must be informed about minimum standards of care and appropriate staff conduct. Without understanding what they are entitled to and what rights they have, it is difficult for beneficiaries to make valuable and relevant assessments and suggestions. Beneficiaries must also feel confident that the inputs and suggestion they provide will be taken seriously and used in the adaptation of the programme, whether in terms of services or staff behaviour. In one context, NGOs have found that the external complaint box, which focuses on services offered outside of the NGO re/integration programme, is seldom used because beneficiaries do not trust that their comments will be taken into account by government institutions.

As well, a critical question for many agencies is to what extent beneficiaries feel empowered to criticise services and organisations on which they are often dependent and without which even basic needs may not be met? Some studies describe a “culture of gratitude”, whereby programme beneficiaries are reluctant to criticise assistance (Brunovskis & Surtees 2007: 105-107; Surtees 2007b: 150). This is likely to be particularly pressing in the case of children who feel the power divide even more acutely. Moreover, in some environments, there may be social and cultural taboos against criticism which further complicate the process of participation. In more repressive political environments, beneficiaries may fear repercussions for criticising services and/or organisations and even anonymous mediums may not be sufficient to assuage such concerns – for example, beneficiaries may be suspicious that anonymous questionnaires are not in fact anonymous, that there will be fall-out if they express displeasure.

Participation at different stages of re/integration

The willingness and ability to criticise may be, at least in part, a function of the stage of re/integration. In the crisis period, some beneficiaries are not comfortable criticising or giving inputs, not only because of their (disempowering) experience of trafficking but also because they may have experienced marginalisation in their past. Moreover, as discussed earlier, beneficiary inputs may be clearer in the transition phase when trauma has been addressed and the individual is more stable and able to analyse their situation. Inputs about assistance may be very positive at the crisis stage but later give way to “dissatisfaction” which is, in part, a signal of beneficiaries’ empowerment. As one service provider put it:

Idealisation of services in the first stage and then after a few months, they start to complain. This is progress and really we are very happy when they start to complain.

This is not to say that criticism and dissatisfaction somehow signals success; programmes must take very seriously criticism of staff and/or programme and adjust accordingly. But it is nonetheless worth noting that criticism may, in some situations, be as much a function of empowerment and improved self-expression as of issues with the programme, services or staff. During later periods of re/integration there are different factors that may inform the nature of inputs and criticism. One organisation found that some criticism levied during and following the transition phase was linked to beneficiaries’ particular relationship to the programme and staff. That is, because over time beneficiaries had become familiar with services and staff, they seemed

to forget the professional boundaries, seeing the staff less as professionals and more as friends/family and services as something automatic. Thus, when they are dissatisfied with some aspect of the programme, they may feel particularly disappointed and experience this on a very personal level rather than in the context of social service provision and programme parameters.

Weighing and contextualising beneficiary feedback

Information from beneficiaries must be contextualised within the framework of their individual experience, psychological and social well-being and stage of re/integration. In some cases, a negative assessment may reflect poor services or service delivery whereas, in other cases, it might be linked, at least in part, to the psychological state of the beneficiary. For example, a beneficiary who refuses to eat certain foods would not be an objective source for assessing the quality (and quantity) of food served in a shelter and any comments would need to be weighted alongside those of other beneficiaries as well as the extent to which the shelter adheres to national standards. Similarly, a beneficiary may provide a positive assessment of a service but because they are in an unstable or dependent state, this assessment may not reflect the reality but rather her desire to please or a manifestation of gratitude. It may also be a function of individual behaviours and different cases as one social worker explained:

It also depends on the person and when you ask someone. We had a case where she wanted more and more services even though she had a good job and didn't need it. But she kept asking. And so if you ask her about services then she will say that "they are bad" and "they didn't give me what I needed" and so on. And yet she stayed almost one year in a shelter but still was unsatisfied. She was angry that we were not continuing with assistance, especially financial. We say "the door is open for counselling and talking" but she didn't want this.

Moreover, there are some forms of assistance which cannot, in an objective sense, be evaluated by beneficiaries because they lack that professional expertise – for example, legal services or the judicial process, psychiatric care, medical assistance, etc. However, their views can be taken into account in terms of how beneficiaries experienced and were treated while receiving these services. So, for example, an indicator like “beneficiaries who evaluate psychological assistance as satisfactory and sufficient” is not an objective measure of the service (or the qualifications of the professional psychologist) but a subjective assessment of how they felt about the service and how it was provided. Similarly, “beneficiaries who evaluate legal assistance as satisfactory – for example, adequate information, comprehensible information, adequate support throughout the legal process” reveals how they felt about the information received and whether they felt it equipped them in the legal process. As one organisation explained, how beneficiaries experience services directly correlates with their willingness to access and accept services which, in turn, will impact re/integration success. One client who had initially refused to accept medical care because she was uncomfortable and scared was very relieved by the doctor's positive and sensitive attitude toward her which then led her, at later stages, to seek out the assistance of this doctor when having medical problems. Beneficiaries' assessment makes it possible for service providers to consider what could be done in order that beneficiaries may better experience (or understand) services and toward ensuring that other beneficiaries will access and/or continue with these forms of assistance.

M&E is not only a short term activity (i.e. as an immediate reaction to the programme or assistance) but equally of relevance in the long term (i.e. once beneficiaries have left programmes and had time to process their assistance experience). To date, this type of longitudinal evaluation is almost entirely lacking in re/integration programmes, as well as anti-trafficking assistance programmes more generally (Surtees 2008b: 38; Warnath 2009). Where a more longitudinal approach is sought, beneficiary participation would be invaluable. However,

there are also limits to what information can realistically and ethically be collected from and about beneficiaries over time. As one re/integration organisation explained:

Gathering information on the individual cases by following them can give us enough information on how exactly our services are useful to our clients. But it is not possible always to get in touch with our client after they leave and cut off the relation with us.

It is also a matter of financial and human resources. There would be costs involved in engaging beneficiaries in long term monitoring.

Broad-based participation

Inputs from beneficiaries should not be limited to M&E within individual programmes; it should also be garnered about programme and policy responses at a national level. For instance, in Albania, a coalition of anti-trafficking shelters has provided inputs into standards of care at the national level, being developed by the Ministry of Social Affairs. Focus group discussions were conducted with beneficiaries, adjusting questions and discussion techniques to the education and comprehension levels of beneficiaries. In addition, interviews were conducted with some beneficiaries to garner individual opinions, not influenced by the group dynamic. Similarly, in Serbia, a former beneficiary (and current peer support person) served as the NGO representative for the national team developing minimum standards for shelters and assisted housing programmes. This beneficiary was selected because of her direct experience of receiving assistance, including having stayed in different shelter programmes (Surtees 2008b: 37). The above examples notwithstanding, at present, beneficiary participation in programme and policy response is not a widespread practice. In some cases, this may be a function of the approach of practitioners and policy-makers. However, it should also not be overlooked that beneficiary participation can be stressful and not all beneficiaries will be equally willing or able to take part in such processes.

5.2 Considerations in beneficiary participation

As noted above, there are some rather substantial issues with beneficiary participation which need to be carefully considered in the design and implementation of M&E efforts, issues discussed below and listed in Box #18. In the case of child participation, there are myriad considerations but, in all instances, the principle of “the best interests of the child” should take primacy.

Box #18: Considerations in beneficiary participation in M&E

- *Participation as traumatising*
- *The intrusiveness of participation*
- *Personal and social obstacles to participation*
- *Representative participation*
- *Costs and resources*
- *Participation as unfamiliar terrain*
- *The ethics of participation*

- ***Participation as traumatising***

Participation may be traumatising in that it may bring back memories of trafficking and/or require beneficiaries to revisit and be involved in a part of their life that they wish to put behind them. For some beneficiaries, even the period of assistance and re/integration may be a stage of their lives they wish to remain in their past. It may also be traumatising in that the involvement with service professionals may not always be positive and empowering and may serve to cause strain for beneficiaries. At the same time, professionals should not make unilateral decisions about beneficiary participation. Decisions about if, how and when to participate in evaluations, research and/or policy review should be made by beneficiaries, albeit with full information about what this involves and any potential risks or problems that may result from their participation. There has been a tendency by some service providers to prevent participation – for example, in research – on the grounds that it would have negative impacts for beneficiaries, a decision being made without involving beneficiaries in the discussion (Brunovskis & Surtees 2007, 2010, Surtees 2007). This has served to silence beneficiaries who would have liked to participate; it has also been a missed opportunity in improving programme and policy. It is important, on the one hand, that M&E is planned in ways that minimise the likelihood of traumatisation; that M&E processes anticipate and address the stresses and difficulties of beneficiary participation. On the other hand, beneficiaries should be able to make their own decision about participation (whether for M&E, research, etc.), having been provided with full information about what this entails and the potential implications of participation (both positive and negative), specific to the situation and context.

- ***The intrusiveness of participation***

Participation in M&E can, in some cases and at some stages of re/integration, be intrusive and overwhelming for beneficiaries. This is perhaps most likely to occur when they are in the initial stages of re/integration and focused on immediate needs. As such, the timing and the form of beneficiary participation has to be carefully assessed, including accommodating differences between beneficiaries. Whereas, in some cases, beneficiary participation poses obstacles to stabilisation and recovery; in other cases, it may be a helpful process which can even prove empowering. In still other cases, the intrusiveness of participation may be of a more banal nature – that is, beneficiaries may not have the interest or energy in providing inputs, even when these can contribute to improve programmes for other trafficked persons. The overarching principle should be that no one should be made to participate, which requires considering overt as well as more subtle forms of pressure.

- ***Personal and social obstacles to participation***

Trafficked persons represent different nationalities, economic situations, educational backgrounds, sexes, ages, ethnicities, social groups and so on. Some of these identities may create barriers to participation. Beneficiaries may not feel they have sufficient education or capacity to engage in such a process; they may not be used to being asked of their opinion; they may be from socially marginalised groups and unfamiliar with participation, etc. Equally, the experience of trafficking – including its impact on an individual's self esteem, social stigma and the trauma of exploitation – may serve as a barrier to participation, with individuals unable, unwilling or ambivalent about such involvement. Despite these differences, all VoTs should have the opportunity to engage in M&E processes if they wish, even where this means putting in place certain measures to allow for this – for example, using interpreters, modifying tools, training staff, child friendly environments/staff, providing childcare, etc. In the case of children, they may feel uncomfortable with (or even threatened by) certain environments or individuals. They may also not be viewed as actors and decision-makers but rather as passive recipients of adults' decisions and actions.

Child participation should be appropriate to different children's age, stage of development and individual experience. Particular child-friendly techniques and tools should be developed and used for this purpose, in line with ethical standards.

