

PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

Enhancing Transnational Cooperation on Trafficking Cases in South-Eastern Europe (TRM-II)

Implemented by the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD)

Funded by United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

Commissioned by: ICMPD

Implemented by: Razbor Ltd., Zagreb

Evaluator: Ivana Novoselec and Andrijana Parić

Preface

The Evaluation Team would like to thank all individuals who participated in this evaluation process. Your co-operation and contributions are highly appreciated, making this exercise possible.

Every effort has been made to ensure that the information given here is correct, and any factual errors that might occur are unintended, and are the responsibility of the evaluators.

This Report represents exclusively the views of the Evaluation Team, and does not necessarily represent the views of ICMPD or any other organisation or individual participating in the evaluation process and/or referred to in the Report.

Ivana Novoselec and Andrijana Parić

Abbreviations

A1	Activity no 1.
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
EC	European Commission
EQ	Evaluation question
EU	European Union
ICMPD	International Centre for Migration Policy Development
LLO	Local Liaison Officer
NC	National Coordinator
NGOs	Non-governmental organisations
NIT	National Implementation Team
NRM	National Referral Mechanism
OHR	Office for Human Rights
PCM	Project Cycle Management
SEE	South-East Europe
SMART	Specific Measurable Available Relevant and Time-bound
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
THB	Trafficking in Human Beings
TIP	Trafficking in Persons
TRM	Transnational Referral Mechanisms
UN	United Nations
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Table of Contents

0. Executive summary	4
1. Introduction: Evaluation background, subject and scope.....	6
2. Evaluation methodology	7
2.1. Evaluation concept.....	7
2.2. Sources and activities.....	10
3. Evaluation findings.....	12
3.1. Project design.....	12
3.2. Evaluation Criterion 1 – Efficiency	14
3.3. Evaluation Criterion 2 – Effectiveness.....	21
3.4. Evaluation Criterion 3 – Relevance	29
3.5. Evaluation Criterion 4 – Impact.....	32
3.4. Evaluation Criterion 5 – Sustainability	33
4. Conclusions and Recommendations:	35

Annexes:

Annex 1 Simplified Logical Framework and Evaluation Methodology
Annex 2 List of Interviews
Annex 3 Questionnaire results: First Regional Seminar (Budapest)
Annex 4 First Regional Seminar Conclusions and Recommendations
Annex 5 Questionnaire results: Thematic workshop on trafficking of children (Durrës)
Annex 6 Questionnaire results: Thematic workshop on labour-related trafficking (Sofia)
Annex 7 Questionnaire results: Study visit to France
Annex 8 Questionnaire results: Study visit to Cyprus
Annex 9 Questionnaire results: Transnational Training in Skopje
Annex 10 Questionnaire results: Transnational Training in Belgrade
Annex 11 Questionnaire results: Final Regional Seminar (Bucharest)
Annex 12 Questionnaire results: Study visit of Bulgarian delegation to Greece
Annex 13 Questionnaire results: Study visit of Montenegrin delegations to Austria and Slovakia
Annex 14 Meeting minutes Focus Group
Annex 15 TRM Follow-up Template Usage Questionnaire
Annex 16 Questionnaire results: TRM Follow-up Template
Annex 17 Interim Evaluation Report

0. Executive summary

The external evaluation was performed by Razbor Consultancy Company at the request of the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD). The subject of the evaluation was **“Enhancing Transnational Cooperation on Trafficking Cases in South-Eastern Europe” (TRM-II)** project (a continuation of the previously successfully implemented TRM I project), implemented between 30 September 2010 to 30 June 2012 by ICMPD. The total project budget was USD 1.292.810 and the project was funded by USAID.

The **methodological basis** of the evaluation is assessment against key evaluation criteria: *relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact*. These criteria were in consultation with the Beneficiary further developed into nine evaluation questions in order to focus evaluation work and allow better reflection, targeted data collection and in-depth analysis.

The **project** set to contribute to the effective assistance and protection of trafficked persons with due respect to the protection of their personal data and privacy by strengthening the communication and cooperation between relevant governmental and non-governmental stakeholders at the transnational level in South - Eastern Europe (SEE). It targeted 10 SEE countries and involved over 100 participants both from SEE countries’ National Implementation Teams and equally from the EU Member States. The expected project outcomes were: 1) To develop a new tool for cooperation in referral of trafficked persons (Template for Follow-up of Transnational Referral of Trafficked Persons). 2) To continue to support the networking and experience exchange between origin, transit and destination countries stakeholders in joint planning and implementation of anti-trafficking policies 3) To increase the capacities of stakeholders in the countries of origin, transit and destination to support the victims of child and labour related trafficking.

The **key findings** of the evaluation are that the project, as well as the whole TRM process (i.e. both TRM-I and TRM-II projects) played a significant role in the process of raising the capacities in the SEE region for combat against human trafficking. The project was successful in achieving the expected outcomes. It was particularly effective in maintaining the network of contacts established in the previous TRM I project and managed to set a basis for further development of the network by taking initial steps of inclusion of the EU destination countries. The project succeeded in developing a *Template for Follow-up of Transnational Referral of Trafficked Persons* which is welcomed by the participants and, even if it did not undergo a controlled testing, could be expected to enter into formal or informal practices of most of the countries involved. Capacity building in terms of the thematic foci of child and labour-related trafficking was successful and set a basis for the next ICMPD project in the region focused on labour-related trafficking. **Project effectiveness is therefore very good and the project’s impact was recognised as highly positive by the participants.**

Management of the project was efficient and the ICMPD team proved to be highly professional, disposing of a remarkable level of expertise in the area of THB. It mostly overcame the external obstacles it faced during project implementation in relation to the preparation of the two key project outputs: Assessment Report on the TRM practices in SEE and the Follow-up template.

The project team has already ensured the continuation of the project results by their incorporation in its new project: Capacity Building for Combating Trafficking for Labour Exploitation (CB LAB) and also aims to ensure further development and sustainability of the project outcomes by promoting the TRM process as a good practice model within a wider geographical context.

Key recommendations to the project team are as follows:

- To rely more on the proven in-house expertise as a more cost-effective method of implementation than hiring of external experts and also a method which creates valuable long-term effect of capacity building within the organisation.
- To perform a more detailed risk analysis of political and legal context during the future project planning exercises so that the team can adjust their expectations of their actions, limit the scope of work, if necessary, or plan the mitigation strategy.

- In projects that aim at official establishment of transnational procedures, consider a stronger focus on the political, decision-making level, which has the power to integrate procedures into the national practices, while in parallel continuing to work closely with the operational level practitioners.
- To consider future projects which would focus on research into the emerging trafficking trends in the SEE region and their relation with economic migration and political context. Taken that ICMPD activities represent important interventions into transnational mechanisms within and outside the SEE region and that they are an important source of information to all the stakeholders, such research could provide a basis for numerous further operations in the area of fighting against THB.
- To seize the opportunity for multiplication of project results that the new EU Strategy towards the eradication of trafficking in human beings (2012 – 2016) presents. An introduction of TRM model to EU Member States and other countries outside the SEE region as a good practice example, would be the most appropriate continuation of this project.

1. Introduction: Evaluation background, subject and scope

The central **subject** of this evaluation is the project Enhancing Transnational Cooperation on Trafficking Cases in South-Eastern Europe (TRM-II), implemented during the period 30 September 2010 to 30 June 2012 by the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD). Total project budget was USD 1.292.810 and the project was funded by USAID through an unsolicited contracting procedure. The duration of the project was 21 months, which included a non-cost extension of 3 months in addition to the originally planned 18 months. The project built upon the lessons learned from the 'Programme to Support the Development of Transnational Referral Mechanisms (TRM) for Trafficked Persons in South-Eastern Europe' funded by USAID (2006 - 2009), and the project 'Development of a Transnational Referral Mechanism for Victims of Trafficking between Countries of Origin and Destination (TRM-EU)' funded by the European Commission (2008 - 2010). Involving countries from South-Eastern Europe, as well as key destination countries outside the region, the project focused on the further improvement of cooperation between countries of origin, destination and transit.

The evaluation was commissioned by ICMPD and its **purpose** is typically manifold. Firstly, the function of evaluation is to *assist the Beneficiary in focusing future planning* through the provision of objective perspective relevant for management and decision making (institutional learning). Secondly, its purpose is to *assist the donor in objective judgement* of the project achievements. Finally, through wider dissemination of the Evaluation Report, the evaluation serves the purpose of *deepening and accumulating knowledge and understanding* among all relevant parties.

In practical terms this evaluation represented an on-going exercise with evaluator's follow up and continuous feedback on all the project activities. The evaluation was undertaken by Ivana Novoselec and Andrijana Parić, both Senior Consultants. The bulk of activities (interviews, desk research and report preparation) was undertaken by Ms Novoselec, while Ms Parić participated in an advisory role, mainly in relation to the methodology development. On behalf of ICMPD, Ms Mariyana Radeva Berket, one of the three project officers, was the key contact person for the evaluation process, while the rest of the Project Team were, together with other relevant stakeholders, involved in evaluation by participation in different forms of data collection and consultation processes.

The **scope of evaluation** is imposed by intended purpose and available resources thus, being limited to the project itself, i.e. external coherence and complementarities are not examined as a separate evaluation question. Notably under the examination of the project's relevance and sustainability, the evaluation tackles some external elements of the Project but these mainly relate to the complementary activities of beneficiary rather than to other elements in project environment (institutional surroundings, programmatic framework, relevant policies and projects etc).

The evaluation was conducted based on the guidelines of "An evaluation framework for the USAID – funded TIP prevention and victim protection programs." This methodology is also known as impact analysis and builds on standard project cycle management evaluation methodology (logical framework approach) adding more measurable elements to the process. The **core methodological basis** of the evaluation and the point of departure in evaluation work was an agreement between the Beneficiary and the Consultant on **evaluation criteria** which the project is to be analysed.

