

ASIA REGIONAL TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS PROJECT (ARTIP)

MID-TERM REVIEW (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY & FULL REPORT)

MAY 2009

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Recommendation: The MTR recommends that the Project continue through to August 2011 with a range of conditions and expectations on performance, planning and outcomes established and agreed between AusAID and CardnoAcil.

BACKGROUND

The Project has realised a wide range of outputs that inform and support anti and counter-TIP in the criminal justice sector, particularly in shaping policy and legislative change, awareness raising, development of specialist skills, and in accelerating reform, coordination and facilitation processes at the regional, national and sub-national levels, on TIP. The technical expertise of the team was acknowledged across nearly every government department and donor agency interviewed by the MTR. The Project from this point forward, however, should be seeking to shift and modify the emphasis and approach in strategy if sustainable and institutionalised outcomes, and thereby an effective exit strategy at the regional and country program levels, are to be delivered.

IMPACT OF ARTIP

A major premise for the Project going forward and that largely defines the impact is the capacity to inform, assist and shape ASEAN policy, legislation and the approach to TIP. The emphasis by ARTIP in developing and securing ASEAN wide agreement, endorsement and the ownership of materials and processes, has been sound – but this same reliance is also a critical vulnerability. It is recognised that the ASEAN imprimatur on ARTIP training courses and products can realise a significant impact, particularly in progressing country capacity building activities. It is also recognised that as a commercial provider CardnoAcil can potentially only ever realise limited gains in ASEAN as there are cultural and political factors outside of the Project's control. Yet the impact has been marked and has included:

- At the regional, international and national levels, particularly across other donor agencies, there is wide recognition of the value of the Project, evidenced through the following:
 - The dissemination and adoption of ARTIP products for use outside of ASEAN by agencies such as UNODC and IOM.
 - Endorsement and adoption by ASEAN the International Quality Standards.
 - Integration of products, shared services and willingness by UNIAP and UNODC to provide leverage for ARTIP outputs, particularly as the role of ARTIP is reducing in some countries.
 - Improved communication across participant ASEAN countries involving the identification and rescue rates for TIP victims and arrest of trafficking suspects (facilitated through the HSU process).
- At the regional, international and national levels there is acknowledgement and trust in the expertise of the CardnoAcil ARTIP team, evidenced through the following:
 - Increased openness in discussion and reform in TIP case management and the conduct of prosecutions in the courts in Thailand, Cambodia and Myanmar, such as the adoption of improved structures for the development of briefs of evidence, the management of victims and the collection of case management data.
 - Growing demand by ATU personnel in Indonesia, Thailand and Cambodia for TIP products and assistance to inform approaches and the standardisation of law enforcement services.
- Most feedback has been positive and at the national and provincial levels of the Project, national governments have developed a high degree of trust in ARTIP advisers and staff who are afforded good access to officials and decision makers in a sensitive sector, evidenced through the following:

- Access to ARTIP for case management data and the use of products, such as the CAS to inform and change behaviours in victim management and the prosecution and development of evidentiary handling procedures in TIP cases.
- Invitations to actively participate in the SOMTC TIP Working Group and to work directly with the HSU, such as the recent ARTIP facilitated HSU Strategic Planning process.
- At the ASEAN and regional levels, ARTIP maintains a credible reputation and is recognised for its TIP expertise and the value of services, evidenced through the following:
 - Legislation now in place and regional wide memoranda being developed and/or passed at the country and ASEAN level.
 - In Cambodia, comments by trainees on the recognised value of ARTIP and the effectiveness of products and delivery of training (particularly when compared to previous training provided).

ISSUES IDENTIFIED

The MTR identified a range of achievements, areas of opportunity and key concerns. There were four key areas the MTR identified as medium to high risk issues with the potential to directly impact on the effectiveness of the Project end-state. The issues include the strategic framework not being clearly defined, management systems not providing sufficient clarity about project implementation, insufficient visibility of finance & resource management planning, limited progress towards an effective approach to sustainability and no exit strategy. All of which are now more critical as the Project moves towards the second half of delivery and the discretion on strategy, planning, priorities, resourcing, costs, workforce planning and risks, must now be better focused.