- **Representative participation**

Some beneficiaries are easier to access and consult than others – for example, those who are currently in a programme, persons who are satisfied with services received (past or present), persons who are articulate and open to discussions, etc. But to genuinely learn about what does (and doesn't work) in re/integration programmes, it is necessary to look beyond these more easily accessed respondents. Biases in the selection of respondents may lead to certain issues being identified or needs being stressed, which may not reflect the broader population of trafficked persons. Being representative in this context is not about looking for a statistically representative sample. Rather, it is about involving a broad spectrum of trafficked persons – for example, persons of different nationalities or ethnicities, sexes, ages, education levels, socio-economic situation, cultural backgrounds, trafficking experiences and so on. It also means, where possible and ethical, the participation of past and current beneficiaries to afford a longitudinal assessment of the programme and re/integration success. And it might also involve contacting trafficked persons who were never beneficiaries (e.g. individuals who declined or dropped out of assistance, who were never offered assistance and who were excluded from a programme) to consider whether changes are needed to better meet the needs of a wider group of trafficked persons.³⁹ That being said, there are serious and important ethical considerations in accessing potential respondents which need to be taken into account. This is particularly the case where beneficiaries are no longer part of a programme or were never part of a programme, not the least of which is that contacting them may "out" them as trafficked in their families and/or communities which, for example, can lead to stigma, social ostracism, violence and retribution by traffickers.⁴⁰

- **Costs and resources**

Victim participation is time consuming and expensive compared with unilateral decision-making by professionals. Engaging beneficiaries takes up staff time and organisational resources, both of which are heavily constrained in the field of anti-trafficking re/integration. It also requires time and investment by beneficiaries who, regardless of whether they are currently in programmes or have completed assistance, often have other obligations (e.g. work, study, family responsibilities) which prevent or limit involvement. That resources are already constrained from all angles is a significant inhibitor to beneficiary participation. If donors and funders take on board the premise that beneficiary involvement is essential in ensuring appropriate programmatic and policy response, then adequate time and resources must accompany this (Surtees 2008b: 37).

³⁹ Brunovskis & Surtees (2007) found that some reasons for declining assistance were linked to how the assistance framework was organised. Many reported inadequate information about programmes as well as their own ability to process and comprehend assistance offers. For others, how assistance was arranged (that is, residential programmes in the capital and no option for work) meant that they could not accept assistance because of the desire/or requirement that they return home to support their family. In still other cases, the dynamics and interactions between service providers and beneficiaries played a role in who accepted or declined assistance, with excessive rules and restrictions being a deterrent to entering a programme.

⁴⁰ For a discussion of some of these ethical issues, please see Brunovskis & Surtees 2010.

- **Participation as unfamiliar terrain**

Beneficiary participation is a relatively new approach in many countries, including in the Balkan region where the TVRP is implemented. As one service provider explained:

Participation of users is new for this culture and we are pioneering this issue. And it is important that we inform beneficiaries that they have a right to participate and give feedback and say openly about the services.

Participation and decision-making power is often a new model of behaviour for beneficiaries and one about which many beneficiaries are often ambivalent (Surtees2008b: 37). It will take time and careful thought about how participation can best be done. For example, requests for information which are too time consuming or too frequent may serve to alienate beneficiaries and decrease their motivation to provide inputs. How best to gather inputs is another question and one which will likely vary not only from programme to programme but also case to case. Service providers must be committed to soliciting and using the inputs of beneficiaries in how re/integration programmes are developed and implemented. Participation may be particularly unfamiliar terrain for children. In many cultures it is not usual for children to be asked their opinion and children are not always comfortable talking freely with adults or expressing negative opinions. Navigating these dynamics will require a child-specific response.

- **The ethics of participation**

How participation is undertaken requires adherence to strict ethical standards and principles, the overarching principle being that no harm comes to beneficiaries as a consequence of their participation in M&E activities. Participation must be entirely voluntary and beneficiaries must demonstrate "informed consent", which includes a clear understanding of what participation entails and any potential consequences or impact. Participants should be informed about the M&E work including who is undertaking it, who is funding it, what the results will be, the likely impact of the study (including attention to not raising expectations), the option to end their participation at any stage, etc. They must also be clear about whether their participation will be anonymous, confidential (identity known to monitor/evaluator but not publicly) or public (Admira 2005: 19). The safety and security of beneficiaries is also of paramount importance, even where this conflicts with transparency. Thus, participation must not "identify" beneficiaries as trafficked in ways that will have negative consequences, such as stigma, blame, etc. For some trafficked persons, part of recovery and re/integration involves breaking with assistance programmes and individuals associated with this phase of their life (Brunovskis & Surtees 2010 & 2007; Surtees 2008b, 2007, 2005), an approach which must be respected even where it constrains M&E work. Any M&E activities should be followed by feedback sessions to inform beneficiaries of findings and next steps in a comprehensible and accessible way. How this is done will differ from situation to situation, depending on the beneficiary characteristics (e.g. age, education level, language, etc.), stage of assistance (e.g. crisis, transition or re/integration), location (e.g. whether they are assisted in a shelter, day programme or with individual services) but might include a discussion/presentation, a written report tailored to beneficiaries, etc.

Box #19: Ethics of participation – some key issues⁴¹

Some key considerations in terms of ethics in M&E (and research generally) may include asking some simple questions such as:

- *Is the activity necessary and justified?*
- *Have the risks and benefits for trafficked persons been weighed up?*
- *How will results be used and fed into improving programmes?*
- *How will trafficked persons be involved in the research design, planning, managing and analysis of the study?*
- *Which research methods can be applied that will cause the least intrusion?*
- *Do all researchers have a thorough understanding of monitoring, evaluation and research (MER) ethics, trafficking in persons, a rights based approach?*
- *Do all researchers have experience in carrying out research activities with trafficked and/or vulnerable persons?*
- *How will beneficiary expectations be managed?*
- *Has the MER team discussed the TVRP values and principles?*
- *Who will interview? E.g. same-sex interviewers? Researchers trained in child-friendly techniques, etc.*
- *How to ensure the right amount and level of participation?*
- *When working with children, have the evolving capacities of children been considered, including the importance of not only age but experience?*
- *Have the potential power imbalances been considered, including how to minimise these?*
- *Would building rapport through multiple sessions (rather than a one-off activity) be more beneficial?*
- *Has the research setting been considered, including where participants may feel most comfortable?*
- *How will participants be debriefed?*

⁴¹ Adapted from Plan 2009b.

6. MOVING FORWARD – SOME CONCLUSIONS, SOME RECOMMENDATIONS

Unless re/integration programmes are monitored and evaluated on a regular and on-going basis, service providers, policy makers and donors are without the information needed to design, adjust and implement effective programmes. In simple terms, this means that good programmes may not be continued while other (weaker) programmes may continue and waste (often limited) resources. This makes it all the more striking that so little attention has been paid to the importance of M&E.

In the context of KBF's TVRP programme, many lessons have been learned about how M&E might take place as well as many problems and constraints in how to monitor and evaluate re/integration work. However, this is an on-going process and this paper serves only as a starting point in exploring and addressing this key issue. The findings and recommendations presented below by no means exhaust the full range of possible recommendations. Far more needs to be done to explore the strengths and weaknesses of different indicators, models and tools. And far more thought and discussion is needed to how to most effectively and efficiently monitoring and evaluate anti-trafficking re/integration programmes.

Make M&E an essential component of all re/integration work

M&E is essential to re/integration work – to ensure that assistance is appropriate and effective. Attention needs to be paid to how this can best be achieved – for example, through the development of indicators, tools and means of beneficiary involvement. And it must be designed and planned at the outset of the intervention. In addition, M&E must be consistent with the values and ethical principles of the reintegration programme and administrative aspects of re/integration work do not take away from service delivery.

Monitor individual re/integration plans and overall services

Monitoring efforts must pay attention not only to the re/integration process of individual trafficked persons, but equally to the services offered to trafficking victims. Both should be monitored and evaluated from the perspective of beneficiaries (trafficked persons) and service professionals. This requires that monitoring takes place at all stages of the re/integration process – 1) crisis intervention, 2) transition and 3) re/integration/social inclusion – with different indicators at the different stages.

Regularly evaluate programmes

Evaluation can be done in different ways, based on the resources and goals of the organisation. What is crucial is that evaluation be recognised as an essential part of programme planning and implementation. Resources needed for evaluations should be built into programme budgets; donors should increasingly consider how programme evaluations can best be undertaken.

Use qualitative and quantitative information

Whether undertaking monitoring or evaluation, both qualitative and quantitative information is needed. There are limits to what can be learned from quantitative information alone. It is vital to consider what each indicator does (and does not) tell us, and identify what additional information can “colour in” a more complete picture of re/integration efforts. Balancing qualitative and quantitative indicators is also important in monitoring and evaluating “difficult” cases. Such cases will often require greater (and different) inputs and resources than more “typical” cases and thus, “success” or “failure” in such cases may need different measures and indications, including qualitative ones. Where “difficulties” are multiple, this exponentially complicates re/integration including monitoring and evaluation.

Include beneficiaries in M&E

Beneficiary participation ensures that programmes and policies are created according to beneficiaries’ needs and interests; facilitates empowerment; and ensures accountability on the part of anti-trafficking organisations and institutions. Beneficiary participation is central in monitoring individual re/integration plans as well as re/integration services. There are a range of tools and techniques to engage trafficked persons in this process, each with advantages and disadvantages. Consider what tools are most effective for soliciting the views of beneficiaries and involving beneficiaries in M&E on a regular basis.

Follow ethical principles in all M&E work

Re/integration organisations must ensure that ethical principles – such as confidentiality, privacy, “do no harm”, anonymity, safety/security, informed consent, non-discrimination, participation, sensitivity, data protection and “best interests of the child” – are not violated, even where this impedes monitoring and evaluation efforts. Special care must be taken in the case of children to ensure that they are afforded all of the protections that their age and experience requires. M&E with children and adults must be handled differently, including in terms of (ethical and appropriate) beneficiary participation.

Apply the lessons from M&E to bring about positive change

Monitoring and evaluation allows programme staff and beneficiaries to learn what does (and does not) work and also offers a way forward – how to make changes where necessary and build on successes where they exist. Re/integration programmes must mobilise the information collected in the course of monitoring and evaluation to capitalise on good practices and make necessary changes where programmes face obstacles as well as in the planning for future interventions. There should be a systematic management response and an action plan drawn up stating how the findings/recommendations will be used – this document should then be reviewed in the next stage and staff monitored against the action plan. Too often there is a tendency for evaluations to simply sit on the shelf.

Making M&E a “safe” and comfortable process

Given that M&E is looking for “failures” as much as “successes”, it can be a very sensitive and difficult process, particularly for programme staff. Donors and organisational management should consider how they can most effectively create a “safe space” for the monitoring and evaluation of re/integration work – for example, by encouraging organisations to share their “failures” as part of the learning process, acknowledging that problems are an inevitable part of any programme, allocate funds and time for M&E work which will enable programmes to adjust midstream, etc. Constructive dialogue is far more likely to lead to positive change and a healthy environment for both staff and beneficiaries.

Balancing cost and benefits of M&E

Consider what constitutes a reasonable amount for resources for M&E work, both in terms of personnel time and programme finances. The use of resources for M&E means, in practical terms, that fewer resources are available for the actual programme. At the same time, inadequate resources to M&E will not be effective and it will not be possible to determine if the programme is effective and appropriate. Finding a balance between the cost and the benefits of M&E work is paramount.

Staff training in M&E

M&E is a specialty professional area. Project staff will likely need to be trained in M&E techniques in order that the monitoring component is designed and implemented in a way that will be useful to the project and from which others can learn. Moreover, it is important that staff is trained not only on how to carry out M&E activities but also in recognising the importance of such activities, as a central, critical and valuable programming task. Far too often monitoring is simply seen as paperwork that needs to be done every quarter by adding up some numbers and reporting to a donor. This training and conceptual shift will improve not only the specific programme but also enhance the institutional capacity of the organisation.