2. Evaluation methodology

2.1. Evaluation concept

Five usual evaluation criteria were applied in this evaluation: **relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact**. Upon discussion that took into account contextual limitations and even more, the purpose of the evaluation, this conclusion has been reached in order of priority and interpretation of each criterion:

- **Efficiency** examines the extent to which the outputs and/or desired effects have been achieved with reflection to the use of resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc). This criterion concerns *the implementation of activities*, so the evaluation examines the quality of both technical and financial management and actual course of implementation. In line with the intended purpose of the evaluation, technical management and content of the activities are given preference over financial and procedural compliances, which are subject to official audit.
 - **Effectiveness** criterion concerns the ability of the project to deliver the objectives planned. Practically this criterion examines *how far and in what way the project's results were achieved*.
 - **Relevance** relates to the extent to which the objectives of the project are consistent with actual requirements and needs¹ and can be examined in two points in time – before and after the intervention. Hence, the evaluation needs to answer two questions: “was the project needed?” (checking the validity of initial problem analysis) and “did the project satisfy the actual needs?” (checking if the project addressed the problems and did the management adequately respond to changed circumstances, if appropriate)
 - **Impact** concerns positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. Practically this criterion examines the *achievement of project objectives, specific and overall*. Similarly to sustainability, due to the long-term nature of objectives and lack of time distance, the evaluation here estimates the *probability* that desired long-term effects would eventually be achieved.
 - **Sustainability** criterion concerns the likelihood of the continuation of benefits from the intervention, after the termination of the donor funding. Due to the lack of longer-term perspective, typically the evaluation here assesses the *probability* that the benefits continue in the long-term in a way that is resilient to risks, by examining follow up actions and synergies achieved with other ongoing / planned initiatives.
- **EFFICIENCY – questions 1 & 2 examining the quality of technical and financial management:**

No.	Question	Rationale and tools
1	To what extent were the activities implemented as planned (in terms of timing, resources and outputs planned) and how efficient was the technical project management?	Assessing how activities were realised in terms of timing, outputs, resources, methodology, how the process was managed in terms of action planning and monitoring, administration, coordination and communication with other stakeholders and donor.
2	The extent and way of utilising financial resources – were they spent regularly (for purpose intended) and efficiently (value for money)?	Providing rather general assessment of financial management since the project expenditure will be subject to audit and also does not have a decisive influence to fulfil the evaluation's purpose.

¹ Needs of the target group and final beneficiaries, provisions resulting from other interventions and policies on global, national and local level, requirements and priorities of sector policies and programmes etc. The extent to which the relevance will be concerned with external factors and complementarities depends on the chosen scope of evaluation.

EFFECTIVENESS – questions 3 to 6 examining achievement of the project outcomes:

No.	Question	Rationale and tools
3	To what extent has the project resulted in the development of a new tool for cooperation in referral of trafficked persons?	The evaluators tried to find out the level of satisfaction of the participants and the team with the Transnational Referral <i>Follow-up Template</i> which was developed in the project. The evaluators also reviewed the output itself and compared its contents with the plan presented in the project proposal and during the project activities.
4	Has the project successfully followed its predecessor (TRM-I) in improving networking and experience exchange between the origin, transit and destination countries' stakeholders in joint planning and implementation of anti-trafficking policies?	The evaluators analysed the level of satisfaction of the participants and team with the type and profile of contacts gained or sustained through the project events and the type of exchange encouraged. The questionnaires from the project events, interviews and focus group were analysed in order to provide insights into these matters. The evaluators were also observers in a part of the project events.
5	To what extent has the project increased the capacities of the stakeholders to support the victims of child and labour-related trafficking?	The evaluators analysed the perception of the workshops, seminars and participants' study-visits (through the questionnaire analysis, interviews and focus group, as well as through the project team reports and conclusions from workshops and seminars) on their increase in capacities in relation to the thematic foci of this project.
6	To what extent has the project resulted in an improved communication and information exchange in South-East Europe and between SEE and EU Member States on safe and voluntary return of trafficked persons as well as case follow-up? In particular, in respect to trafficking for labour purposes and child trafficking.	The evaluators tried to find out the general effect and added value of the project in terms of improved communication and information exchange. In particular, the evaluators tried to learn to what extent the project succeeded in its attempts to build on the previous TRM project by widening the scope of the network established to the EU Member States as destination countries and by adding new thematic foci to the cooperation and information exchange. The interviews and focus groups were the key sources of information in respect to this question.

- **RELEVANCE – question 7 examining consistency of original project design and degree of adaptability to changes in environment:**

No.	Question	Rationale and tools
8	To what extent were the needs and problems properly identified and has the project management adequately to adapt to situations on the field and unforeseen circumstances (if appropriate)?	Assessing the validity of basic pre-assumptions made in the project proposal on the composition and problems and needs of the target group, as well as the appropriateness of actions designed to tackle them. Furthermore, looking into the validity of risks mitigation measures and their actual realisation in order to estimate whether an effort was made to maintain validity of intervention throughout the implementation. Interviews, questionnaires and a

focus group were used as tools.

• **IMPACT – question 8 evaluating achievement of expected project impact (long-term objective):**

No.	Question	Rationale and tools
9	To what extent has the action contributed to the achievement of its long-term objective?	The evaluators assessed the level to which the project contributed to the effective assistance and protection of trafficked persons with respect to the protection of personal data and privacy by strengthening the communication and cooperation between relevant governmental and non-governmental stakeholders at a transnational level within SEE. The evaluators also aimed at, to some extent, assessing the overall impact of the TRM I and II and the difference they have made in relation to the situation in the region.

• **SUSTAINABILITY – question 9 examining capacity to produce sustainable benefits:**

No.	Question	Rationale and tools
7	To what extent is the continuation of project activities and benefits (services, products and outcomes) after external assistance and also, is there a likelihood and opportunity for their replication / extension in a wider context?	Assessing the influence and the effects that the Project has had on the developments in the post-implementation period, whilst distinguishing different levels. Estimating the probability that these effects will continue in the long term and/or that they can be replicated/extended to wider context in terms of geography, sector and target group. In particular, the intention of the stakeholders to use the Follow-up template was an important element of both project sustainability and effect which were analysed in a separate questionnaire.

Apart from Annex 1, which contains a simplified logical framework with indication of evaluation methodology, each respective Chapter of Section II, the Evaluation makes reference to judgement references and indicators chosen to answer the above listed evaluation questions.

Evaluators’ opinion and findings are given as a set of conclusions rather than as numerical marks. For the sake of simplicity, however, the evaluators tried to summarise their findings in respect to different criteria by grading them on the following scale:

Grade	Description
Excellent	Project achievements are extraordinary and exceed both the team’s and the evaluators’ expectations
Very Good	Project achievements are above average and fully meet the expectations of the team and evaluators
Good	Project achievements are satisfactory and mainly meet the expectations of the team and the evaluators

Sufficient	Project achievements are below average, but still can be considered within acceptable limits
Insufficient	Project achievements are missing or of unsatisfactory quality

2.2. Sources and activities

Evaluation methodology involved a combination of tools, which allowed a multi-angular approach to the evaluation questions and which enabled the evaluators to observe the evaluation criteria without bias. Each of the aspects was cross-checked with at least 2 different tools. These included:

- 1) **Questionnaires** prepared and distributed at each project event or circulated to the project participants and team members via e-mail. In total, 10 different questionnaires were distributed among project participants, out of which eight were dedicated to the evaluation of project activities, one dedicated to the evaluation of the Final Regional Seminar, the overall project and the overall TRM process (circulated in the Final Regional Seminar), and one dedicated to the collection of information and evaluation of the usage of the *TRM Template for Follow up* (circulated by e-mail in June 2012). The detailed analyses of the questionnaires are annexed to this report.
- 2) **Observations** of part of the project events by one of the evaluators (First Regional Seminar in Budapest, 16 - 17 March 2011; Transnational Training in Belgrade, 8 - 9 December 2011; Final Regional Seminar in Bucharest, 27 – 29 February 2012)
- 3) **Interviews** with target groups and project team. A representative sample of stakeholders was interviewed, including 18 persons in total. The interviews were held with the project participants and project team.
 - a. 12 project participants from 3 National Implementation Teams (NITs) – Croatian, Moldovan and Romanian - were selected as a sample of a total of about 100 participants. The sample of interviewees was agreed with ICMPD and was based on variable geographical representation and different types of expertise. The three countries selected were considered representative of geographical sub-groups included in the project (Western Balkans, Eastern Balkans, Eastern Europe). They also represented different degrees of closeness to the EU and therefore different immigration and trafficking problems (EU Member, EU candidate/acceding country, a non-EU candidate country). In terms of different types of expertise, the national teams themselves contain a combination of stakeholders involved in different aspects of THB identification, prosecution and victim support, ranging from national coordinators, staff of national coordinator offices, ministries of labour and equivalent institutions, police, prosecution and victim-support NGOs.
 - b. Furthermore, 6 members of the project team were interviewed, out of which 4 representatives of the core team and 2 LLOs.
- 4) **Desk research** of project outputs, reports and other project documentation, including:
 - Project proposal submitted to USAID on 9 April 2010
 - Project team's reports from each of the project activities
 - Project outputs: Follow-up template and report "The Way Forward in Establishing Effective Transnational Referral Mechanisms in Trafficking Cases. A Report Based on Experiences in South-Eastern Europe"
- 5) One **focus group discussion** with representatives of Croatian NIT

The evaluator provided **on-going feedback on project activities** to the project team, including statistics of the analysed evaluation questionnaires from project events and comments and recommendations (written or oral) after the project events in which the evaluator participated. As required in the Evaluation contract, the Evaluator also delivered an Interim Evaluation Report which was submitted to ICMPD in August 2011 and which involved the first 9 months of project implementation. The report contained an overview of the agreed

evaluation methodology, of project activities and evaluation activities, as well as comments and recommendations for the remainder of the project implementation. (See Annex 17).