SUMMARY OF KEY ASSESSMENTS

The adoption of a prescriptive series of rolling six monthly planning cycles has decreased the visibility of the Project to a more immediate range of responses, rather than an informed and strategically focused planning framework. This underpins a key concern by the MTR team on the requirement for the Project to better plan and define the strategic operating environment and to design a planning framework to support the Project going forward and maintaining a confidence in the ability to meet contractual requirements in finances, costs, resources and performance management.

The major concern from the MTR is that strategically the Project is struggling and the cost of doing nothing will increase as the emphasis in the second half of the delivery cycle shifts towards a greater emphasis on cost management and the need to ensure any interventions are of high value and contribute towards an agreed strategic agenda and framework. Despite a number of achievements by the Project and wide spread stakeholder and client endorsement for ARTIP, however, any gains can potentially be quickly eroded if the Project outcomes are not effective or within budget and with the agreed resources – so the cost of doing nothing is a potentially high risk to AusAID.

The MTR recommended that the Project continue through to August 2011 with a range of conditions and expectations on performance, planning and outcomes established and agreed between AusAID and CardnoAcil. Key recommendations included the need to develop a more effective strategic framework, improved project management systems, better financial accountability and reporting, and the need to prioritise and shift the emphasis on the Project's approach to the achieving the outcomes. Key assessments include:

KEY ASSESSMENTS

Assessment: The MTR assesses that strategically the Project is struggling and there is an absence of a strategic framework and end-of-project plan to 2011, which is a **HIGH RISK ISSUE** for ARTIP and AusAID in taking the Project forward.

Assessment: At the Project level there is a limited degree of clarity across the reporting and a poorly understood range of accountability mechanisms in the Project which is a **MEDIUM RISK ISSUE** for ARTIP and AusAID in taking the Project forward.

Assessment: The MTR assesses that there is insufficient visibility of financial & resource management planning, which is a **HIGH RISK ISSUE** for ARTIP and AusAID in taking the Project forward.

Assessment: The MTR assesses that if all activities, products and services as scheduled in the February-August 2009 six month rolling plan are approved, the Project will exceed the contract specified monetary limit, which is assessed to be a **MEDIUM RISK ISSUE** for AusAID and ARTIP in taking the Project forward.

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

The Project operates across a confused financial planning and resource management framework that is difficult to interpret and reconcile against existing invoices. This appears to be contributing to a level of uncertainty and frustration in AusAID and the confidence in CardnoAcil to meet funding milestones, operate within budget, and to prioritise funding against key project deliverables. The financial reporting and planning must be capable of delivering the information and planning requirements for AusAID (and the contractor) to make informed decisions on progress and forward planning. Current financial reporting, which was provided largely through the six monthly reports, irregular reporting on allocations by CardnoAcil to AusAID, and from documents requested from the contractor by the MTR team, appear largely task orientated and focused on task-scheduling with no transparency of residual liabilities for short or longer term personnel against tasks.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The ARTIP project management framework appears to be compliance based and structured as a rearward view of activities and scheduling. The current framework provides relatively little guidance or utility to the management of the Project in the forward planning of scope, scheduling, finances, control, quality or change management. Importantly, it does not provide sufficient clarity on project critical issues, such as the rationale for prioritisation and the mapping of control assurance activities. The Project documentation is extensive and while it is acknowledged that significant effort has been expended in the development of these products, much of this effort is misdirected and/or redundant.

GOING FORWARD

The Project is now progressing towards the conclusion of the initial three year term with the prospect of a further two year period through to August 2011. The capacity and institutional integration of country programs can now be better calibrated, adjusted and evaluated at this stage of the Project. The successes from many of the ARTIP training and products already provided should now be directed at institutionalization and capacity building at the regional and country levels in order to maximise the Project's impact. This is an important distinction to preceding efforts and shifts the approach and emphasis in services, products and training towards longer-term goals and the measures needed to arrive at an effective exit strategy post August 2011. Key interventions which should be tied to the strategic planning framework, could include aspects of the following:

- Bilateral engagement with destination countries such as Indonesia, and source/transit countries, such as Cambodia and Vietnam.
- Prosecutor and judiciary expertise interventions through targeted workshops and limited support/advisory services.
- Targeted/bilateral funding support to the SOMTC and HSU process/activities.
- Limited technical interventions to promote institutionalisation such as ToT assistance in select areas.
- NGO funding assistance to parallel programs, such as those run through UNODC or IOM, in niche areas of the criminal justice sector or human rights issues.