Fund and undertake both M&E and research

M&E efforts should not replace research. There are some questions that can not be answered purely by M&E; research can play a vital role in answering these questions as well as understanding the needs of trafficked persons. In addition, research is, in many situations, conducted independent of service provision, which affords objectivity and independence which is essential in better understanding the issues involved and ways forward. The long term effect of re/integration programmes is one area which would benefit from research in order for organisations to better understand how to work more effectively and creatively.

7. REFERENCES CITED

Admira (2005) *Work for Care: Sexual and Domestic Violence During and After War, A Trainers' Manual. Module 15: Programme Evaluation*. The Netherlands: Admira Foundation. Available at www.transact.nl

Asquith, S. & E. Turner (2008) *Recovery and reintegration of children from the effects of sexual exploitation and related trafficking*. Geneva: Oak Foundation.

Bloom, S. (2008) *Violence against women and girls. A compendium of monitoring and evaluation indicators*. IGWG, Measure Evaluation & USAID East Africa.

Brunovskis, A & R. Surtees (2010) "Untold stories: Biases and selection effects in qualitative human trafficking research", *International Migration*.

Brunovskis, A. & R. Surtees (2007) *Leaving the past behind: when trafficking victims decline assistance*. Oslo: Fafo Institute & Washington: NEXUS Institute. Available at: <http://www.nexusinstitute.net/publications/pdfs/Leaving%20the%20past%20behind.pdf>

Craggs, S. & R. Surtees (2010) *Beneath the surface. Methodological issues in trafficking research and data collection*. Geneva: IOM & Washington: NEXUS Institute.

DAC (2002) *Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results based management*. Paris: OECD, Development Assistance Committee (DAC).

Di Maio, M. A, Kanics, J. & O. Haldorsson (2007) *Position Paper on Preventing and Responding to Trafficking of Children in Europe*. SC/SCEP.

EC (2007) *Measuring responses to Trafficking in Human Beings in the European Union: an assessment manual.*, Draft Text (September 21, 2007). Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/news/events/anti_trafficking_day_07/indicators_manual.pdf

GAATW (2007) *Collateral Damage. The impact of anti-trafficking measures on human rights around the world*. Bangkok: GAATW.

GAO (2007) *Monitoring and evaluating of international projects are limited but experts suggest improvements*. United States Government Accountability Office, Report to Congressional Requesters. Report GAO-07-1034.

Hague, G. & A. Mullender (2006) 'Who listens? The voices of domestic violence survivors in service provision in the United Kingdom', *Violence against women*. 12(6): 568-587.

Huntington, D. (2002) *Anti-trafficking programmes in South Asia: appropriate activities, indicators and evaluation methodologies, summary report of a technical consultative meeting*. New Delhi, India: Population Council.

IOM (2008) *Handbook on performance indicators for counter-trafficking projects. A handbook for project managers, developers, implementers, evaluators and donors working to counter trafficking in persons*. IOM: Geneva.

Lindgren, L. (nd) *What Does Performance Management do to Nonprofit Values?* School of Public Administration, Gothenburg University Available at: http://cipe.ca/distribution/20001012_lindgren_lena.pdf

- Lindgren, L. (2001) 'The non-profit sector meets the performance management sector: a programme-theory approach.' *Evaluation*. 7(3): 285:303.
- Ministry of Labour, Social and Equal Opportunities (2008) *Standards of social care for trafficked persons or persons at-risk of trafficking in residential centres*. Albania: Government of Albania, Ministry of Labour, Social and Equal Opportunities.
- Plan (2009a) *How to: Include Child Protection in All Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Initiatives*. Woking, Plan Ltd. Unpublished document.
- Plan (2009b) *How to: Include Ethical Standards in all Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Initiatives*. Woking, Plan Ltd. Unpublished document.
- Plan (2009c) *The Programme Accountability and Learning System (PALS)*. Woking, Plan Ltd. Unpublished document.
- Rachel, L. (2006) *Guidelines for impact or outcome evaluation, for projects funded by UNIFEM's Trust Fund to Eliminate Violence against Women*. PREM, World Bank.
- Rende Taylor, L. (2008) *Guide to ethics and human rights in counter-trafficking. Ethical standards for counter-trafficking research and programming*. Bangkok: United Nations Inter-Agency Project on Human Trafficking (UNIAP).
- Rosenberg, R. (2008) *Best Practices for Programming to Protect and Assist Victims of Trafficking in Europe and Eurasia*. Washington: USAID, Creatives Associates & JBS International.
- Save the Children (2004) *So you want to involve children in research? A toolkit supporting children's meaningful and ethical participation in research relating to violence against children*. Stockholm: Save the Children.
- Save the Children (2003) *So you want to consult with children? A toolkit of good practice*. UK: Save the Children.
- Save the Children (2000) *Children and participation. Research, monitoring and evaluation with children and young people*. UK: Save the Children.
- Schenk, K. & J. Williamson (2005) *Ethical Approaches to Gathering Information from Children and Adolescents in International Settings: Guidelines and Resources*. Washington, DC: Population Council.
- Shapiro, J. (nd) *Monitoring and evaluation*. CIVICUS.
- Somach, S. & R. Surtees (2005) *Anti-Trafficking Programmes in Albania – an Evaluation*. Tirana, Albania: USAID.
- Surtees, R. & S. Somach (2008) *Methods and models for mixing services for victims of domestic violence and trafficking in Europe and Eurasia*. Washington: USAID, Creatives Associates, JBS International & NEXUS Institute. Available at: <http://www.nexusinstitute.net/publications/pdfs/Methods%20and%20Models%20for%20Mixing%20Services%20to%20TIP%20and%20DV%20Victims.pdf>
- Surtees, R. (2009) *Anti-Trafficking Data Collection and Information Management in the European Union– a Handbook. The situation in the Czech Republic, Poland, Portugal and the Slovak Republic*. Vienna: ICMPD. Available at: <http://www.nexusinstitute.net/publications/>

Surtees, R. (2008a) *Re/integration of trafficked persons: handling "difficult" cases*. Brussels: King Baudouin Foundation & Washington: NEXUS Institute. Available at: <http://www.kbs-frb.be/publication.aspx?id=241906&LangType=1033>

Surtees, R. (2008b) *Re/integration of trafficked persons – how can our work be more effective*. Brussels: King Baudouin Foundation & Washington: NEXUS Institute. Available at: <http://www.kbs-frb.be/publication.aspx?id=241898&LangType=1033>

Surtees, R. (2008c) 'Trafficked men as unwilling victims'. *St. Antony's International Review (STAIR)*. Special issue: the politics of human trafficking. 4(1): 16-36.

Surtees, R. (2008d) *Trafficking in men from Ukraine and Belarus. A trend less considered*. Geneva: IOM Migrations Research Series. #36. Available at: <http://www.nexusinstitute.net/publications/pdfs/Trafficking%20in%20men%20-%20the%20case%20of%20Belarus%20&%20Ukraine,%20Surtees%202008.pdf>

Surtees, R. (2008e) *Why shelters? Considering residential approaches to assistance*. Washington: NEXUS Institute. Available at: <http://www.nexusinstitute.net/publications/pdfs/Why%20Shelters%20-%20%20Residential%20approaches%20to%20trafficking%20assistance%20NEXUS%202008.pdf>

Surtees, R. (2007a) *Handbook on anti-trafficking data collection in South-eastern Europe. Developing regional criteria*. Vienna: ICMPD. Available at: <http://www.nexusinstitute.net/publications/pdfs/Data%20collection%20handbook.pdf>

Surtees, R. (2007b) *Listening to victims: experiences of identification, return and assistance in SEE*. USAID & ICMPD. Available at: <http://www.nexusinstitute.net/publications/pdfs/Listening%20to%20victims.pdf>

Surtees, R. (2006a) *An Evaluation of Victim Assistance Programmes in SE Europe*. Brussels: King Baudouin Foundation.

Surtees, R. (2006b) 'Child Trafficking: Different Forms of Trafficking and Alternative Interventions'. *Tulane Journal of International & Comparative Law*. Vol. 14 (2).

Tdh (2009) *Supporting child (re)integration. Terre des homes policy paper*. Switzerland: Tdh.

UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (2009) *Convention on the Rights of the Child, General Comment No. 12, the right of the child to be heard*. UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, UN document CRC/C/GC/12, 1 July 2009.

UNOHCHR (2002) *Recommended Principles and Guidelines on Human Rights and Human Trafficking*, Addendum to the Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to the Economic and Social Council, UN document E/2002/68/Add.1, 20 May 2002.

Available at: <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/Traffickingen.pdf>

USAID (1996) *What are performance indicators?* Washington: USAID Center for Development Information and Evaluation. Available at: http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/usaid_eval/#02

Warnath, S. (2009) *Best practices in trafficking prevention in Europe and Eurasia*. Washington: USAID, Creatives Associates, JBS International & NEXUS Institute. Available at: <http://www.nexusinstitute.net/publications/pdfs/Prevention.pdf>

APPENDIX 1:

Organisations working on re/integration through KBF's Trafficking Victims Re/integration Programme (TVRP) in SEE

Within the framework of its project "Assisting the Victims of Human Trafficking" (AvoT), the King Baudouin Foundation (KBF) launched the "Trafficking Victims Re/integration Programme" (TVRP) in order to enhance the scope and capacity of re/integration programmes for trafficking victims in Albania, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Romania, Serbia and Kosovo. The Trafficking Victims Re/integration Programme (TVRP) aims to support programmes that result in sustainable re/integration of victims, build NGO capacity in this sector, encourage cooperation and synergies with government agencies, to identify effective re/integration models and, very importantly, to promote sustainable re/integration programmes. Grants totalling eight hundred seventy-five thousand Euros over four years (2007 to 2011) have been awarded to nine NGO's from those SEE countries.