3. Evaluation findings

3.1. Project design

The original project proposal included the following wording of objectives:

- TO DEVELOP a reporting template for the facilitation of transnational cooperation at the operational level between countries of destination, origin and transit in order to support the implementation of the Guidelines for the Development of a Transnational Referral Mechanism for Trafficked Persons (TRM Guidelines), focusing especially on special measures for children and labour exploitation.;
- TO STRENGTHEN the mechanisms for information exchange between the main anti-trafficking actors both at an operational and policy making level through regular multilateral and bilateral meetings in the region and beyond;
- TO CONTRIBUTE towards building counter-trafficking partnerships among countries in the European Union (EU) and South-Eastern Europe (SEE).

In addition to the objectives, a list of activities with expected outputs/results were defined. In order to ensure a clearer division between different elements and accents of implementation as well as between means and objectives, the Evaluator proposed to slightly re-formulate the objectives according to “An evaluation framework for the USAID – funded TIP prevention and victim protection programs” methodology.

While the definition of the project's objectives was generally logical and fitted the vision of the Project Team, the Evaluator suggested to the Project Team to make minor adjustments to the structure and emphasis of the wording of the objectives. Namely, from the project design, as well as from the discussions with the Project Team, it seems reasonable to emphasise and make demarcation between a number of elements present in the project idea and in its implementation so far:

- Operationalisation of the TRMs and SOPs developed in its predecessor TRM-SEE project, which were, according to the final evaluation of the first TRM project, as well as according to the findings of the Project Team, not sufficiently operational and insufficiently incorporated into national practices
- A need to strengthen the co-operation with destination countries within the European Union initiated in the EC-funded project TRM-EU
- A requirement for raising the capacities of target groups to deal with specific forms of trafficking for which the capacities are generally low, such as labour-exploitation related trafficking and child trafficking.
- A need to preserve the levels of networking and communication between different stakeholders in trafficking victim support throughout South-East Europe which represent an important result of the previous TRM project. It is evaluator's impression that the Team rightfully takes pride in that achievement but it has not emphasised it sufficiently in the project design.

Hence, the Evaluator proposed a slightly rephrased description of the objectives to the Team:

Project impact/long-term objective:	<i>To contribute to the effective assistance and protection of trafficked persons with due respect to the protection of their personal data and privacy by strengthening the communication and cooperation between relevant governmental and non-governmental stakeholders at a transnational level</i>
Project outcomes/mid-term objectives:	<i>To improve the transnational communication and information exchange in South-East Europe and between SEE and EU Member States on safe and voluntary return of trafficked person, as well as case follow-up, in particular in respect to trafficking for labour purposes and child trafficking.</i>

Project outcomes/short-term objectives (or results):	<i>1. A new tool for co-operation in referral of trafficked persons developed (Template for Follow-up of Transnational Referral)</i>
	<i>2. Continuously supported networking and experience exchange between origin, transit and destination countries stakeholders in joint planning and implementation of anti-trafficking policies</i>
	<i>3. Capacities of stakeholders in the countries of origin, transit and destination to support the victims of child and labour related trafficking increased</i>

The set of activities and outputs remained as originally planned, with minor additions in terms of specification of the expected outputs for part of the activities, which were not indicated as expected outputs in the project proposals, but were clearly expected to come out of the activities planned. The detailed overview of the planned activities and outputs is given in the next paragraph (3.2. valuation Criterion 1 – Efficiency).

The original project design did not foresee SMART indicators for project results and objectives. Since indicators are a key reference point for successful evaluation, the Evaluator proposed a set of indicators, which was approved by the project team. In order to integrate the description of the project objectives and indicators in a model that can serve as a basis for an evaluation, the Evaluator developed a simplified model of Logical framework adjusted to the needs of the team. This contained a presentation of intervention logic and proposed objectively verifiable indicators. The simplified Logical framework was also presented to the project team at the beginning of the project and agreed with them. The document is annexed to this report (Annex 1).

3.2. Evaluation Criterion 1 – Efficiency

Evaluation approach in analysis of project efficiency is concerned primarily with *implementation of activities* and technical and financial management. The criterion is covered by two evaluation questions, the first (EQ1) assessing technical management (implementation of activities in terms of timing, outputs, resources, monitoring arrangements, coordination and communication with stakeholders and donor) and the second one (EQ2) looking into the way funds were utilised (value for the money, regularity of expenditure, book keeping). In response to those questions, the following **judgement references and indicators** were chosen:

(EQ1) All project activities were realised as planned (in terms of the scope, timing, resources and outputs); The modification of activities was justified and approved by the donor; The division of tasks between team members was carefully planned beforehand and regularly controlled; Action plans were regularly updated and their realisation was closely monitored; Management was observant of visibility requirements and public relations; Project documentation was systematically collected and filed in orderly fashion; Communication and coordination with partners was smooth and regular. *Indicators*: descriptive answer to judgement references.

(EQ2) The funds were spent for purpose intended; value for money was satisfactory; financial documentation is complete and filed in orderly fashion and regularity of secondary procurement and bookkeeping was respected. *Indicators*: % of budget spent and descriptive answer to judgement references.

An overview of project activities planned and delivered is given here:

Planned			Delivered		
Activity	Outputs and aims	Timing	Activity	Outputs and aims	Timing
Phase 1. Mapping of existing mechanisms for transnational cooperation					
1.1. Background analysis	Assessment report	“Months 1 – 5”, i.e. to be finalised by the end of February 2011	1.1. Background analysis	Report “The Way Forward in Establishing Effective Transnational Referral Mechanisms in Trafficking Cases. A Report Based on Experiences in South-Eastern Europe”	June 2012
1.2. First regional seminar	The usage of the reporting template and the detailed needs for improvement in information exchange and facilitated communication discussed; Platform provided for NITs to share experiences, be introduced to project activities and committed to the transnational cooperation	“Months 1 – 5”, i.e. to be finalised by the end of February 2011	1.2. First regional seminar in Budapest, Hungary	Outputs achieved as planned (the Template discussed and the platform for exchange of experiences established.) However, the assessment report was not presented, other than as a concept. 105 participants	16 – 18 March 2011
Phase 2. Implementation Phase					
2.1. Drafting of the reporting template	Draft Report Template	Months 6 – 12 of project implementation (i.e. March –	2.1. Drafting of the reporting template	Draft <i>Template for Follow-up of transnational referral</i>	March - May 2011

		September 2012)			
2.2. Transnational workshops (2 workshops)	<p>Draft reporting templates developed and adapted to the needs of the participating countries;</p> <p>Knowledge of participants on effective return of trafficked individuals increased;</p> <p>Awareness of the special needs of children and persons trafficked for labour exploitation raised</p>	Months 6 – 12 of project implementation (i.e. March – September 2012)	2.2. Transnational Workshops in Durres, Albania, and Sofia, Bulgaria with emphasis on trafficking on children (Durres) and labour-related trafficking (Sofia)	Workshops were held with 30 participants each. The expected outputs were achieved and conclusions in regards to further development of the template brought.	Durres: 23 – 25 May 2011; Sofia: 27 – 29 June 2011
2.3. Workshops in EU destination countries (3 workshops)	<p>Good practices exchanged between countries from and beyond SEE;</p> <p>Ground laid for cooperation on transnational trafficking cases between SEE and key destination countries outside SEE region</p>	Months 6 – 12 of project implementation (i.e. March – September 2012)	2.3. Workshops – study tours to Paris, France and Nicosia, Cyprus	Study visits were held, with the 28 participants on the Cyprus study tour and 24 in France. The third study visit, which was originally planned to take place in Spain, was cancelled by the host. The potential participants were re-directed by the project team to the other two destinations. The outputs, nevertheless, were achieved as planned.	Paris: 24 – 26 October 2011; Nicosia: 8 - 9 November 2011
Phase 3. Training and test-run phase					
3.1. Joint transnational training between SEE and EU countries to familiarise the stakeholders with	<p>All involved actors trained on the usage of the reporting template;</p> <p>Exchange of up-to-date anti-trafficking knowledge between participating countries and countries outside the region</p>	Months 12 – 18 of project implementation (i.e. September 2011 – March 2012)	3.1. Transnational training held in Skopje, Macedonia, and Belgrade, Serbia	Somewhat changed outputs: the training on the template usage is part of a wider set of topics (objectives: To share experiences and good practices on transnational referral of trafficked persons; To discuss the usage of	Skopje: 5 – 7 December 2011; Belgrade: 8 – 9 December 2011

the template and its implementation	accomplished			the template for follow up on transnational referral; To learn from real life experiences of trafficked persons). The destination countries representatives did not participate in the workshop on template usage. The <i>Follow-up Template</i> was still in the draft stage during the workshops. 31 persons participated in Skopje and 33 in Belgrade.	
3.2. Testing the usage of the reporting template on actual trafficking cases	Analysis report drafted on the usage of the reporting template on actual trafficking cases	Months 12 – 18 of project implementation (i.e. September 2011 – March 2012)	3.2. Testing the usage of the reporting template on actual trafficking cases	The template was not systematically tested and report not prepared. However, in coordination with the evaluator, a questionnaire on its usage was disseminated among the participants.	July 2012
3.3. Final regional seminar	Efficiency of transnational communication and cooperation on an operational level on trafficking cases between the relevant governmental and non-governmental stakeholders at the operational level improved		3.3. Final regional seminar	Seminar successfully held with 102 participants from both the SEE and destination countries and the additional output in terms of a promotion and awareness-rising video prepared and published on ICMPD's You-tube channel.	28 – 29 February 2012
			Project extension activities		
			TRM presentations during 3 National workshops on trafficking in human beings in Croatia		May 2012
			Study visit of Bulgarian NIT to Greece		May 2012

	Study visit of the Montenegrin Delegation to Slovakia and Austria	May 2012
	Round Table on Enhancing Transnational Cooperation on Trafficking Cases between Kosovo and EU destination Countries	June 2012
	Screening of the movie "Sestre" in Vienna for Albania, Serbia and B&H	June 2012
	Study visit to National Commission for Combating THB, Sofia, Bulgaria for Macedonian representatives	May 2012
	Training on Labour Exploitation for Romanian and Moldovan representatives	June 2012

Evaluation findings with respect to the *realisation of activities* indicate the accomplishment of the majority of the activities and delivery of outputs, with some modifications in timing and minor modifications in scope.