CONCLUSION

The Project has realised a wide range of outputs that inform and support anti and counter-TIP in the criminal justice sector, particularly in shaping policy and legislative change, awareness raising, development of specialist skills, and in accelerating reform, coordination and facilitation processes at the regional, national and sub-national levels, on TIP. The technical expertise of the team was acknowledged across nearly every government and donor agency and department interviewed by the MTR. The Project from this point forward, however, should be seeking to shift and modify the emphasis and approach in strategy if sustainable and institutionalised outcomes, and thereby an effective exit strategy at the regional and country program levels, are to be delivered.

The major concern is that strategically the project is struggling and the cost of doing nothing will increase as the emphasis in the second half of the delivery cycle shifts towards a greater emphasis on cost management and the need to ensure any interventions are of high value and contribute towards an agreed strategic agenda and framework. Despite a number of achievements by the Project and wide spread stakeholder and client endorsement for ARTIP, any gains can potentially be quickly eroded if the Project outcomes are not effective or within budget and delivered in the agreed resources – so the cost of doing nothing is potentially high for AusAID.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
Table of Contents	6
INTRODUCTION	7
GENERAL.....	7
THE MID TERM REVIEW	7
MID TERM REVIEW – ANALYSIS & ASSESSMENT	8
BACKGROUND.....	8
IMPACT	9
EFFICIENCY	12
PROJECT MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.....	15
FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS	16
RELEVANCE	18
MONITORING & EVALUATION	19
SUSTAINABILITY.....	21
CAPACITY BUILDING.....	22
CROSS CUTTING ISSUES	23
PARTNERSHIPS	25
RISK MANAGEMENT.....	27
CONCLUSION	7
RECOMMENDATIONS	27
Annex A ARTIP Persons Met	31
Annex B Cambodian ARTIP Case Study.....	34
Annex C Sustainability Strategy – A Step by Step Process.....	45

INTRODUCTION

GENERAL

Background

The ARTIP Project is a five year AUD\$21 million initiative addressing the criminal justice response to trafficking in Persons (TIP). At the regional level it operates through ASEAN and at the national level, directly with ASEAN member countries such as Thailand, Lao PDR, Cambodia, Myanmar, Indonesia and Vietnam. China and East Timor were originally included in the proposed program, however, only some limited cross border work continues with China. The Philippines is proposed for 2009 but this is pending formal approval by the Government of the Philippines.

The Project consists of five core components that are structured to facilitate an improved approach to trafficking across the criminal justice services in the ASEAN region through the delivery of capacity building activities to specialist anti-trafficking units, law enforcement officials, judiciary and prosecutors, involved in responses, policy, legislation and counter-measures for TIP. The ARTIP program is structured for delivery over a five year period from 2006-2011 with a stop/go condition at the third year of the Project in 2009. The Project is intended to build on work already completed through the Asia Regional Cooperation to Prevent People Trafficking Project (ARCPPT), which was completed in 2006.

Overview of Findings

The Project has realised a wide range of outputs that inform and support anti and counter-TIP through the criminal justice sector, particularly in shaping policy and legislative change, awareness raising, development of specialist skills, and in accelerating reform, coordination and facilitation processes at the regional, national and sub-national levels. The technical expertise of the team was acknowledged across nearly every government department and donor agency interviewed by the Mid Term Review (MTR) and affirms the selection of the CardnoAcil Project team by AusAID as a *technically* competent contractor in the area of TIP. The Project from this point forward should now be seeking to shift and modify the emphasis and approach in strategy to better achieve greater sustainability and institutionalisation in outcomes, and an effective exit strategy.