Different and Equal (D&E), Albania

Different & Equal (D&E) is a non-profit organisation offering a wide range of qualified services toward the protection and re/integration of trafficking victims or those at-risk of trafficking as well as working in the areas of awareness raising, prevention and training. D&E's main activities include: re/integration assistance for former Albanian victims of trafficking and their families; prevention activities amongst vulnerable groups, especially children and youth; income generating activities for programme beneficiaries; training of NGOs and state institutions; and supporting the Albanian National Referral Mechanism. For more details, see www.differentandequal.org or contact Different and Equal (D&E) at: different&equal@icc-al.org

Tjeter Vizion (Another Vision), Albania

"Tjeter Vizion" (Another Vision), with its headquarters in Elbasan, offers services for women, children and youth. For nearly six years, Tjeter Vizion has been offering social care services for vulnerable categories of the population (including children, youth and women) in Elbasan, Gramsch and surrounding areas. Services for trafficking victims are both residential and non-residential and are designed for the individual needs of victims toward an independent system of living. Tjeter Vizion is a member of the National Reference Mechanism for the Victims of Trafficking (NRMVT) and of various Albanian coalitions and international networks. For more details, contact Different and Equal (D&E) at: tjetervizion@gmail.com

Animus Association, Bulgaria

Animus Association Foundation was founded in 1994 with the aim of providing space where women and children victims of violence could receive professional help and non-victimising attitude. Animus has been working against trafficking and in support of victims since 1997. In 1998, Animus Association became part of the La Strada International programme for prevention of trafficking in women in Central and Eastern Europe. For the past eight years, Animus has worked against violence and trafficking of women and children in Bulgaria. Animus' anti-trafficking activities are organised around three main areas of work: 1) residential assistance at the rehabilitation centre, 2) community work including lobbying and prevention activities and 3) training of NGO and GO partners in Bulgaria and abroad toward the transfers its experience and model of work. For more details, see <http://www.animusassociation.org> or contact Animus Association at: animus@animusassociation.org

Nadja Centre, Bulgaria

In 1995, with the financial support by Novib in the Netherlands, Nadja Centre was established as a project of the Bulgarian Women's Union to respond to the needs of victims of violence. Nadja is a psychosocial care centre for women and children victims of violence. The centre provides a variety of services including a telephone help-line; psychological, medical, legal, and social counselling; psychotherapy; and referral services. The Nadja team has experience in implementing projects related to psychological, medical and juridical consultations provided to women and children victims of domestic violence and trafficking and has branches throughout Bulgaria – in Russe, Sandanski, Turgovishte and Kjustendil. Nadja Centre continues to implement projects related to prevention of violence, giving priority to child sexual abuse and re-integration programmes for victims of trafficking, both women and children. For more details, see <http://www.centrenadja.hit.bg/index.html> or contact Nadja centre at: nadja@cablebg.net

Center for Protection of Victims and Prevention of Trafficking in Human Beings (PVPT), Kosovo

PVPT is a non-governmental organisation that works to address the causes and consequences of violence through a multi-sectoral approach (e.g. socio-economic long term services, awareness raising, advocacy, and research) and facilitates empowerment of its target population. PVPT staff has been working in the field of anti-trafficking since 2000, both on direct assistance and on trafficking prevention and awareness-raising. Since 2005, PVPT has been working on the long-term reintegration of victims of the worst forms of child labour, including trafficking, and, in July 2008, opened the Kosovo Rehabilitation Centre, which is an open shelter for trafficked women and children. This Centre provides survivors of trafficking with long term re/integration services, including shelter, medical care, psychological assistance, legal counselling, educational and professional opportunities and empowerment sessions. The PVPT Centre operates in close cooperation and partnership with various government ministries (e.g. Ministry of Internal Affairs, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, Ministry of Education Science and Technology) as well as international and national organisations. For more details, see www.pvptcenter.net or contact PVPT at: pvpt_ngo@gmail.com

Open Gate, Macedonia

Open Gate – La Strada Macedonia is a non-government, non-profit organisation registered in September 2000. It provides psychological and social support to victims of trafficking in persons and those at-risk as well as working in the field of prevention. As a part of its' social assistance programme, the "Residence", a shelter for victims of trafficking, offers specialised services such as safe accommodation, food, clothing, psycho-social support, medical treatment, legal aid, vocational training, on-job training or help with opening a small business. A team of trained professionals, including social workers and psychologists, is available 24 hours-a-day. For more details, see www.lastrada.org.mk or contact Open Gate at: lastrada@on.net.mk

Adpare, Romania

ADPARE is a Romanian NGO working exclusively in the area of trafficking in human beings. The main activity of ADPARE is re/integration assistance for victims of trafficking. ADPARE offers equal services for victims of external and internal trafficking; victims of different kinds of exploitation in the trafficking period; women and men. For more details, see <http://www.adpare.ro/> or contact ADPARE at info@adpare.ro or contact@adpare.ro

Young Generation, Romania

Association "Generatie Tanara" (Unga Liv) Romania was created in 2001. "Generatie Tanara" (Unga Liv) Romania is a non-governmental, democratic, non profit, independent, non-religious and non-political association which promotes children's rights in Romania according to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, and promotes family rights according to various international treaties and conventions. Other main activities are: prevention and combating of trafficking in human beings; assistance toward the re/integration of THB victims; and assistance for asylum-seekers, refugees and refugee children. For more details, see www.generatietanara.ro or contact Young Generation at: office@generatietanara.ro

Atina, Serbia

Founded in 2004, NGO ATINA provides direct assistance and support toward the re/integration to victims of trafficking. The key objective of ATINA's programme is the establishment and improvement direct assistance and support to victims of trafficking in order to provide for their psycho-physical recovery, empowerment and, thus, sustainable re/integration. Assistance and support in re/integration are provided to beneficiaries within three separate programmes: 1) the transition house (a semi-independent residential programme), 2) the open club (a non-residential programme) and 3) the field support team. Beneficiaries of ATINA's programmes are women and children, Serbian citizens and foreigner nationals holding temporary residence permits, victims of trafficking for labour and sexual exploitation. Each individual programme of assistance is based on the unconditional respect for beneficiary's human rights, mutual cooperation, respect and tolerance. Individual programmes are developed in cooperation with each beneficiary to be able to fully meet their individual needs and help them regain control over their lives. For more details, see www.atina.org.rs or contact ATINA at: atinango@eunet.yu

NEXUS Institute, Washington

NEXUS is a multi-disciplinary policy and research centre dedicated to developing more effective counter-trafficking laws, policies and practices. NEXUS has produced a number of trafficking studies, including on victim assistance and re/integration work in SEE and other regions. NEXUS provides technical assistance to KBF as part of the TVRP programme. For more details, see www.nexusinstitute.net or contact Stephen Warnath, Executive Director at swarnath@nexusinstitute.net

APPENDIX 2:

Working terms and definitions⁴²

Accountability: Obligation to demonstrate that work has been conducted in compliance with agreed rules and standards or to report fairly and accurately on performance results vis a vis mandated roles and/or plans. This may require a careful, even legally defensible, demonstration that the work is consistent with the contract terms.

Anti-trafficking actors: Persons from GOs, NGOs or IOs who are involved in efforts to combat trafficking in persons.

Assistance and protection: Measures, programmes and services aimed at the recovery of trafficked persons as outlined in Article 6 of the Palermo Protocol. These may be offered by non-governmental, governmental or international organisations in countries of destination, transit and origin. These might include but are not limited to accommodation/housing, medical care, psychological assistance, education, vocational training, employment, legal assistance and transportation. Assistance may involve one or multiple services.

Baseline study: An analysis describing the situation prior to a development intervention, against which progress can be assessed or comparisons made.

Beneficiaries: The individuals, groups or organisations, whether targeted or not, that benefit, directly or indirectly, from the intervention.

Child: Anyone under the age of 18 years.

Empowerment: The process by which trafficked persons are equipped with the skills and ability to lead an autonomous life.

Evaluation: Evaluation attempts to determine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, effectiveness and impact of activities in the light of project objectives. It is generally done upon completion of the programme (an ex post evaluation) and looks at what the programme set out to do, what it has accomplished and how it was accomplished. There are also mid-term evaluations, which measure and allow for mid-stream programme adjustments and ex-ante evaluations, which are performed before implementation to ensure appropriate programme design.

Impact: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Indicator: Indicators are the quantitative and qualitative ways of measuring change which result from programme activities

Lessons learned: Generalisations based on evaluation experiences with projects, programmes, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader

.....
⁴² Many of the definitions and terminologies are taken from Surtees, R. (2005) *Regional Clearing Point's Second Annual Report on Victims of Trafficking in SEE*. Geneva: IOM and Surtees, R. (2007) *Listening to victims: experiences of identification, return and assistance in SEE*. Vienna: ICMPD. Evaluation related terms are primarily taken from DAC (2002) *Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results based management*. Paris: OECD, Development Assistance Committee (DAC).

situations. Frequently, lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome and impact.

Means of verification: Sources of information which can measure whether the indicators have realised the objective/results.

Monitoring: Monitoring is the continuous oversight of the implementation of project activities, assessing progress, identifies operational difficulties and recommending actions. Monitoring is aimed at improving the efficiency and effectiveness of a project and ensures that activities are transformed into results/outputs. It is undertaken during the course of the project.

Re/integration: Re/integration refers to the process of recovery and economic and social inclusion following a trafficking experience. This inclusion is multifaceted and must take place in social and economic arenas. It includes settlement in a safe and secure environment, access to a reasonable standard of living, mental and physical well-being, opportunities for personal and economic development and access to social and emotional support. In many cases, re/integration will involve the return to the victim's family and/or community of origin. However, it may also involve integration in a new community and even in a new country, depending on the needs and interests of the victim. A central aspect of successful re/integration is that of empowerment, supporting victims to develop skills toward independence and self sufficiency and to be actively involved in their recovery and re/integration.

Recovery: The process by which persons who have experienced abuse and/or exploitation achieve physical and mental well-being.

Service providers: Organisations and individuals that provide one or more of the range of services and assistance provided to trafficking victims. These may include social workers, psychologists, shelter staff, medical personnel or legal professionals from NGOs, IOs and GOs.

Stigma: A mark of disgrace on one's reputation. Stigma occurs when the social environment – whether family or community – disapproves of an individual's behaviour or activities.

Sustainability: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.

Trafficking victim/trafficked person: For many people, the term "victim" implies powerlessness and constructs identity around the individual's victimisation. At the same time, from a human rights framework, the term "victim" is important as it designates the violation experienced and the responsibility for redress. It is for this reason that the term "victim" is used in this paper. The term "trafficked person" is also used because it too acknowledges that person's trafficking experience as central and in need to redress. Both terms designate persons who qualify as victims of trafficking in accordance with Article 3 of the UN trafficking Protocol and/or according to relevant national legislation.

APPENDIX 3

Sample from Matrix #1. Monitoring individual re/integration plans of trafficked persons

This is a sample of matrix 1 which appears in the KBF TVRP monitoring manual – *Monitoring anti-trafficking re/integration programmes. A manual*. Matrix 1 monitors the individual re/integration plans of trafficked persons. The matrix below is not complete; it includes only some of the “impact indicators” which cumulatively constitute a victim’s re/integration plan. The full list of “impact indicators” currently outlined in matrix 1 includes:

- *Safe and affordable accommodation*. This refers to whether the victim has access to a safe, secure and affordable place to live, whether provided by an organisation, institution or privately arranged.
- *Legal status*. This relates to the victim’s legal situation – e.g. whether they have legal status (i.e. have been registered at birth, are citizens), have access to their identity documents or have been provided with temporary or permanent residency in the case of foreign victims.
- *Professional/employment opportunities*. This refers to the victim’s professional/employment opportunities, which might include employment or income generation activities.
- *Education and training opportunities*. This refers to victim’s educational and training opportunities – e.g. educational qualifications (both formal and informal), professional/vocational skills and training, life skills, and other training/skills.
- *Security and safety*. This refers to the victim’s physical safety and well-being, including whether they are exposed to threats or violence by the trafficker or by other persons within the community/country.
- *Healthy social environment (including anti-discrimination and anti-marginalisation)*. This considers whether victims face problems in their social environment related to their trafficking and/or because of social discrimination or marginalization pre-trafficking.
- *Social well-being and positive interpersonal relations*. This refers to the victim’s social relations including vis a vis peers, family, spouses/intimate partner and the community.
- *Economic situation*. This refers to the victim’s economy – e.g. the ability to earn money, support family members, etc.
- *Physical well-being*. This considers the individual’s physical health – e.g. any medical issues/problems, disabilities, physical constraints and general sense of physical well-being.
- *Mental well-being*. This refers to the victim’s mental health as well as their more generalized mental well being such as self esteem and self acceptance.
- *Access to services and opportunities*. This refers to whether the victim has access to services and opportunities which are of importance in recovering from trafficking as well as those needed by people generally for personal, social and economic well-being.
- *Motivation and commitment to re/integration process*. This considers the extent to which the individual victim demonstrates commitment and motivation to realising re/integration.