In terms of the **schedule** of the activities and timing, **all the project events were organised according to the schedule**, which demonstrated excellent team organisation and project management abilities. However, a **significant delay** happened in respect to the preparation of **the originally planned assessment report**, which was only finalised at the end of the project, instead of in the preparatory, mapping phase of the project. The delay was due to the fact that coordination with an external expert did not function as planned. The project team undertook to finalise the report and managed to do so with a very high-level quality of the final output, however, only at the very end of the project implementation. The team members point out that they have, during the project implementation, realised that the scope of the report changed and decided to have a 'living document' to be published at the end of the project that would also incorporate the draft *Follow-up template* and recommendations for TRM development and implementation beyond the SEE region. The change in dynamics, however, in Evaluators opinion, did have implications on the dynamics of other project activities (since the preparation of the *Follow-up template* was originally intended to be based on the Assessment report, rather than prepared in parallel). Nevertheless, the report will be a useful project output and is sure to serve as a background analysis for further anti-trafficking measures and victim support oriented capacity building projects and programmes in the SEE region. Since the quality of the output is indisputable and it represents a very valuable resource, the evaluators trust that the mitigation measures for this delay are appropriate.

Another modification of the project plan included a significant **reduction in the scope of the originally planned test-run phase for the *Follow-up template***. Namely, the project did not, as originally planned, involve a real-case testing of the template. This was, to a large extent related to the obstacles presented by the complexity of the political and institutional context in which the circulation of the template (as, in general, the transnational referral of the trafficking victims) would take place. The team, therefore, decided to, based on discussions with the participants during project events and training, develop a template that would not necessarily represent a legally binding format for exchange of data between the officials in the country of destination and country of origin, but rather a suggested practice. In other words, a form of a checklist on the set of information to be exchanged between the persons communicating during the process of the transnational referral of the victims. The team considered that, considering its changed purpose, the template would not necessarily require controlled testing. Even though the real-case testing did not take place, certain feedback on the potential usage of the template was collected through a questionnaire disseminated among project participants within this evaluation exercise. The questionnaire was agreed between the team and Evaluator, partially as a mitigation strategy for the reduction of the test-run phase.

A third minor modification of the scope of the activities was the reduction of the number of study visits to the destination countries. Instead of organising three visits, as originally proposed, two visits took place. This occurred because Spanish hosts cancelled the organisation of the visit with very short notice due to the local political situation. As the cancellation came at very short notice, the Evaluator estimates that the project team could not have done anything to prevent this. Furthermore, the problem was mitigated without any negative impacts to project's outcomes by re-directing the participants of the cancelled visit to alternative visits to other destination countries (France and Cyprus). Therefore, none of the target groups were deprived of the planned insight into the anti THB models of at least one of the EU Member States.

In terms of **action planning and monitoring**, the project team was very well organized. The team cooperated very well and there were no communication issues hindering successful project implementation. All the members of the team were extremely dedicated to project implementation. The team proved that it had great capacities not only in project management, but also in providing quality expertise in the field of trafficking in human beings. The fact that in the case where an external expert could not deliver the expected output fully and on time, the team managed to generate the high quality output clearly proving that **ICMPD should be understood not only as a capable facilitator, but also as an excellent source of expertise in the areas related to trafficking in human beings**.

Our recommendation, therefore, is that in future, potential problems in project management related to management of external experts could be prevented by greater reliance on in-house expertise, which is not

only more efficient, but also a more cost-effective way of organising project implementation and one that ensures long-term capacity building for ICMPD.

Coordination and communication with other stakeholders (project participants – NITs in SEE countries, other international and local organisations active in the THB field, state officials in SEE, EU destination country THB teams) was smooth, due to the good functioning of the network of LLOs established, who are all recognized experts in victim support and the fight against THB in their respective countries. The only critical element of the communication and coordination aspect, according to the findings of the team itself, was an insufficiently high involvement of the EU Member States officials, due to their lesser general interest in the topic. This was, as members of the team suggested, mainly a consequence of less active anti THB policies in the destination countries, rather than for the lack of the project teams' efforts. However, the team is satisfied with those contacts it managed to establish and the cooperation realized during the project, regretting only that its scope was not broader.

Our recommendation therefore, is that ICMPD should ensure that the level of communication established between the team and destination country officials within this project should be taken as a basis for further projects in relation to THB in the SEE region and the SEE countries' cooperation with destination countries, as well as those supporting the development of the EU Member States' national and transnational referral procedures. (In this respect, please refer also to the recommendations in relation to the effectiveness and sustainability criteria)

Financial management of the project was successful. The project saved funds by responsible spending and reduction in the number of study visits. When it became clear that the original budget would not be spent by the originally planned activities, a non-cost extension was requested and approved with implementation prolonged 3 months. The left-over funds were re-allocated to additional activities identified ad-hoc in individual beneficiary countries (see list of the activities above), which was a very successful risk-mitigation strategy on behalf of the project team.

The project had been spending in Euro and, due to the exchange-rate variations there is a nominal left-over of 5.370 USD, although all the funds (plus an excess of € 970.49) have been in fact spent. The project, therefore, in the Evaluators' opinion, represents an example of effective and efficient financial management.

Seeing that activities were mostly implemented as planned and that, even in cases when the activities were reduced in scope, the team managed to organize mitigation measures to minimise the negative effects of modifications, the effectiveness of the project implementation is considered **good**.

3.3. Evaluation Criterion 2 – Effectiveness

Evaluation approach in assessment of effectiveness is concerned with the **achievement of project outcomes**, both short and medium-term. The evaluation questions relevant for the evaluation of project effectiveness were: (EQ.3) To what extent has the project resulted in the development of a new tool for cooperation in referral of trafficked persons? (Short-term outcome 1) (EQ.4) Has the project successfully followed its predecessor (TRM-I) in improving networking and experience exchange between the origin, transit and destination countries' stakeholders in joint planning and implementation of anti-trafficking policies? (Short-term outcome 2) (EQ.5) To what extent has the project increased the capacities of the stakeholders to support the victims of child and labour-related trafficking? (Short-term outcome 3) (EQ.6) To what extent has the project resulted in an improved communication and information exchange in South-East Europe and between SEE and EU Member States on safe and voluntary return of trafficked persons as well as case follow-up, in particular in respect to trafficking for labour purposes and child trafficking? (Medium-term outcome or specific objective of the project)

In response to those questions, the following **judgement references and indicators** were chosen for each evaluation question:

(EQ.3) The evaluators tried to find out the level of satisfaction of the participants and the team with the *Follow-up template* developed in the project. The Evaluators also reviewed the output itself and compared its contents with the plan presented in the project proposal and during the project activities. The indicator for this objective in the initial methodological layout was: number of countries integrating the new tool in their regular practices. The Evaluators prepared a questionnaire analysing the current and planned uses of the *Follow-up Template* among the participants.

(EQ.4) In order to judge the achievement of this outcome, the Evaluators analysed the level of satisfaction of the participants and team with the type and profile of contacts gained or sustained through the project events and the type of exchange encouraged. The questionnaires from the project events, interviews and focus group were analysed to provide insights into these matters. The Evaluators also observed part of the project events. Indicator for the achievement of this outcome is defined as: the number of participants who judge that the project has furthered their potential for joint planning and implementation of anti-trafficking policies.

(EQ.5) In respect to this evaluation question, the Evaluators analysed the perception of the workshop, seminar and study-visit participants (both through the questionnaire analysis, interviews and focus group and through Project team reports and conclusions from workshops and seminars) on their increase in capacities in relation to the thematic foci of this project. The indicators considered for this question was the number of participants who judge that the project has furthered their potential for effective support to THB victims.

(EQ.6) The Evaluators tried to find out what the general effect and added value of the project were in terms of the improved communication and information exchange between different stakeholders in the SEE region and EU. In particular, the evaluators tried to learn to what extent the project succeeded in its attempts to build on the previous TRM project by widening the scope of the network established to the EU Member States as destination countries and by adding new thematic foci to the cooperation and information exchange. The interviews and focus groups were the key sources of information in respect to this question. The indicator considered in respect to this question was: the number of project participants estimating that the project has managed to improve the transnational communication and information exchange on safe and voluntary return of victims and case follow up in the region and between the SEE and EU member states countries.

Evaluation findings

Short-term outcome 1 (EQ.3)

The Follow-up template as a project output underwent a long consultative process with all the participants, which continued throughout the project implementation, and took place in all the project events. The difficulties in the development of the template were not related to its contents (i.e. the type of information that should be exchanged between the stakeholders organising the voluntary return and follow-up), but rather to the context of its use and procedures to be followed. The key questions which created difficulties in the development of the template were:

- 1) Protection of the victims' personal data
- 2) Institutional and legal set-up of the circulation of the template, including the issue of the ownership of the template (the national institution gathers data from other institutions nationally, circulating it internationally) and the legal basis for their circulation (a need for regulation of the circulation of the template through international agreement(s) or memoranda of understanding).
- 3) At which point in the process of transnational referral should the template be used and by whom, i.e. again the question of the procedure of its use and transfer.

The debates on these issues have taken place repetitively throughout the project events in which the template was discussed, but did not give rise to solutions and the participants could not reach an agreement. Therefore, the team decided to reduce their ambition to create a standard procedure that would be binding to all the countries involved and decided to take advantage of the fact that all the project participants found the idea of a structured set of information that the template represents useful, regardless of the context of its usage. Therefore, the template will remain as a tool for safe voluntary return and follow-up of the referral process, but only as a suggested practice that can provide a form of a checklist for all the actors communicating during the process, which they may or may not use in full and which may or may not become an official requirement according to the national legislative framework.