There are four key areas the MTR identified as medium to high risk issues with the potential to directly impact on the effectiveness of the Project end state. The issues include the strategic framework not being clearly defined, management systems not providing sufficient clarity about project implementation, insufficient visibility of finance & resource management planning, limited progress towards an effective approach to sustainability with no clear exit strategy. All of which are now more critical as the Project moves towards the second half of delivery and there is an increased focus on planning, priorities, resourcing, costs and workforce design and the management of risk.

THE MID TERM REVIEW

Aim of the Review

The aim of this report is to provide an outline of the overall assessment by the MTR of ARTIP. The review was conducted by the Technical Assistance Group (TAG) and consisted of a two week in-country period from 23 April 2009 to 4 May 2009.

Report Methodology

The MTR focused on four broad areas: a) progress toward achievement of sustained project objectives; b) efficacy and quality of project deliverables; c) extent to which the project is progressing with implementation or delivery of project outputs in a timely manner; and d) effectiveness and efficiency of management systems, which included reviews of areas such as the quality of strategic and annual planning, governance and oversight of the project,

staffing arrangements, financial management and value-for-money, quality of M&E and risk management systems, and resourcing.

A case study approach was applied in order to provide a good understanding of how the Project was being delivered and to assess delivery across all of the interventions being offered. Cambodia was selected where by project implementation could be assessed in more detail across the entire TORs, along with a range of products and services, which included:

- ASEAN policy engagement
- HSU Process at regional and bilateral levels
- Strategic policy and training assessment of Indonesia & Thailand.
- FLO training materials and evaluations as an example of a major training deliverable
- The Victim Detention Study as an example of the research component

A desk review and analysis of documentation, supplemented by in-depth interviews using qualitative questioning techniques seeking the perceptions of relevant stakeholders, was the primary source of assessment. Primary data was sought from the project M&E system to demonstrate achievements, but where this was not available, perceptions of stakeholders was combined with the professional judgement of the reviewers. Persons interviewed for the review include the following groups:

- Direct beneficiaries (police, prosecutors, ASEC representatives, and heads of the relevant agencies involved, country focal points)
- Representatives of ultimate beneficiaries (NGOs, Victim Support Agencies)
- Internal respondents (AusAID, implementation team and technical advisors, country managers and officers)
- External respondents (Australian WoG partners, other donors, other projects)

The list of persons met as part of the MTR interviews is attached as **Annex A**. A fully elaborated methodology was developed and is available on request.

MID TERM REVIEW – ANALYSIS & ASSESSMENT

BACKGROUND

The TAG undertook a familiarisation review of ARTIP in August 2008 and key issues identified included the requirement for an improved M&E and capacity building plan, and the development of an end-of-project exit strategy. The development of a final M&E framework, assisted by an external consultant, has already resulted in a marked improvement for the Project. Other than the scheduling of activities through to 2011, HSU strategic planning, the finalisation of country expansion studies and further development of the CAS, however, little has been progressed in defining the broader strategic issues for improved institutionalisation and the development of an appropriate end-of-project exit strategy.

It is important to recognise that success in the first half of the project from an environment with fewer financial and resource constraints, may not translate into success in the second half. Consequently, the MTR has focused on key issues that impact on the Project's capacity to meet and/or exceed the delivery of the five contracted deliverables. Key concerns were identified and each is examined in terms of impact, efficiency, M&E, etc... rather than as discrete areas (also see MTR ARTIP Aide Memoire dated 4 May 2009).

The issues identified in this MTR Report predominantly cover concerns on the absence of an overarching strategic framework and the internal-to-project management of finances, resources and scheduling of activities. Addressing these factors should then more accurately inform AusAID and better facilitate CardnoAcil's capacity to meet the contracted deliverables to an improved standard and outcome, in the specified time, and against the agreed budget – and despite a number of achievements by the Project and wide spread stakeholder and

client endorsement for ARTIP, these achievements will be quickly eroded if the Project outcomes are not effective, within budget or against the expected resourcing.