The matrix, currently in draft form, is being tested by re/integration organisations and is likely to change substantially based on the experiences and inputs of TVRP partner organisations during the testing period. It will be finalised in the forthcoming phase of the TVRP programme, 2009-2011. See: Surtees forthcoming. That being said, monitoring tools such as this should, arguably, always be “in progress” given that successful re/integration involves the efficient and ethical provision of services and assistance to beneficiaries whose needs are diverse, complex and often changing.

Impact indicators	Baseline information (completed upon identification and/or entry into the programme)	Crisis intervention (0-6 months)	Transition phase (7-12 months)	Re/integration/social inclusion (13-36 months)
Safe & affordable accommodation	<p>Number of beneficiaries: 43</p> <p>Number of beneficiaries who are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - foreigners and nationals - minors and adults - male and female - residential and non-residential - victims of sex THB; labour THB; begging; other <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who have access to safe, adequate and affordable accommodation (e.g. shelter, with family, alternative placement, etc.)</p> <p>Means of verification: Shelter entry form, document for subsidised housing</p> <p>And/or:</p> <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries for whom it was not possible to find an option for safe, adequate and affordable accommodation</p> <p>Means of verification: Case files, case worker assessment</p>	<p>Number of beneficiaries currently in this phase: 43</p> <p>Number of beneficiaries who are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - foreigners and nationals - minors and adults - male and female - residential and non-residential - victims of sex THB; labour THB; begging; other <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who have access to safe, adequate and affordable accommodation (e.g. shelter, with family, alternative placement, etc.)</p> <p>Means of verification: Shelter entry form, document for subsidised housing</p> <p>And/or:</p> <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries for whom it was not possible to find an option for safe, adequate and affordable accommodation</p> <p>Means of verification: Case files, case worker assessment</p>	<p>Number of beneficiaries currently in this phase: _____</p> <p>Number of beneficiaries who are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - foreigners and nationals - minors and adults - male and female - residential and non-residential - victims of sex THB; labour THB; begging; other <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who have access to safe, adequate and affordable accommodation (e.g. independent or semi-independent housing, foster care for minors, protected apartments for minors, family home)</p> <p>Means of verification: Entry form for semi independent living, rental/lease agreement for independent apartment, beneficiary progress report</p> <p>And/or:</p> <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries for whom it was not possible to find an option for safe, adequate and affordable accommodation</p> <p>Means of verification: Case files, case worker assessment</p>	<p>Number of beneficiaries currently in this phase: _____</p> <p>Number of beneficiaries who are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - foreigners and nationals - minors and adults - male and female - residential and non-residential - victims of sex THB; labour THB; begging; other <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries living independently – either in an independent house/apartment or with family or within an alternative care structure (e.g. foster care, protected apartments for minors)</p> <p>Means of verification: Rental/lease agreement for independent apartment, statement that of living arrangement, case files</p> <p>And/or:</p> <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries for whom it was not possible to find an option for safe, adequate and affordable accommodation</p> <p>Means of verification: Case files, case worker assessment</p>
Legal status	<p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who are satisfied with their accommodation (e.g. they deem it safe, of a satisfactory standard, affordable)</p> <p>Means of verification: Beneficiary satisfaction form, interview with beneficiary</p> <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who do not have legal status</p> <p>Means of verification: Intake form, case manager report</p>	<p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who are satisfied with their accommodation (e.g. they deem it safe, of a satisfactory standard, affordable)</p> <p>Means of verification: Beneficiary satisfaction form, interview with beneficiary</p> <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who received general legal assistance and information related to their legal status</p> <p>Means of verification: Case manager report, referral notes for legal assistance, attendance list from legal assistance sessions, report from legal consultant or social worker</p>	<p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who are satisfied with their accommodation (e.g. they deem it safe, of a satisfactory standard, affordable)</p> <p>Means of verification: Beneficiary satisfaction form, interview with beneficiary</p> <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who received legal assistance and information which they use to address their legal needs – e.g. document processing, birth registration, etc.</p> <p>Means of verification: Case manager report, referral notes for legal assistance, attendance list from legal assistance sessions, report from legal consultant or social worker</p>	<p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who are satisfied with their accommodation (e.g. they deem it safe, of a satisfactory standard, affordable)</p> <p>Means of verification: Beneficiary satisfaction form, interview with beneficiary</p> <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries whose legal status issues have been resolved</p> <p>Means of verification: Evaluation form, case files, report from legal consultant or social worker, copy of legal documents</p>

43 Please note that the number of beneficiaries currently in any of the three phases should include new and on-going cases. In some cases, on-going cases will fall within the crisis phase, even after a period of intervention. In some cases, beneficiaries who enter a programme may no longer be in the crisis phase, having passed this period either outside of the programme or without any assistance.

	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total foreign beneficiaries who receive temporary or permanent residence permit (as VoT or for other reasons) <i>Means of verification:</i> Copy of TRP or permanent stay document</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total foreign beneficiaries who receive all necessary documentation – e.g. birth certificate, identity papers, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Copy of documents, receipts for document processing fees, timesheets for staff time</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total foreign beneficiaries who have been able to access to (free) state services – e.g. medical, social assistance, education, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Documents related to service entitlements, appointments at various service agencies</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total national child beneficiaries for whom appropriate interim care options are identified and arranged <i>Means of verification:</i> legal document specifying guardianship</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of foreign minor beneficiaries for whom appropriate long term care options are identified and arranged <i>Means of verification:</i> legal document specifying guardianship, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries facing improvements within their social environment (family, school and/or community). <i>Means of verification:</i> Assessment of case manager, report from the social worker and case manager, incidents reported by beneficiaries</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who participate in activities that promote self and mutual respect <i>Means of verification:</i> Lack of conflict in social environment, lack of discrimination, beneficiary feedback forms.</p>
<p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries whose legal status issues have been resolved <i>Means of verification:</i> Evaluation form, case files, monitoring section in the re/integration plan</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total foreign beneficiaries who receive temporary or permanent residence permit and/or extension of residence permit (as VoT or for other reason) <i>Means of verification:</i> Copy of TRP document</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who have received all necessary documentation – e.g. birth certificate, identity papers, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Copy of documents, receipts for document processing fees, timesheets for staff time</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who have been able to access to (free) state services – e.g. medical, social assistance, education, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Documents related to service entitlements, appointments at various service agencies</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total national child beneficiaries for whom appropriate interim care options are identified and arranged <i>Means of verification:</i> legal document specifying guardianship, case files</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of foreign child beneficiaries for whom appropriate long term care options are identified and arranged <i>Means of verification:</i> legal document specifying guardianship, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries facing improvements within their social environment (family, school and/or community). <i>Means of verification:</i> Assessment of case manager, report from the social worker and case manager, incidents reported by beneficiaries</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who participate in activities that promote self and mutual respect <i>Means of verification:</i> Lack of conflict in social environment, lack of discrimination, beneficiary feedback forms.</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total foreign beneficiaries who receive temporary residence permit (as VoT or for other reason) <i>Means of verification:</i> copy of TRP document</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who have received all necessary documentation – e.g. birth certificate, identity papers, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Copy of documents, receipts for document processing fees, timesheets for staff time</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who have been able to access to (free) state services – e.g. medical, social assistance, education <i>Means of verification:</i> Documents related to service entitlements, appointments at various service agencies</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total national child beneficiaries who require appointment of a legal guardian <i>Means of verification:</i> Legal document specifying guardianship</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of foreign child beneficiaries who are appointed a legal guardian <i>Means of verification:</i> Legal document specifying guardianship</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries facing improvements within their social environment (family, school and/or community). <i>Means of verification:</i> Assessment of case manager, report from the social worker and case manager, incidents reported by beneficiaries</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who participate in activities that promote self and mutual respect <i>Means of verification:</i> Lack of conflict in shelter, lack of discrimination, good relations between social workers and beneficiaries, beneficiary feedback forms.</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who face issues of self and mutual respect <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total foreign beneficiaries who require temporary or permanent residence permit <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager report</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require documentation – e.g. birth certificate, identity papers, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager report</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require access to (free) state services – e.g. medical, social assistance, education <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager report</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total national child beneficiaries who require appointment of a legal guardian <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker assessment</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of foreign child beneficiaries who require appointment of a legal guardian <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries facing discrimination within their social environment (family, school and/or community). <i>Means of verification:</i> Assessment of case manager, incidents reported by beneficiaries</p>	<p>Healthy social environment, including anti-discrimination & anti-marginalisation</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who face issues of self and mutual respect <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>

<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who face issues of discrimination in their social context. <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with information and knowledge about their right to non-discrimination, evaluation for the social context. <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker assessment, feedback from beneficiaries.</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with ability to work through problems of discrimination and presence of assertive behaviour <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker assessment.</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with improved capacity to manage discriminatory situations. <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker assessment, feedback from beneficiaries</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with further improved capacity to manage discriminatory situations. <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker assessment, feedback from beneficiaries</p>
<p>Social well-being positive interpersonal relations</p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with bad family relationship <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with improved family relationship – e.g. re-established contact with at least one member of their primary/ secondary family. <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker assessment, contact with family members, meetings with parents, beneficiary interview</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with good family relationships <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker assessment, contact with family members, beneficiary interview</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with improved family relationship – e.g. re-established contact with at least one member of their primary/ secondary family. <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker assessment, contact with family members, meetings with parents, beneficiary interview</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who have good family relationships and/or regular contact with friends <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary interview, case worker assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with good family relationship – e.g. contact with at least two members of their primary/ secondary family. <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary interview, case worker assessment, contact with family members, meetings with parents, visits to their families, living with their families</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who have good family relationships <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary interview, case worker assessment</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require professional counselling toward improved family relations <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker assessment, attendance at counselling sessions, counsellor reports, beneficiary interview</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are engaged in improvement of family relationships under professional counselling. <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker assessment, attendance at counselling sessions, counsellor reports, beneficiary interview</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are engaged in and/or achieved improvement of family relationships under professional counselling. <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker assessment, attendance at counselling sessions, counsellor reports, beneficiary interview</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with improved family relations – for example, regular contact, living with family, etc <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary interview, case worker assessment, completion of counselling sessions, counsellor reports, monitoring reports</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are engaged in and/or achieved improvement of family relationships under professional counselling. <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker assessment, attendance at counselling sessions, counsellor reports, beneficiary interview</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who have good family relationships and/or regular contact with friends <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary interview, case worker assessment</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who have poor relations with existing or new intimate partner/spouse <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who improve relations with existing or new intimate partner/spouse <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary reports, case manager reports, counsellors reports, regular contact with partner/spouse</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who establish healthy emotional relationships with partner/spouse, of a minimum duration of three months. <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, beneficiary feedback forms or interview</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who establish healthy emotional relationships with partner or spouse that lasts more than six months. <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, beneficiary feedback forms or interview</p>