The evaluation found that the participants saw the template developed as a useful tool that will enable them to do their jobs and coordinate more efficiently, even if this tool is not yet and might not become a part of a legally binding framework.

In filling in the questionnaires during the Final regional seminar in Bucharest (27 – 29 February 2012), the participants were asked to respond to the question: How would you assess the level of achievement of the main objectives and results of the TRM project? In response to the achievement of this particular objective (Development of a new tool for co-operation in referral of trafficked persons (Template for Follow-up of Transnational Referral), the following answers were concluded:

How would you assess the level of achievement of the following objective of the TRM-II project: "To develop a new tool for cooperation in referral of trafficked persons (template for follow up on transnational referral)"

Mark	No. of participants	%	Comments
1 - not achieved	0	0.00%	
2- slightly achieved	3	8.33%	
3 - neutral	11	30.56%	
4 - achieved to a certain degree	17	47.22%	It is good but I think it still needs to be adjusted.
5 - completely achieved	5	13.89%	
Total	36		
Average	3.67		

The answer received corresponds to the interview and observation findings of the Evaluator. Both in discussions with the team members and in the interviews and discussions with the participants, the Evaluator understood that there was generally a high level of satisfaction towards the template as a tool that can support the existing practices of transnational communication between the project participants by providing structure and content to the regular exchange. However, the participants have not yet formally incorporated the template into their institutional or national practices. As shown by the questionnaire distributed separately to research the current and future practice in using the template, the participants mainly believe that the template will eventually in some way be formally integrated into their system.

How do you expect the Follow-up template developed under TRM II to be integrated into your work?	% of respondents*
It will most likely be incorporated in the national legal system	7.89
It will most likely be incorporated in official practice/acts of my institution or other institutions in the national team	23.68
It will most likely be adapted and then integrated into our national legal system	21.05
It will most likely be adapted and then integrated in the official practice/acts of my institution	23.68
It will most likely not be formally used, but it will serve as a guidance to the practitioners in our teams	13.16
It will most likely not be used at all	0.00
I don't know	10.53
Other (please add text to explain)	

*Some respondents circled more than one answer.

The participants who responded that the template would not be formally used, but will serve as a guidance and those who responded by saying "They will most likely not be used at all" were requested an explanation to their response. The answers received were: "Because the usage of TRM and TRM Follow-up template do not have any legal base. It is necessary to conclude bilateral agreements on that or multilateral agreement between TRM countries" and "Because the project does not foresee the possibility for the Template to be adopted, and it was not done so on a national level".

The project has not succeeded in its original plan to organize a real situation test for the usage of the template. The training on its usage remained at a level of two half-day exercises during the Workshops in Belgrade and Skopje and it left the issue of the context of the usage of the questionnaire open. Therefore, the questionnaire circulated among the participants in July 2012 as part of the external evaluation, served as the key element of feedback in relation to the practical usage of this output.

Only 3 participants in the survey (out of 27) claimed that they have already used the template in their practice, but only one of them shared his/her experience, explaining that it was only relatively useful, since "*The designated persons on TRM list were either not available or were not on a sufficiently high level to act*". Another responded that he/she found it useful, but did not provide an explanation and the third person failed to provide any feedback.

The statements of the persons interviewed indicated less optimism about the formal adoption of the template, but gave very positive feedback on its contents and usefulness. Some of the typical examples are:

"The result itself has been achieved - the template as such did not exist before and now it exists. But it is still not used in practice. International, donor-funded projects as such are not the right forum for

solving such issues - it requires strong national commitment of a political level and administrative procedures that need to be dealt with as a goal in itself”;

“There are official channels that the police are using in their exchange of data, but this will for sure help me structure that communication, the type of data that I exchange with my colleagues through those existing channels”;

“The process of joint development of the template helped us to understand what kind of issues we have to have in mind when we are helping the victims”.

In conclusion, we can say that the achievement of this specific objective was **very good** and that the project did manage to create a new tool for cooperation in referral of trafficked persons. Namely, even if that tool, the *Template for Follow-up* of transnational referral of trafficked persons, was not introduced in the way in which the project team hoped it would be – as a formally binding standard document – both the tool and the process of its making are considered of a high quality and very useful by almost all of the project participants.

For future reference, the Evaluator would recommend the project team to consider the following:

- Consider the complexity of the political and legal context in project planning and consider the risks of the type occurring in the achievement of this outcome timely, so that they can adjust their expectations and, if needed, limit them.
- Consider directing stronger action to a political, decision-making level, which has the power to integrate procedures into the national practices and focusing project activities on that level. The level of national coordinators and higher would be an appropriate forum for aiming for development of memoranda of understanding or other forms of international agreements.

Short-term outcome 2 (EQ.4)

The questionnaires, interviews and observations undertaken during the evaluation process all clearly indicate that **the strongest success of this as well as of the previous TRM project was the establishment of a network of contacts of all the stakeholders in the region dealing with THB**. Good communication and a set of pre-defined contacts is considered by all participants of the evaluation process to be a necessary pre-requisite of the successful cooperation in transnational referral and safe and voluntary return of the victims. The project’s success was in ensuring that the participants know who their counterparts are or, in cases when they already had official contacts, to, as one participant put it in the focus group, *“put a face to the name”*, and thus enable faster cooperation with a greater level of trust.

The responses of the participants to the question posed in the evaluation questionnaire distributed in the final seminar demonstrate this high level of appreciation of the quality of communication and exchange achieved in the project:

How would you assess the level of achievement of the following objective of the TRM-II project: “Continuously supported networking and experience exchange between origin, transit and destination countries’ stakeholders in joint planning and implementation of anti-trafficking policies”			
Mark	No. of participants	%	Comments
1 - not achieved	0	0.00%	But it is a very good step forward.
2 - slightly achieved	0	0.00%	
3 - neutral	10	27.78%	
4 - achieved to a certain degree	15	41.67%	
5 - completely achieved	11	30.56%	

Total	36
Average	4.03

In almost all the responses to open questions and all the interviews, the participants pointed out the success in creating a network and a platform for exchange as their most positive impression of the project. Of the 26 responses to the question “What did you find most useful about the TRM programme” (referring to both TRM I and TRM II project), 20 out of 26 responses were related to the establishment of a functioning network of practitioners, cooperation and coordination and the personal contacts gained. (E.g. *“The development of a cooperation, establishment of a working network and the implementation of this network through the years”*; *“Focal points in all countries”*, *“The development of cooperative working”*, *“Improvement of the transnational communication, synchronisation of the process of referral of victims of trafficking, which raise the efficiency of the implementation of the procedures.”*; *“Higher level of homogenisation and cooperation is achieved among all relevant subjects form the participating countries; “List of contacts in the region” etc.)*

However, a specific element integrated in this project objective, was the fact that TRM II was aimed at widening the network developed and cooperation established under the previous, TRM I project, to the destination countries, predominantly EU member states, whose involvement and cooperation is one of the key elements of the project’s effectiveness. However, **despite of the best efforts of the project team, the participation of the destination countries in the project was limited and their full incorporation into the TRM system established in SEE is yet to be achieved**, possibly in the context of the new “EU Strategy towards the eradication of trafficking in Human beings (2012 – 2016)”, which promises a perspective of greater involvement of the EU Member States in the development of transnational referral mechanisms.

While all the participants in the Final seminar survey judged the success of the networking element of the project to be its strongest achievement, the answers that were given to the open questions on “What is the issue that you feel remained unresolved by this process” and “What would be your key recommendation to the project team for their future work” were predominantly pointing at the remaining need to involve the countries of destination, and the EU Member States into the TRM process. Responses included: *“Countries of destination – focal points, referral of victims, SOPs for countries of destination”*, *“More participant countries to work together”*, *“More lobbying (maybe on higher level) with countries of destination to participate actively, including in TRM”*, *“To create a compact form for EU countries and developing countries” etc.*

A large proportion of the interviewed participants said that they felt that the participation of the countries of destination outside the SEE region was the only element that was significantly missing from this project. The project team members recognize this problem and point out that they themselves are not entirely satisfied with the achieved level of involvement. When asked why they thought this was the case, both the project team members and the participants pointed out that there was no political pressure towards the EU Member State countries, up until recently, to develop a uniform system for the fight against THB and victim support. Therefore, some of the highly organised European Member States do not possess the national referral mechanisms developed to a level that would meet the standards of that SEE countries now have.

This is likely to change soon, as the project team informed the Evaluator. Namely, the new “EU Strategy towards the eradication of trafficking in Human beings (2012 – 2016)”, adopted in June 2012 by the European Commission, suggests to “develop a model for an EU Transnational Referral Mechanism which will link different national referral mechanisms to a better identify, refer, protect and assist victims”². Clearly, this represents a great opportunity to take the results of both TRM projects and a) multiply them by introducing a successful model to another set of countries and thus b) finally establish the desired effect of connecting the countries of destination and origin, under the presumption that their transnational referral mechanisms are joint.

² «Enhancing Transnational Cooperation on Trafficking Cases in South-Eastern Europe. An Assessment Report in South-Eastern Europe», draft

While the project might not have entirely succeeded in achieving the institutional form of cooperation with the destination countries, it did achieve a level of exchange of experiences with the destination countries.

The team managed to invite speakers from EU destination countries to participate in the project events, whereby they presented their country's experiences in fighting against trafficking in human beings and cases with transnational dimensions. During project events, officials from France, the Netherlands and Spain were presenting the models of fighting against THB in their countries. Furthermore, contacts were established and experience exchange achieved in the study visits to Cyprus and France, organised during the project for all the TRM SEE countries and, additionally, during the project extension, to Slovakia and Austria (organised for Montenegrin representatives) and to Greece (for Bulgarian delegation).

The opinion of the project team, is that through the attempts to organise the participation of the Member States, both those successful and those that did not lead to active participation in project events, ICMPD did manage to create a network of contacts among the relevant EU Member States' officials and that this will represent a basis for future projects in which further steps of integration of destination countries in TRM process could be taken. The Evaluator supports their view and believes that this project has managed to set the grounds for further development of connections between the countries of origin and countries of destination, which is already visible in the new ICMPD project in the region, "Capacity Building for Combating Trafficking for Labour Exploitation (CB LAB)". Namely, the new project involves 14 Central and Eastern European Countries, both EU and non-EU Members, seeking to further enhance cooperation on a regional, national and European level in relation to combating trafficking for labour exploitation..

Even with the reservations in relation to the involvement of the destination countries, the Evaluator judges that the level of achievement of this outcome was **very good** and is recognized as one of the strongest successes of the TRM process.

The recommendations for future projects that we can offer to the project team are:

- To further promote the successful cooperation between the SEE countries which is an outcome of the TRM process. Even in the case whereby the lesser donor sources are available for this topic and this geographical region, the maintenance and further development of such a well established network might not require intensive and expensive action. This is an extremely valuable outcome and could be preserved through some level of regular coordination or capacity-building events to be organised in the future.
- ICMPD should consider this project as an opportunity to take TRM model to the EU Member States and multiply its effect to benefit not only the EU Member States as (mostly) destination countries, but also to benefit SEE countries as (mostly) countries of origin and transfer by working to integrate them into a single, "compact" model.
- The team should also take advantage of the contacts established in the Member States, even in cases where they did not lead to significant outcomes under this particular project, since they represent a valuable resource for future projects.

Short-term outcome 3 (EQ.5)

The third short-term outcome of the project was related to its specific thematic foci: child and labour-related trafficking, which represented the key topics in the 2 Workshops held in May and June 2011 in Durres and Sofia, but were also a horizontal element emphasised throughout all the other project activities, including in the development of the Follow-up template. The wording of the objective agreed with the Evaluator during the re-design of the structure of the project's objectives was "to increase the capacities of the relevant stakeholders in the SEE countries to support the victims of child and labour-related trafficking" (in initial project design, the thematic foci were not emphasised in the wording of the project objectives).

Generally, the project participants have, both in the questionnaires and interviews, given a very positive assessment of the achievement of this objective.

How would you assess the level of achievement of the following objective of the TRM-II project: “Capacities of stakeholders in the countries of origin, transit and destination to support the victims of child and labour related trafficking increased”

Mark	No. of participants	%	Comments
1 - not achieved	0	0.00%	
2 - slightly achieved	1	2.78%	
3 - neutral	10	27.78%	
4 - achieved to a certain degree	20	55.56%	
5 - completely achieved	5	13.89%	
Total	36		
Average	3.81		

In addition, the assessment of the two thematic workshops was positive. After the **Transnational workshop on Child Trafficking held in Durres**, in response to the question: “How would you assess the level of achieving the results of this seminar?”, the average grade given in regards to the expected result of “Awareness of the special needs of children raised” was **3.53**. After the **Transnational workshop on Labour-related Trafficking held in Sofia**, the average grade given in regards to the expected result of “Awareness of the special needs of persons trafficked for labour exploitation raised” was given a very high **4.40**. The interviewed participants mainly expressed satisfaction and interest with the thematic foci, in particular with the focus on labour-related trafficking, which is overall recognised as a growing form of trafficking requiring a special set of skills and stakeholders to be trained, in particular for identification.

Less feedback was received on the issue of the project’s success in relation to the capacity building for fighting against trafficking in children. Most of the participants interviewed were not giving extensive comments on this topic or were not present at the seminar. Of those who recognised trafficking of children as relevant to their work, the majority emphasise the need to give special attention to the cases of child begging. Child begging was often recognised as a frequent form of exploitation in the region and also represents a form of both child and labour-related trafficking, which, in the opinion of a number of participants, should be especially tackled in the coming projects.

The Evaluators judge that the level of achievement of this project outcome is **very good** and that the project generally had a positive effect on the capacities of the participants to deal with cases related to the two thematic foci of the project, especially when it comes to labour-related trafficking.

A lot of recommendations of the interviewed participants, as well as recommendations found in the interviews referred to the thematic foci of potential future projects. A large proportion of the participants felt that they would like to further work on their capacities in relation to the labour-related trafficking, a significant part of them emphasising a need to further the target groups included in the training to labour inspectors and border police.

This recommendation is already recognised by ICMPD in that it initiated the Capacity Building for Combating Trafficking for Labour Exploitation (CB LAB) project, which started 1 December 2011 and was presented in the Final Regional Seminar in Bucharest.

Furthermore, a number of interesting proposals came both from the interviewees and from the project team members for the integration of the interest in labour-related trafficking into a wider topic of the relation between economic immigration trends and trafficking in human beings. Namely, the Evaluators have taken the

point offered by a number of participants interviewed, that they would benefit significantly from a research of the arising trends in trafficking and an insight into the correlation between the recent economic crises or political changes (e.g. Croatia’s accession into the EU) and the trends in labour-related and other forms of THB. A project dedicated to such research could provide an informed basis for numerous further projects in the region, both national and international.

Medium-term outcome (EQ.6)

The specific objective of the project is phrased as a combination of the short-term outcomes of the project: *To improve the transnational communication and information exchange in South-East Europe and between SEE and EU Member States on the safe and voluntary return of trafficked persons as well as case follow-up, in particular in respect to trafficking for labour purposes and child trafficking.* However, in approaching the assessment of this medium-term objective, the Evaluators tried to look at a level higher than a simple addition of the short-term outcomes and put an emphasis on the concept of improving the communication and information exchange in the geographical area and in the specific thematic foci. The sub-question posed to the participants in the interviews was, therefore: “Do you think that this project made a difference and caused a change in the way participants communicated and operated?”

The answers, again, were mainly positive.

The questionnaire responses received at the project final event were the following:

How would you assess the level of achievement of the following objective of the TRM-II project: “To improve the transnational communication and information exchange in South-East Europe and between SEE and EU Member States on the safe and voluntary return of trafficked persons as well as case follow-up, in particular in respect to trafficking for labour purposes and child trafficking”

Mark	No. of participants	%	Comments
1 - not achieved	0	0.00%	
2 - slightly achieved	3	8.11%	
3 - neutral	8	21.62%	New countries involved - destination countries and non-TRM countries
4 - achieved to a certain degree	18	48.65%	It has definitely improved but efforts and steps taken in this sense should be continued as well.
5 - completely achieved	8	21.62%	
Total	37		
Average	3.84		

After 6 years of TRM process, part of the interviewed participants found it difficult to distinguish between the project effects and developments that followed from the project or those that ran in parallel, since the project became an integral part of the cooperation between SEE Countries in countering THB. In that respect, an interesting answer received from a participant was:

“I do believe we would have cooperated even if the project did not take place, especially us in the police. But I guess we are much faster this way, now when we know the people we communicate with”.

The participants also found it difficult to distinguish between the effects of this and the previous TRM project and mainly considered them as part of a continuous effort of ICMPD’s to work on the development and

implementation transnational referral mechanisms in the SEE region. While this generally represents a positive aspect of the project, i.e. an indication that the project was embedded in a wider process and that it built on the contacts and outcomes established in previous actions, it did in some cases render the evaluation difficult in as much as the evaluation needed to focus on TRM – II, not the process as a whole. For future projects, therefore, we can suggest that if a series of projects are planned, either an overall evaluation of the series as a whole should be ordered or, in cases evaluation would be focused on only one of the projects in the series, it is ensured that the division between parts of the sequence is visible to the participants. This, however, does not represent a concern in relation to the quality of project impact, rather a reservation in relation to the relevance of its evaluation. With this reservation in mind, the Evaluators came to the conclusion that the level of achievement of the project's mid-term objective is **very good**.

3.4. Evaluation Criterion 3 – Relevance

Evaluation approach in the analysis of project relevance deals with the **appropriateness of the project for the needs and problems of the target groups** and **risk management**, i.e. the degree of flexibility to adapt to changes in environment, if appropriate. The Evaluation question (EQ7) is assessing to what extent the needs and problems were properly identified and addressed, including the response to different situations on the field and unforeseen circumstances. The following **judgment references and indicators** were chosen: Assessing the validity of basic pre-assumptions made in the project proposal on the composition, problems and needs of the target group, as well as the appropriateness of actions designed to tackle them. Furthermore looking into the validity of risks mitigation measures and their actual realisation in order to estimate whether an effort was made to maintain validity of intervention throughout the implementation. Interviews, questionnaires and a focus group were used as tools. *Indicators*: A list of problems & risks from the project proposal and reports on the field; Reactions of the beneficiaries; Descriptive answer to the judgment references.

Evaluation findings

Project relevance in this broadly set transnational project was, both in terms of its design and during the implementation, a challenge to the team, which the team in most cases faced very well. Namely, **the project incorporated a very broad and diverse set of stakeholders** (from national coordinator's offices, police and prosecution to civil sector organisations supporting the victims), **as well as an even more diverse set of participating countries**. The project seems to have addressed the different needs with varying degrees of success, in most cases, succeeding in ensuring some level of benefits for all.

The relevance of the project results to **different countries** was variable and the discussions during the project events proved that the problems that different national teams faced in terms of the functioning of their national systems, the trafficking trends and the environment in which they function internationally, differ greatly. For example, the communication between countries of Western Balkans, especially former Yugoslav Republics, is much smoother than between other countries in the region, because of the shared or very similar languages, the similar legal systems and similarity in the trafficking trends. Participants from that region often claimed, during the workshops and in the interviews, that their cooperation was satisfactory and that the new tool was not a necessity for them. Other countries' representatives, however, felt differently. Many considered all the elements of the project relevant to them, and some emphasised that both TRM projects had been crucial for development of their national systems. However, most of them, regardless of their own sub-region, emphasised that the project would have been more relevant to their needs should it have succeeded in establishing a stronger involvement of the EU destination countries. In reference to the relevance of the *Follow-up Template*, attitudes expressed again varied from enthusiasm to further adjust the national procedures according to the template (provided that the countries of origin used it, too), to scepticism towards a need for formal incorporation of the template in their national practice. Nevertheless, all the participants interviewed were very much aware of the diversity of the needs of target groups and understood that such

wide-ranging interventions as The TRM projects could not address all of them in a tailor-made fashion. Most of them agreed that the team succeeded in creating a wide and flexible platform that can, but does not necessarily have to be, used by all the stakeholders in the region.