<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who need assistance in improving relations with existing or new intimate partner/spouse <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who lack social networks <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who improved partner/spouse relationships through professional counselling. <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary interview or feedback, case worker assessment, attendance at counselling sessions, counsellor reports</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with improved partner/spouse relationships through professional counselling. <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary interview or feedback, case worker assessment, attendance at counselling sessions, counsellor reports</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who maintain established relationships within and/or outside the re/integration programme <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker assessment of exiting peer network and relationships, case managers notes, observation by staff, beneficiary interview</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who improved relations with partner/spouse through professional counselling <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary interview or feedback, case worker assessment, attendance at counselling sessions, counsellor reports</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who have difficulty in establishing and managing relations in the broader social environment – e.g. with employers, neighbours, community members, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who create social networks and contacts with peers (old or new peers) and/or other programme beneficiaries and/or family/relatives <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker assessment of exiting peer network and relationships, case managers notes, beneficiary interview</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are able to establish and manage relations in the broader social environment – e.g. with employers, neighbours, community members, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary interview or feedback, case worker assessment, counsellor reports</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are able to establish and manage relations in the broader social environment – e.g. with employers, neighbours, community members, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary interview or feedback, case worker assessment, counsellor reports</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who mobilise skills from life skills training toward improved social skills and relations <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker reports, interviews with beneficiaries, attendance/completion of course</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who mobilise skills from life skills training toward improved social skills and relations <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker reports, interviews with beneficiaries, attendance/completion of course</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require life skills training toward improved social skills <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who receive life skills training toward improved social skills <i>Means of verification:</i> Case worker reports, interviews with beneficiaries, attendance/completion of course</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who have a poor, average and good economic situation <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries assessed to have an improved economic situation <i>Means of verification:</i> Assessment of case manager, information from beneficiary, social worker report</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries whose basic needs are increasingly met at least in part by themselves (or family) rather than the re/integration organisation (or other support services) <i>Means of verification:</i> Exit form from shelter, entry form for semi-independent living, proof of employment, case manager reports</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries whose basic needs are met entirely or primarily by themselves (or family) rather than the re/integration organisation (or other support services) <i>Means of verification:</i> Exit form from shelter and/or semi-independent living apartment, proof of employment, case manager reports</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require assistance with basic needs – for example, the provision of food, clothes, hygienic set, accommodation <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries whose basic needs are satisfied by the re/integration organisation – for example, the provision of food, clothes, hygienic set, accommodation <i>Means of verification:</i> Shelter entry form, signature of non-residential beneficiaries receiving food packs, hygiene sets, clothes, etc.</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require assistance with education, legal assistance, training courses, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries whose ancillary needs are increasingly met at least in part by themselves rather than the re/integration organisation (or other support services) – for example, assistance with education, legal assistance, training courses, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Proof of employment, case manager reports, beneficiary feedback</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries whose ancillary needs are increasingly met at least in part by themselves rather than the re/integration organisation (or other support services) – for example, assistance with education, legal assistance, training courses, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Proof of employment, case manager reports, beneficiary feedback</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries whose ancillary needs are met entirely or primarily by themselves rather than the re/integration organisation (or other support services) – for example, assistance with education, legal assistance, training courses, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Proof of employment, case manager reports, beneficiary feedback</p>
<p>Economic situation</p>					

<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who have sufficient financial resources to establish independent life – for example, pensions, social assistance payments, employment, family support, alimony, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, social workers documentation, beneficiary information</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total child beneficiaries whose parent/ guardian has been assisted in finding employment or income generation in the re/integration phase <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary interview, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require and receive on-going medical care <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are in good physical condition <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff report, doctor treatment received, beneficiary reports</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who required and received specialised medical care – for example, for a specialist problem, to manage a difficult case – which has resulted in long term management/ cure of the problem <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require and receive psychological assistance, and have ceased treatment <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners <i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are psychologically healthy following assistance – for example, no longer show visible signs of trauma <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, monitoring reports, ability to work, successful social relations</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who have income and than assistance received from the re/integration organisation – for example, pensions, social assistance payments, employment, family support, alimony, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, social workers documentation, beneficiary information</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total child beneficiaries whose parent/ guardian has been assisted in finding employment or income generation in the transition phase <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary interview, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who required and received longer term medical care <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are in an improved physical condition <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff report, doctor treatment received, beneficiary reports</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who required and received specialised medical care – for example, for a specialist problem, to manage a difficult case – which has resulted in long term management/ cure of the problem <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require and receive psychological assistance, and have ceased treatment <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners <i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are psychologically healthy following assistance – for example, no longer show visible signs of trauma <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, monitoring reports, ability to work, successful social relations</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who have income other than assistance received from the re/integration organisation – for example, pensions, social assistance payments, employment, family support, alimony, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, social workers documentation, beneficiary information</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total child beneficiaries whose parent/ guardian has been assisted in finding employment or income generation in the crisis phase <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary interview, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who required and received emergency medical care <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners, forensic medicine documents, receipts for medicines/prescriptions</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are in an improved physical condition <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff report, doctor treatment received, beneficiary reports</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who required and received specialised medical care – for example, for a specialist problem, to manage a difficult case <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require and receive psychological assistance <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who have income from the re/integration organisation – for example, pensions, social assistance payments, employment, family support, alimony, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total child beneficiaries whose parent/ guardian need assistance in finding employment or income generation <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who required and received emergency medical care <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment, medical assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are identified in poor physical condition <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment, medical assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who required and received specialised medical care – for example, for a specialist problem, to manage a difficult case <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment, medical assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require and receive psychological assistance <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment, psychological assessment</p>
<p>Physical well-being</p>					
	<p>Mental well-being</p>				

<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are identified in poor mental condition <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment, psychological assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are in an improved mental condition <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff report, doctor treatment received, psychological assessment, beneficiary reports</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are in an improved mental condition <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff report, doctor treatment received, psychological assessment, beneficiary reports</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are in good mental condition <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff report, doctor treatment received, psychological assessment, beneficiary reports</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require and receive psychiatric assessment and specific psychiatric treatment <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment, psychological assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require and receive psychiatric assessment and specific psychiatric treatment <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioner</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require and receive psychiatric treatment <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners, report from psychiatrist</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require and receive psychiatric treatment <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners, report from psychiatrist</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are assessed to no longer require psychiatric treatment <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners, report from psychiatrist</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require and receive hospitalisation in psychiatric facilities <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment, psychological assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require and receive hospitalisation in psychiatric facilities <i>Means of verification:</i> Hospital records, staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require and receive hospitalisation in psychiatric facilities <i>Means of verification:</i> Hospital records, staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require and receive hospitalisation in psychiatric facilities <i>Means of verification:</i> Hospital records, staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require assistance in initiating and attending meetings with mental health professional on a regular basis. <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require assistance in initiating and attending meetings with mental health professional on a regular basis. <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require assistance in initiating and attending meetings with mental health professional on a regular basis. <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require assistance in initiating and attending meetings with mental health professional on a regular basis. <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who initiate and attend meetings with mental health professional on regular basis. <i>Means of verification:</i> Staff reports, payment receipts from private practitioners</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require assistance and support in coping with their every day challenges <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment, psychological assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require assistance and support in coping with their every day challenges <i>Means of verification:</i> Report of professionals (psychologists, psychiatrists), observation of organisational staff, monitoring reports</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require assistance and support in coping with their every day challenges <i>Means of verification:</i> Report of professionals (psychologists, psychiatrists), observation of organisational staff, monitoring reports</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require assistance and support in coping with their every day challenges <i>Means of verification:</i> Report of professionals (psychologists, psychiatrists), observation of organisational staff, monitoring reports</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who cope with their every day challenges independently and successfully. <i>Means of verification:</i> Report of professionals (psychologists, psychiatrists), observation of organisational staff, monitoring reports</p>

<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who lack the ability to re/integrate in communities as defined by positive interactions with staff and peers, self confidence, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment, psychological assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who demonstrate greater resiliency and ability to re/integrate in communities as defined by positive interactions with staff and peers, self confidence, re-entry to school or vocational training or take up employment living independently or with family <i>Means of verification:</i> Case files, case worker assessment, beneficiary interview</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who demonstrate greater resiliency and ability to re/integrate in communities as defined by positive interactions with staff and peers, self confidence, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Case files, case worker assessment, beneficiary interview</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who demonstrate greater resiliency and ability to re/integrate in communities as defined by positive interactions with staff and peers, self confidence, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Case files, case worker assessment, beneficiary interview</p>
<p>Motivation and commitment to re/integration process</p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are assessed by staff as committed to assistance and re/integration work <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are able to accept the objectives and the activities underlined in the re/integration plan and start to fulfil these obligations. <i>Means of verification:</i> Periodical progress report, information from case record files, evaluation from the case manager, action plan</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are able to accept the objectives and the activities underlined in the re/integration plan and start to fulfil these obligations. <i>Means of verification:</i> Entry declaration assigned both by case worker and beneficiary, assessment of psychologist and social worker</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who participate in programme activities <i>Means of verification:</i> Attendance lists, case worker notes <i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who regularly participate in the activities related to re/integration plan – e.g. life skills, training, counselling, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Attendance list from activities, report from case manager</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who will benefit from participation in programme activities <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who initiate contact with other services and organisations which can support their transition and re/integration <i>Means of verification:</i> Reports from other organisations, case files, beneficiary interview</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who initiate contact with other services and organisations which can support their transition and re/integration <i>Means of verification:</i> Reports from other organisations, case files, beneficiary interview <i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who regularly participate in the activities related to re/integration plan – e.g. life skills, training, counselling, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Attendance list from activities, report from case manager</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who access other services needed to further support their re/integration <i>Means of verification:</i> Reports from other organisations, case files, beneficiary interview <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who have completed programmes activities which are related to their re/integration plan – e.g. find a job, independent living, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Completion of courses, departure from programme, report from case manager</p>
<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require assistance with living costs – for example, rent, utilities, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Intake form, case manager assessment</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who assume full (or almost full) responsibility for living costs – for example, rent, utilities, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Case files, budget of organisation, monitoring reports</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who assume partial responsibility for living costs – for example, rent, utilities, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Case files, budget of organisation, monitoring reports</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who assume full (or almost full) responsibility for living costs – for example, rent, utilities, etc. <i>Means of verification:</i> Case files, budget of organisation, monitoring reports</p>

This is a sample of matrix 2 which appears in the KBF TVRP monitoring manual – *Monitoring anti-trafficking re/integration programmes. A manual*. Matrix 2 monitors the re/integration services offered to trafficked persons. Services are monitored from the perspective of beneficiaries as well as by anti-trafficking professionals – those who work directly on re/integration programmes as well as, wherever possible, professionals which provide different forms of assistance within the context of the overall re/integration work – for example, doctors and nurses who provide medical services or lawyers who provide legal advice and representation.