The most important criticism expressed by almost all of the participants in terms of the relevance of the project approach, was the concept of the process of development of the *Follow-up template* which did not ensure the **inclusion of the destination countries**, whose officials are supposed to be responsible for entering the data on victims in the template. The Evaluators understand that EU destination countries could not be beneficiaries in this project and therefore could also not really cooperate in it on an equal footing as the SEE countries. The limitation is set by the donor policy and outside of the scope of the Project Team's influence. The recommendation here therefore is also to be given to the donors, rather than the project team. Donor policy, not only that of USAID but also of other donors active in the field of countering THB is typically (and logically) oriented at lower and mid-income countries. However, in transnational crime and THB in particular, the mid and lower-income countries cannot be supported without the full involvement of the destination countries. If donor funding is limited only to part of the countries, others could be encouraged to seek own or other available funding in order to fully engage in the project, on an equal footing with the countries of origin.

The involvement of destination countries in terms of experience exchange between their officials and SEE countries' counterparts is, on the other hand, perceived as fully appropriate, since a significant proportion of the speakers in the seminars and workshops indeed were from the EU countries of destination. An interesting comment at one of the interviews was: *"When we started this process, experts from destination countries were only presenting their experiences to us. The perception has since then slightly changed and they also understand that they have something to learn from us and that their experiences are limited to their own countries"*.

In terms of the thematic **relevance of the topics** chosen for training, most of the persons who the Evaluators encountered during the project seminars and interviews emphasised the usefulness of the labour-related trafficking element of the project for their needs, since it reflected current trends in trafficking. Most of the interviewees claimed that their capacities to deal with the labour-related trafficking grew significantly due to the project activities and that this was something that they would most certainly need and use in their work. There were some differences of perspective in this matter, too, and they were mainly correlated to the role of the participants in the system in fighting against THB and victim support. A person who works for a women's shelter considered that the emphasis on labour-related trafficking as a trend wider than only this project, is taking away the focus from the still predominant form of exploitation, which is sex exploitation of women. Some representatives claimed that they did not face many child-related trafficking cases or these were not identified sufficiently, so the child trafficking was not a topic of high relevance to their work, while others thought it was not even given enough emphasis. A significant proportion of suggestions in terms of potential further activities in TRM process went into the direction of child begging as a specific form of exploitation, which requires special attention and means of identification and victim support.

The project team tried to overcome some of the problems of diverse geographical and professional backgrounds by organising workshops, study-tours and group work within seminars by organising the work with the participants into smaller groups depending on their geographical area or on their expertise and this represented a valuable approach and a very appropriate response to project risks. This allowed a number of smaller and more focused communication axis to develop during the project implementation and equally enriched the communication, while adding focus to particular workshops and group-tasks.

From these diverse reactions, the Evaluator can conclude that the project tried to cater for a very broad and diverse target group (or rather a set of target groups) and has managed, under these circumstances, to keep a **very good** level of relevance to different participants.

Risk elements that the project faced were: a) delays in delivery of the Assessment Report, b) delays (and ultimately the cancellation of the test-run phase of the *Follow-up Template*) and c) project under-spending. The response to the delivery of the Assessment Report was slow, but appropriate. Namely, once it became clear that the Report will not be finalized by the external expert in time to serve as a basis for the Follow-up template, the team decided to proceed by itself with finalisation of the Report and to change its purpose and use it as a tool for broader needs-identification for not only ICMPSD's future initiatives, but as a source of data

for all the potential future interventions in the area of THB in South-Eastern Europe. The team proved that it is more than capable of preparing a high-quality expertise.

One of the important recommendations in regards to the experience of risk management in this project is that ICMPD's team can very well rely on its in-house expertise, since it is both more reliable than any form of external involvement, but additionally because it is most cost-effective and because it creates a long-term effect of capacity building of the institution as such.

The delays in the preparation of the *Follow-up Template* and the fact that the test-run phase was partly abolished were, in the Evaluator's opinion, less appropriately mitigated and only partly overcome. Namely, the problems that caused the delays and change in plan, i.e. the fact that most of the participants saw the data protection as a critical obstacle to any form of formal endorsement of the template and the lack of motivation for the formal endorsement of the template as part of bidding national procedures - could have been overcome at an earlier stage. In the Evaluator's opinion this should have been done either in a way in which it finally was – by the changed approach to the Template and the change of its purpose into a supporting, rather than a formally binding instrument - or by actions to involve the national coordinators into finding a legal solution to the problem and drafting and promoting between the national coordinators a form of memorandum of understanding, that would enable some level of incorporation of the Template into the practices. Finally, the opportunity was not used to test the template on a real case even as an unofficial model procedure, since the decision to re-think its potential usage into it serving as a non-binding document came at a late stage of project implementation. In this sense, the team could have shown more flexibility in adjusting to the external threats to project outcomes.

The team, however, organised a very quick and appropriate response to the fact that there were financial savings in the project and requested a project extension in which it allowed different participating countries to organise smaller-scale activities which met their individual needs and complemented the work organised under the core-part of the project.

Overall, taking into consideration a tremendously wide set of elements, needs and challenges that the project had to face in realisation of its initially very ambitious aims, the mark given to the **relevance** criterion of the project is **very good**.

For future reference, however, the Evaluator would suggest as a potential approach in project design to consider the following: if such a wide set of countries is to be taken as a target for a transnational cooperation project, the project should be aware of the fact that it is extremely difficult to achieve complex outcomes and meet the needs of all the participants. Such a project should, in our opinion, either focus only on improving the communication and networking between the participants by creating and sustaining a framework for experience exchange, or focus strongly on achieving a particular formal level of cooperation. In the later case, however, the team would have to take into account the complexity of the political and legal harmonisation and foresee activities in the project that would address these (such as legal experts, high level meetings, drafting the relevant memoranda of understanding for the coordinators to sign etc.)

3.5. Evaluation Criterion 4 – Impact

Evaluation approach in analysis of project impact deals with *long-term effects of the project* so the evaluation question (EQ6) is looking into the contribution to the achievement of broader project objectives, i.e. how much has the project contributed to the achievement of the long-term objectives? In particular:

The Evaluators looked for the *judgement references and indicators* in the opinions of the beneficiaries and the project team to assess the extent to which they considered the project contributed to the effective assistance and protection of trafficked persons with due respect to the protection of their personal data and privacy by strengthening the communication and cooperation between relevant governmental and non-governmental stakeholders at a transnational level? The Evaluators also aimed at, to some point, assessing the overall impact of the TRM I and II and the difference they have made in relation to the situation in the region.

Evaluation findings

The assessment of the project's impact is not fully possible within the scope of this evaluation, since impact assessment would require a longer time-perspective and measurement of indicators in a longer period. However, it is relevant to consider the opinions of the team and the participants on the likelihood that such impact is or will be achieved. When asked directly on their views on the likelihood of the project contributing significantly to the assistance and protection to trafficked persons in terms of a measurable reduction of time needed for assistance, the interviewees were cautious in giving any exact estimates, but in most cases sure of a positive impact of the project. The majority emphasised that it is difficult to isolate project effects or indeed the TRM process effects from a number of other influences on the effectiveness of the system of support to the victims. As already quoted above, an interesting statement came from one of the representatives of police interviewed and it can, we believe, be considered indicative of the general attitude: *"I do believe we would have cooperated even if the project did not take place, especially us in the police. But I guess we are much faster this way, now when we know the people we communicate with"*.

It is also undisputable that, while the participants and team members were cautious to give estimates of effect of the project on the overall functioning of the system, the other premise of the project impact, i.e. "by strengthening the communication and cooperation between relevant governmental and non-governmental stakeholders at a transnational level" is indisputably already achieved through this and the previous project. Again, 20 out of 26 respondents in the questionnaire disseminated in the final event considered the improvement of communication and networking of various stakeholders in the region to be the most significant achievement of the project and this is also a statement which features in all the interviews. In this respect, the impact of the project is considered **very good**.

The statistics available to support the general impression are, however, of limited relevance, since they mainly refer to the numbers of cases identified, rather than the numbers of victims supported or referred and the time needed for successful voluntary referral.

In terms of impact assessment, therefore, the key recommendation that the Evaluator can give is to ensure that some form of measurements of the project impact, which seems to be highly positive in the case of this TRM project, are integrated in the project layout. Even if longer-term impact of any project cannot be predicted with full numeric certainty, some target values for indicators could be set as projections or at least a set of baseline measurements should be made available in order to make measurement of change in the long run possible.

3.4. Evaluation Criterion 5 – Sustainability

Evaluation approach in analysis of project sustainability is concerned primarily with *follow up activities* that should ensure the continuation of project benefits in the longer term. The Evaluation question (EQ9) is assessing to what extent there is a continuation of project activities and benefits (services, products and outcomes) after external assistance and is there a likelihood and opportunity for their replication / extension in a wider context.

(EQ9)

The same or similar activities continue after the project end (targeting the same beneficiaries and/or with the same objectives); Target groups and local community have developed a sense of ownership over the Project outputs and benefits and display commitment towards their continuation; Project partners are aware of the lessons learned and this experience has been applied to other/wider contexts. *Indicators:* Number and type of activities/initiatives with the same focus; forecasts of the usage of the *Follow-up template*; Descriptive answer to judgment references.