The matrix below is not complete; it includes only some of the “impact indicators” (or services) which cumulatively constitute re/integration assistance. The full list of “impact indicators” which may be needed at these different stages of re/integration and currently outlined in matrix 2 include:

- *Accommodation*. This refers to all accommodation assistance – e.g. shelter, protected living, subsidised housing – as well as where victims live independently but are monitored by the programme – e.g. with family or partner, independent housing.
- *Legal assistance*. This refers to all forms of legal assistance – e.g. document processing, assistance in accessing state services, compensation claims, representation and advice in civil procedures, assistance/support in criminal procedures including as a victim/witness.
- *Medical assistance*. This refers to all medical services both general and specialised, offered by both state and NGOs/IOs. Psychiatric assistance falls within this service area.
- *Psychological assistance*. This refers to all psychological services offered to trafficked persons, by the state, NGOs or IOs.
- *Education and professional/vocational training*. This refers to all forms of education and training made available to trafficked persons – e.g. formal education, education reinsertion programmes, informal education, life skills, vocational training, etc.
- *Economic opportunities*. This refers to the various forms of economic assistance offered – e.g. job placement, micro/small business and income generating activities.
- *Family mediation and counselling*. This refers to assistance related to assessing and, where appropriate, assisting in improving family relations.
- *Case monitoring and follow-up*. This refers to the regular monitoring of each case by state or NGO service providers.
- *Assistance to secondary beneficiaries*. This refers to assistance needed by victims’ dependents and within their social environment – e.g. assistance to the family and dependents of VoTs or initiatives with community members where re/integration takes place.

The matrix, currently in draft form, is being tested by re/integration organisations and is likely to change substantially based on the experiences and inputs of TVRP partner organisations during the testing period. It will be finalised in the forthcoming phase of the TVRP programme, 2009-2011. See: Surtees forthcoming. That being said, monitoring tools such as this should, arguably, always be “in progress” given that successful re/integration involves the efficient and ethical provision of services and assistance to beneficiaries whose needs are diverse, complex and often changing.

Impact indicator: Education and professional/vocational training

Monitored by beneficiaries			Monitored by professionals		
<p>Phase 1: Crisis</p> <p>Please specify the # of beneficiaries currently in this phase: _____</p>	<p>Phase 2: Transition</p> <p>Please specify the # of beneficiaries currently in this phase: _____</p>	<p>Phase 3: Re/integration</p> <p>Please specify the # of beneficiaries currently in this phase: _____</p>	<p>Phase 1: Crisis</p> <p>Please specify the # of beneficiaries currently in this phase: _____</p>	<p>Phase 2: Transition</p> <p>Please specify the # of beneficiaries currently in this phase: _____</p>	<p>Phase 3: Re/integration</p> <p>Please specify the # of beneficiaries currently in this phase: _____</p>
<p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who are offered education courses (formal or informal)</p> <p>Means of verification: List of the available courses, enrolment lists, case files, beneficiary inputs/feedback</p> <p>And/or:</p> <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who are offered different training courses which are relevant for their needs</p> <p>Means of verification: List of the available courses, enrolment lists, case files, beneficiary inputs/feedback</p>			<p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who complete education courses (formal or informal).</p> <p>Means of verification: Beneficiary feedback forms, graduation certificates</p> <p>And/or:</p> <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who complete professional/vocational training courses.</p> <p>Means of verification: Beneficiary feedback forms, graduation certificates</p>		
<p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who complete education courses (formal or informal).</p> <p>Means of verification: List of the available courses, enrolment lists, case files, beneficiary inputs/feedback</p> <p>And/or:</p> <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who complete professional/vocational training courses</p> <p>Means of verification: List of the available courses, enrolment lists, case files, beneficiary inputs/feedback</p> <p><i>*Where courses are relatively short, beneficiary may enrol and complete the course in the transition phase in which case please refer to Indicators below:</i></p> <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who complete education courses (formal or informal).</p> <p>Means of verification: Beneficiary feedback forms, graduation certificates</p> <p>And/or:</p> <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who complete professional/vocational training courses.</p> <p>Means of verification: Beneficiary feedback, graduation certificates</p>			<p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who complete education courses (formal or informal).</p> <p>Means of verification: List of the available courses, enrolment lists, case files, beneficiary inputs/feedback</p> <p>And/or:</p> <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who complete professional/vocational training courses.</p> <p>Means of verification: Beneficiary feedback forms, graduation certificates</p> <p>And/or:</p> <p>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who complete professional/vocational training courses.</p> <p>Means of verification: Beneficiary feedback, graduation certificates</p>		

<p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries enrolled in education courses who evaluate it as satisfactory and relevant</i> <i>Means of evaluation: Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</i></p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries enrolled in professional/vocational training courses who evaluate it as satisfactory and relevant</i> <i>Means of evaluation: Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</i></p> <p><i>*please note, for some beneficiaries, it may be too early in their recovery to participate in such programmes</i></p>	<p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries enrolled in education courses who evaluate it as satisfactory and relevant</i> <i>Means of evaluation: Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</i></p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries enrolled in professional/vocational training courses who evaluate it as satisfactory and relevant</i> <i>Means of evaluation: Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</i></p>	<p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries for whom re/integration staff assess the education course to be satisfactory, of a adequate standard and relevant</i> <i>Means of evaluation: Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary, case files, staff assessment</i></p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries for whom re/integration staff assess the training course to be satisfactory, of a adequate standard and relevant</i> <i>Means of evaluation: Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary, case files, staff assessment</i></p> <p><i>*please note, for some beneficiaries, it may be too early in their recovery to participate in such programmes</i></p>	<p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries for whom re/integration staff assess the education course to be satisfactory, of a adequate standard and relevant</i> <i>Means of evaluation: Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary, case files, staff assessment</i></p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries for whom re/integration staff assess the training course to be satisfactory, of a adequate standard and relevant</i> <i>Means of evaluation: Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary, case files, staff assessment</i></p>	<p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries for whom re/integration staff assess the education course to be satisfactory, of a adequate standard and relevant</i> <i>Means of evaluation: Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary, case files, staff assessment</i></p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries for whom re/integration staff assess the training course to be satisfactory, of a adequate standard and relevant</i> <i>Means of evaluation: Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary, case files, staff assessment</i></p>
<p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries enrolled in education courses who evaluate it as satisfactory and relevant</i> <i>Means of evaluation: Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</i></p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries enrolled in professional/vocational training courses who evaluate it as satisfactory and relevant</i> <i>Means of evaluation: Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</i></p>	<p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries enrolled in education courses who evaluate it as satisfactory and relevant</i> <i>Means of evaluation: Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</i></p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries enrolled in professional/vocational training courses who evaluate it as satisfactory and relevant</i> <i>Means of evaluation: Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</i></p>	<p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who are motivated to participate in education classes (formal or informal) and regularly attend</i> <i>Means of verification: Beneficiary completion certificates, graduation/ interview with beneficiary, staff assessment</i></p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who are motivated to participate in trainings and regularly attend</i> <i>Means of verification: Beneficiary completion certificates, graduation/ interview with beneficiary, staff assessment</i></p>	<p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who are motivated to participate in education classes (formal or informal) and regularly attend</i> <i>Means of verification: Beneficiary completion certificates, graduation/ interview with beneficiary, staff assessment</i></p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who are motivated to participate in trainings and regularly attend</i> <i>Means of verification: Beneficiary completion certificates, graduation/ interview with beneficiary, staff assessment</i></p>	<p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who are motivated to participate in education classes (formal or informal) and regularly attend</i> <i>Means of verification: Beneficiary completion certificates, graduation/ interview with beneficiary, staff assessment</i></p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator: # of total beneficiaries who are motivated to participate in trainings and regularly attend</i> <i>Means of verification: Beneficiary completion certificates, graduation/ interview with beneficiary, staff assessment</i></p>

<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who receive appropriate treatment by education staff <i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who receive appropriate treatment by training staff <i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</p> <p>*Please note, some teachers/trainers will be aware of the victim's trafficking status, while others may not. Appropriate treatment might refer to different things depending on the case, including sensitive treatment as a VoT and/or socially vulnerable person, maintaining confidentiality of the case, supportive attitude of staff, etc.</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who receive appropriate treatment by education staff <i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who receive appropriate treatment by training staff <i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</p> <p>*Please note, some teachers/trainers will be aware of the victim's trafficking status, while others may not. Appropriate treatment might refer to different things depending on the case, including sensitive treatment as a VoT and/or socially vulnerable person, maintaining confidentiality of the case, supportive attitude of staff, etc.</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries for whom re/integration staff assess the behaviour/attitude of education staff to be appropriate <i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries for whom re/integration staff assess the behaviour/attitude of training staff to be appropriate <i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</p> <p>*Please note, some teachers/trainers will be aware of the victim's trafficking status, while others may not. Appropriate treatment might refer to different things depending on the case, including sensitive treatment as a VoT and/or socially vulnerable person, maintaining confidentiality of the case, supportive attitude of staff, etc.</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries for whom re/integration staff assess the behaviour/attitude of education staff to be appropriate <i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries for whom re/integration staff assess the behaviour/attitude of training staff to be appropriate <i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</p> <p>*Please note, some teachers/trainers will be aware of the victim's trafficking status, while others may not. Appropriate treatment might refer to different things depending on the case, including sensitive treatment as a VoT and/or socially vulnerable person, maintaining confidentiality of the case, supportive attitude of staff, etc.</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries for whom re/integration staff assess the behaviour/attitude of education staff to be appropriate <i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries for whom re/integration staff assess the behaviour/attitude of training staff to be appropriate <i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</p> <p>*Please note, some teachers/trainers will be aware of the victim's trafficking status, while others may not. Appropriate treatment might refer to different things depending on the case, including sensitive treatment as a VoT and/or socially vulnerable person, maintaining confidentiality of the case, supportive attitude of staff, etc.</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are motivated to participate in trainings or different forms of education <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary feedback forms, graduation/completion certificates</p> <p>*please note, for some beneficiaries, it may be too early in their recovery to participate in such programmes</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries for whom education translated into an economic opportunity – e.g. job placement, internship, small business scheme <i>Means of verification:</i> Proof of employment</p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries for whom education translated into an economic opportunity – job placement, internship, small business scheme <i>Means of verification:</i> Proof of employment</p>
---	---	---	---	---	---	--