Evaluation findings

In assessing project sustainability, the Evaluators were concerned with the two key elements:

- Likelihood of outputs will be continuously used and/or further developed by the target groups
- Likelihood of outputs and outcomes being continued, incorporated in a wider context or multiplied by future activities of ICMPD

The first element primarily relates to the issue of the usage of the *Follow-up template*, which is the key project output, whose concept implies sustainable longer-term implementation. Its acceptance among the beneficiaries was, as explained, a matter of great concern of the project team, since obstacles to the original concept arose during the implementation and it became clear that formal integration of the template into the national practices during project life span was not an option. Evaluators therefore, initiated a small survey targeted at finding out the intentions of the national implementation teams in terms of future usage of the template, as well as systematically investigating the issue during the interviews.

The findings of the questionnaire disseminated to all the NITs through LLOs give a base for optimism in terms of the sustainable use of this project output. 27 questionnaires were completed by participants from 9 countries, representing different types of stakeholders (from national coordinators, their office, different line ministries, prosecutors, to police and NGO representatives).

As given above, their response to the key question was as follows:

How do you expect the Follow-up template developed under TRM II to be integrated into your work?	% of respondents*
It will most likely be incorporated into the national legal system	7.89
It will most likely be incorporated into official practice/acts of my institution or other institutions in the national team	23.68
It will most likely be adapted and then integrated into our national legal system	21.05
It will most likely be adapted and then integrated into the official practice/acts of my institution	23.68
It will most likely not be formally used, but it will serve as a guidance to the practitioners in our teams	13.16

It will most likely not be used at all	0.00
I don't know	10.53
Other (please add text to explain)	

* A number of respondents circled two possible answers.

The interviewed representatives from the 3 different countries differed in their responses to the question concerning the usage of the template. While Montenegrin and Romanian representatives believed that it would, most likely, be adjusted and adopted at some level in their national referral systems, Croatian representatives were quite sure that no formal adoption, even with adjustments was possible, but some of them emphasised that practical benefits of the template in their work are undisputable and that it will serve as a checklist for the type of information that they need to exchange with their counterparts, even if not as a format of formal communication.

The recommendation that we can give in respect to the sustainability of the *Follow-up template* usage is that ICMPD should continue to try to gather information and feedback on its usage and share the information across the region, i.e. the project should ensure a quality feedback on this output's post-project life and effects. It could also encourage the further usage of the template by making sure that all the participants are aware of other's practices and potentially are motivated by the fact that other countries are using it.

Another output whose further use is important is the report on TRM in South-East Europe ("The Way Forward in Establishing Effective Transnational Referral Mechanisms in Trafficking Cases. A Report Based on Experiences in South-Eastern Europe"). While this report could not serve its initial purpose of assessment of the situation in the early project phase, but is rather going to be published and disseminated at the very end of the project, it is an output whose quality deserves to be promoted and used as a basis for further informed action in TRM development and in general in cooperation in SEE.

A significant element of the project's sustainability is the usage of its positive effects and further building upon those in other actions planned. This is partly already insured by the new ICMPF project **Capacity Building for Combating trafficking for labour exploitation**. As mentioned above, the project builds on the network and communication established in TRM process and in the initial steps in capacity building in respect to this specific form of trafficking during this project.

A very important opportunity for multiplication of project results, as well as filling some of the gaps of that this project left in respect to cooperation with the destination countries, is most certainly the fact that the European commission pushes for development of National Referral Mechanisms in the Member States (in the EU Strategy towards the eradication of trafficking in human beings (2012 – 2016)). An introduction of TRM model as a unique good practice example to the EU level would be the most appropriate continuation of this project and a most effective way of approaching the transnational elements of combating trafficking and victim support. In addition to that, establishment of the same system of national coordinators and procedures that would be structured in the same logic as those already established in SEE countries, would help close the gap of cooperation between destination countries and countries of origin and transit. Such usage of the TRM model would, therefore, not only represent a cost-effective approach to development and standardisation of procedures in the EU Member States, but would also provide for a model that has undergone a positive test in practice and which promises to close the chain of cooperation between all the relevant stakeholders internationally.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations:

Conclusions:

The project represents part of a process initiated with the previous TRM project, rather than a stand-alone action. Its aim was to ensure broader implementation and sustainability of the already established outcomes: the creation of a network of SEE stakeholders active in the fight against THB and development of Standard Operating Procedures for transnational referral. The project was aiming to continue its predecessor's good practice by further experience exchange between the 10 involved SEE countries, but also by stronger involvement of destination countries, mainly EU Member States. It also aimed at further standardisation of TRM procedures by the introduction of a common *Template for Follow-up* of the voluntary return of victims. The element of experience exchange and networking was to be further strengthened by adding a thematic focus to the two specific forms of trafficking: child trafficking and labour related trafficking. The project faced a number of obstacles on its way to achievement of the objectives, but has succeeded in overcoming them or finding ways to mitigate their effects.

Project activities were mainly implemented as planned. The team has been very successful in the organisation of all project events. Delays happened in respect to the delivery of two larger outputs - Assessment Report and Follow-up Template. The team did manage to reduce the consequences of the delays by re-organising some of the activities. The only significant reduction of scope of the project is the cancellation of the test-run of the Follow-up Template, but also represents a logical response to obstacles faced during the implementation of the template and the changed scope and function of the *template*. The organisation of the project team and project management were excellent. **Overall, project efficiency is considered good.**

Even though there were some modifications and adjustments in the project activities, the project has largely managed to meet its objectives. It is recognised among all the stakeholders as a best practice example and significant contribution to the region in terms of establishment of the cooperation and networking among the stakeholders from SEE countries. The project was not as successful as planned in the integration of the EU destination countries in the formal cooperation processes. However, the project did build the basis for better cooperation with the EU member states by establishing the basic contacts and organising experience exchange between the countries of destination and origin. The *Template for Follow-up* of the transnational referral is seen as a very valuable tool in transnational victim assistance and, even if not yet integrated into the official practices, a valuable resource for professionals who communicate across the border during the victim return process. **The effectiveness of the project is considered very good.**

With the complex set of stakeholders from 10 countries, which have variable levels and different types of national referral mechanisms organisation, and which are also facing different trends in trafficking human beings, the project had to cater to an extremely difficult set of needs and interests. The project was successful in making sure that there were benefits for all by providing a flexible enough general framework on the one hand, and organising activities according to sub-groups, on the other. **Project relevance is therefore assessed as very good.**

While the project's longer-term impact is difficult to assess at the project end, before longer-term effects are visible, all the participants see this and a previous TRM project as an important building block in the creation of a functional international cooperation model in the SEE region that can serve as a best practice example even to EU Member States in the long run. **The project impact can therefore be expected to be very good.**

Finally, sustainability of project results and outcomes is, based on the estimates of project participants, likely. The element of network development is so strong that the contacts are likely to be preserved even without direct further involvements of ICMPD or other international actors, but the new ICMPD project aimed at capacity building for the struggle against labour-related trafficking for 14 Central and Eastern European states

is promising that contacts will be kept and further developed. The participants of the survey on the *Follow-up Template* usage mainly believe it will enter into the formal or informal practices of their institutions. A great opportunity for further development and multiplication of project outcomes is recognised in the new Strategy of the EU for 2012 and 2016 period, which foresees the development of national AND transnational referral mechanisms in all the member states. ICMPD will aim to promote TRM as a best practice model, which could integrate the practices of mostly destination (EU) countries and mostly origin (SEE) countries. **Project sustainability is thus considered very good.**

Recommendations

- 1) The project team was very ambitious in setting to develop a *Follow-up template*, tested and ready to be integrated in the practices of the 10 participating countries within a year. The team should in future, set more limited and feasible objectives, taking into the account the complexity of the political and legal context in project planning and consider the risks of the type occurring in the achievement of this outcome timely so that they can adjust their expectations and, if needed, limit them.
- 2) Having in mind the importance of political and legal context of the establishment of transnational cooperation procedures, in cases where formalisation of procedures is expected, the team should consider directing its action to political, decision-making level, which has the power to integrate procedures into the national practices. The level of national coordinators and higher would be an appropriate forum for aiming for development of memoranda of understanding or other forms of international agreements.
- 3) In dealing with external risks, the project team has proven not only very agile, but also highly competent. It has compensated for the delays and gaps in the delivery of external expertise with highly valuable own inputs. This has proven that ICMPD can rely on its in-house expertise and engage this in the project implementation. Such an approach would not only be more cost-effective, but also create valuable long-term effect of capacity building of ICMPD as an organisation.
- 4) A lot of recommendations of the interviewed participants, as well as recommendations found in the interviews referred to the thematic foci of potential future projects. A large proportion of the participants felt that they would like to further work on their capacities in relation to the labour-related trafficking, and a significant part of them emphasising a need to further the target groups included in the training to labour inspectors and border police. However, there were some interviewees who felt that the focus on labour-related trafficking was taking the necessary attention away from the still most prominent form of exploitation connected with trafficking which needed further attention, and that is sex exploitation.
- 5) A number of interesting proposals came from both the interviewees and from the project team members for the integration of the interest in labour-trafficking into a wider topic of economic immigration trends. Namely, a number of informants pointed out the need to survey the trends and see how the recent economic crisis or political changes (e.g. Croatia's accession into the EU) will influence economic immigration trends and hence the trends in labour-related and other forms of THB. This could provide a basis for numerous further projects, both nationally and internationally.
- 6) A very important opportunity for multiplication of project results, as well as filling some of the gaps that this project left in respect to cooperation with the destination countries, is most certainly the fact that the European commission pushes for development of National and Transnational Referral Mechanisms in the Member States (in the EU Strategy towards the eradication of trafficking in human beings (2012 – 2016). An introduction of TRM model as a good practice example to the EU level would be the most appropriate continuation of this project and a very effective way of approaching the transnational elements of combating trafficking and victim support in general. In addition to that, it could help close the gap of cooperation between destination countries and countries of origin and transit.