<p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries for whom education translated into further educational opportunities</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Enrolment forms, staff notes, interview with beneficiary</p>			<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who receive life skills training toward their long-term re/integration</p> <p><i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with TRPs who receive training oriented to integration into the new country – e.g. cultural orientation, language, how to access local services, etc.</p> <p><i>Means of evaluation:</i> Case manager report, beneficiary interview, observation of training programme</p>
		<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who receive life skills training toward their long-term re/integration</p> <p><i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who receive life skills training which is assessed to be of a satisfactory standard by re/integration staff</p> <p><i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary, observation of training, trainers notes</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries for whom life skills training translates into better daily living and coping skills</p> <p><i>Means of evaluation:</i> Case manager report</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with TRPs who receive training oriented to integration into the new country – e.g. cultural orientation, language, how to access local services, etc.</p> <p><i>Means of evaluation:</i> Case manager report, beneficiary interview, observation of training programme</p>
	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries whose attitude to education or training has become more positive – for example, greater value placed on education/skills, prolonged presence in the educational field, the wish of further professionalization</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Feedback questionnaires, certificates and diplomas, , beneficiary interview</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who receive life skills training toward their long-term re/integration</p> <p><i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who receive life skills training which is assessed to be of a satisfactory standard by re/integration staff</p> <p><i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary, observation of training, trainers notes</p> <p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries for whom life skills training translates into better daily living and coping skills</p> <p><i>Means of evaluation:</i> Case manager report</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with TRPs who receive training oriented to integration into the new country – e.g. cultural orientation, language, how to access local services, etc.</p> <p><i>Means of evaluation:</i> Case manager report, beneficiary interview, observation of training programme</p>
	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries whose attitude to education or training has become more positive – for example, greater value placed on education/skills, prolonged presence in the educational field, the wish of further professionalization</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Feedback questionnaires, certificates and diplomas, , beneficiary interview</p>		<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who receive life skills training toward their long-term re/integration and evaluate this as satisfactory</p> <p><i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</p>	
	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries whose attitude to education or training has become more positive – for example, greater value placed on education/skills, prolonged presence in the educational field, the wish of further professionalisation</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Feedback questionnaires, certificates and diplomas, beneficiary interview</p>		<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who receive life skills training toward their long-term re/integration and evaluate this as satisfactory</p> <p><i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</p>	
	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries whose attitude to education or training has become more positive – for example, greater value placed on education/skills, prolonged presence in the educational field, the wish of further professionalisation</p> <p><i>Means of verification:</i> Feedback questionnaires, certificates and diplomas, beneficiary interview</p>		<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who receive life skills training toward their long-term re/integration and evaluate this as satisfactory</p> <p><i>Means of evaluation:</i> Evaluation form, interview with beneficiary</p>	

			<p><i>Indicator:</i> A database of education and training options relevant for different types of beneficiaries throughout the region/country and assessed to be of a suitable quality <i>Means of verification:</i> Database and resource mapping</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> A database of education and training options relevant for different types of beneficiaries throughout the region/country and assessed to be of a suitable quality <i>Means of verification:</i> Database and resource mapping</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> A database of education and training options relevant for different types of beneficiaries throughout the region/country and assessed to be of a suitable quality <i>Means of verification:</i> Database and resource mapping</p>
			<p><i>Indicator:</i> MoU with the state education services for facilitating education reinsertion in the formal education system <i>Means of verification:</i> Copy of MoU, copies of student enrolment forms</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> MoU with the state education services for facilitating education reinsertion in the formal education system <i>Means of verification:</i> Copy of MoU, copies of student enrolment forms</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> MoU with the state education services for facilitating education reinsertion in the formal education system <i>Means of verification:</i> Copy of MoU, copies of student enrolment forms</p>
			<p><i>Indicator:</i> MoU with the state training programmes for delivering free of charge education and training services <i>Means of verification:</i> Copy of MoU, copies of student enrolment in training, graduation certificates</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> MoU with the state training programmes for delivering free of charge education and training services <i>Means of verification:</i> Copy of MoU, copies of student enrolment in training, graduation certificates</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> MoU with the state training programmes for delivering free of charge education and training services <i>Means of verification:</i> Copy of MoU, copies of student enrolment in training, graduation certificates</p>

Impact indicator: Family mediation and counselling

Monitored by beneficiaries			Monitored by professionals		
<p>Phase 1: Crisis <i>Please specify the # of beneficiaries currently in this phase: _____</i></p>	<p>Phase 2: Transition <i>Please specify the # of beneficiaries currently in this phase: _____</i></p>	<p>Phase 3: Re/integration <i>Please specify the # of beneficiaries currently in this phase: _____</i></p>	<p>Phase 1: Crisis <i>Please specify the # of beneficiaries currently in this phase: _____</i></p>	<p>Phase 2: Transition <i>Please specify the # of beneficiaries currently in this phase: _____</i></p>	<p>Phase 3: Re/integration <i>Please specify the # of beneficiaries currently in this phase: _____</i></p>
			<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require family mediation/counselling <i>Means of verification:</i> Case files, case manager notes <i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with whom family mediation/counselling is undertaken in the crisis period <i>Means of verification:</i> Case files, case manager notes</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require family mediation/counselling <i>Means of verification:</i> Case files, case manager notes <i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with whom family mediation/counselling is undertaken in the transition period <i>Means of verification:</i> Case files, case manager notes</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who require family mediation/counselling <i>Means of verification:</i> Case files, case manager notes <i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries with whom family mediation/counselling is undertaken in the re/integration period <i>Means of verification:</i> Case files, case manager notes</p>
			<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are ready to establish initial contact with some or all of their family, following intervention of re/integration staff <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary information, case files, case manager notes</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are ready to establish initial contact with some or all of their family, following intervention of re/integration staff <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary information, case files, case manager notes</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are ready to establish initial contact with some or all of their family following intervention of re/integration staff <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary information, case files, case manager notes</p>

<p><i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries return to a healthy, positive and safe family environment, fostered at least in part through the mediation/counselling process <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary and family feedback questionnaires</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are ready to return to live with their family/home community following intervention of re/integration staff <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary information, case files</p>	<p><i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who remain in their family environment for a minimum of twelve months after mediation and counselling and continue to experience a supportive environment <i>Means of verification:</i> Monitoring report, beneficiary reports</p>	<p><i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who contact the organisation for continued mediation and counselling to address continued or additional tensions in family or community <i>Means of verification:</i> Monitoring report, beneficiary reports</p>
<p><i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries return to a healthy, positive and safe family environment, fostered at least in part through the mediation/counselling process <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary and family feedback questionnaires</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are ready to establish initial contact with some or all of their family, following intervention of re/integration staff <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary information, case files</p>	<p><i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are ready to return to live with their family/home community following intervention of re/integration staff <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary information, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total families who were positive about contact with the beneficiary <i>Means of verification:</i> Case manager contact with family, family visits, home visits</p>
<p><i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries return to a healthy, positive and safe family environment, fostered at least in part through the mediation/counselling process <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary and family feedback questionnaires</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are ready to establish initial contact with some or all of their family, following intervention of re/integration staff <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary information, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are ready to return to live with their family/home community following intervention of re/integration staff <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary information, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total families who were positive about contact with the beneficiary <i>Means of verification:</i> Case manager contact with family, family visits, home visits</p>
<p><i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries return to a healthy, positive and safe family environment, fostered at least in part through the mediation/counselling process <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary and family feedback questionnaires</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are ready to establish initial contact with some or all of their family, following intervention of re/integration staff <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary information, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are ready to return to live with their family/home community following intervention of re/integration staff <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary information, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total families who were positive about contact with the beneficiary <i>Means of verification:</i> Case manager contact with family, family visits, home visits</p>
<p><i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries return to a healthy, positive and safe family environment, fostered at least in part through the mediation/counselling process <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary and family feedback questionnaires</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are ready to establish initial contact with some or all of their family, following intervention of re/integration staff <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary information, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are ready to return to live with their family/home community following intervention of re/integration staff <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary information, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total families who were positive about contact with the beneficiary <i>Means of verification:</i> Case manager contact with family, family visits, home visits</p>
<p><i>And/or:</i> <i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries return to a healthy, positive and safe family environment, fostered at least in part through the mediation/counselling process <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary and family feedback questionnaires</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are ready to establish initial contact with some or all of their family, following intervention of re/integration staff <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary information, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries who are ready to return to live with their family/home community following intervention of re/integration staff <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary information, case files</p>	<p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total families who were positive about contact with the beneficiary <i>Means of verification:</i> Case manager contact with family, family visits, home visits</p>

		<p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total families who positively react to plans for the VoTs return to live at home <i>Means of verification:</i> Agreement on re/integration plan</p>	<p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries whose families support them in the wider community (which may be negative to them) and offer protection and support <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary and family feedback questionnaires</p>	<p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> Database of available assistance from family specialists who are trained in working with trafficked people. <i>Means of verification:</i> Supervisor documents and case files.</p>
		<p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total families who positively react to plans for the VoTs return to live at home <i>Means of verification:</i> Agreement on re/integration plan</p>	<p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries whose families support them in the wider community (which may be negative to them) and offer protection and support <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary and family feedback questionnaires</p>	<p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> Database of available assistance from family specialists who are trained in working with trafficked people. <i>Means of verification:</i> Supervisor documents and case files.</p>
		<p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total families who positively react to plans for the VoTs return to live at home <i>Means of verification:</i> Agreement on re/integration plan</p>	<p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> # of total beneficiaries whose families support them in the wider community (which may be negative to them) and offer protection and support <i>Means of verification:</i> Beneficiary and family feedback questionnaires</p>	<p><i>And/or:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> Database of available assistance from family specialists who are trained in working with trafficked people. <i>Means of verification:</i> Supervisor documents and case files.</p>



King Baudouin
Foundation

Working together for a better society

www.kbs-frb.be

You can find further information about our projects, events and publications on www.kbs-frb.be. An electronic e-mail is also available if you would like to keep up to date with our activities.

Please address any questions you may have to us at info@kbs-frb.be or call us on +32 (0)70-233 728.

King Baudouin Foundation,
Rue Brederodestraat 21,
B-1000 Brussels
+ 32 (0)2-511 18 40,
fax + 32 (0)2-511 52 21

For donors resident in Belgium, any gift of €30 or more will qualify for tax deduction.
Bank account 000-0000004-04
IBAN BE10 0000 0000 0404
BIC BPOTBEB1

The King Baudouin Foundation is an independent and pluralistic foundation whose aim is to serve society. Our objective is to make a lasting contribution to justice, democracy and respect for diversity. Each year, the Foundation provides financial support for some 2,000 organisations and individuals committed to building a better society. Our activity domains for the coming years are poverty & social justice, democracy in Belgium, democracy in the Balkans, heritage, philanthropy, health, leadership, local engagement, migration, development, partnership or exceptional support for projects. The Foundation was created in 1976, to mark the 25th anniversary of King Baudouin's reign.

We operate in 2009 with a budget of 35 million euros. As well as our own capital and the large donation we receive from the National Lottery, we manage Funds created by private individuals, associations and businesses. The King Baudouin Foundation also receives donations and bequests.

The King Baudouin Foundation's Board of Governors draws up broad lines of action and oversees the transparency of our management. Some 50 colleagues are responsible for implementing our actions. The Foundation operates out of Brussels, but we are active at Belgian, European and international level. In Belgium, we have projects at local, regional and federal level.

We combine various working methods to achieve our objectives. We support third-party projects, launch our own activities, provide a forum for debate and reflection, and foster philanthropy. The results of our projects are disseminated through a range of communication channels. The King Baudouin Foundation works with public services, associations, NGOs, research centres, businesses and other foundations. We have a strategic partnership with the European Policy Centre, a Brussels-based think tank.

Outside Belgium, the Foundation is particularly active in the Balkans in projects that promote EU integration, tackle human trafficking and defend minority rights. In Africa, we focus on projects involved in the fight against AIDS/HIV and in promoting local development. The King Baudouin Foundation is also a benchmark in international philanthropy thanks to, among others, the international Funds that we manage, the King Baudouin Foundation United States, and our role in the Transnational Giving Europe network.