The Project is now progressing towards the conclusion of the initial three year term with the prospect of a further two year period through to August 2011. ARTIP should now be seeking to articulate a clear and measurable range of end-of-project outcomes, as commenced by the team in the recent M&E Supplement, but which can now be better defined in terms of levels of achievement and compliance.

Furthermore, the absorptive capacity and institutional integration of country programs can now be better calibrated, adjusted and evaluated. The successes from many of the ARTIP training and products already provided should now be directed at institutionalization and capacity building in order to maximise the Project's impact at the regional and country levels. This is an important distinction to preceding efforts and shifts the approach and emphasis in services, products and training towards longer-term goals and the measures needed to arrive at an effective exit strategy post August 2011.

Recommendation 1: The MTR recommends that the Project continue through to August 2011 with a range of conditions and expectations on performance, planning and outcomes established and agreed between AusAID and CardnoAcil.

IMPACT

Regional & Country Impact – ARTIP

The Project has realised areas of wide ranging success in the impact to anti and counter TIP activities across the criminal justice sector. The initiative is valued by ASEAN, participating country governments and other donors, and the long-term commitment by AusAID in funding efforts to reduce the impact of human trafficking, is recognised by all stakeholders as significant.

A major premise in going forward and which largely defines the impact of the Project is its capacity to inform, assist and shape ASEAN policy, legislation and the approach to TIP. The emphasis by ARTIP in developing and securing ASEAN wide agreement, endorsement and the ownership of materials and processes, has generally been sound – but this same reliance is also a critical vulnerability. It is recognised that the ASEAN imprimatur on ARTIP training courses and products can realise a major impact, particularly in progressing country capacity building activities. It is also recognised that as a commercial provider, CardnoAcil can potentially only ever realise limited gains in ASEAN as there are cultural, political and commercial factors that remain outside of the Project's control. Nevertheless, the impact has been marked and has included:

- At the regional, international and national levels, particularly across other donor agencies, there is wide recognition of the value of the Project, evidenced through the following:
 - The dissemination and adoption of ARTIP products for use outside of ASEAN by agencies such as UNODC and IOM.
 - Endorsement and adoption by ASEAN the International Quality Standards.
 - Integration of products, shared services and willingness by UNIAP and UNODC to provide leverage for ARTIP outputs, particularly as the role of ARTIP is reducing in some countries.
 - Improved communication across participant ASEAN countries involving the identification and rescue rates for TIP victims and arrest of trafficking suspects (facilitated through the HSU process)
- At the regional, international and national levels there is acknowledgement and trust in the expertise of the CardnoAcil ARTIP team, evidenced through the following:

- Increased openness in discussion and reform in TIP case management and the conduct of prosecutions in the courts in Thailand, Cambodia and Myanmar, such as the adoption of improved structures for the development of briefs of evidence, the management of victims and the collection of case management data.
- Growing demand by ATU personnel in Indonesia, Thailand and Cambodia for TIP products and assistance to inform approaches and the standardisation of law enforcement services.
- Most feedback has been positive and at the national and provincial levels of the Project, national governments have developed a high degree of trust in ARTIP advisers and staff who are afforded good access to officials and decision makers in a sensitive sector, evidenced through the following:
 - Access to ARTIP for case management data and the use of products, such as the CAS to inform and change behaviours in victim management and the prosecution and development of evidentiary handling procedures in TIP cases.
 - Invitations to actively participate in the SOMTC TIP Working Group and to work directly with the HSU, such as the recent ARTIP facilitated HSU Strategic Planning process.
- At the ASEAN and regional levels, ARTIP maintains a credible reputation and is recognised for its TIP expertise and the value of services, evidenced through the following:
 - Legislation now in place and regional wide memoranda being developed and/or passed at the country and ASEAN level.
 - In Cambodia, comments by trainees on the recognised value of ARTIP and the effectiveness of products and delivery of training (particularly when compared to previous training provided).

A detailed case study on Cambodia provides specific examples of actual outcomes achieved to date and is attached at **Annex B**.

Impact of ARTIP Products & Skills

The impact of ARTIP can be partly measured through the Project's products and skills and the ability of these services to shape and inform policy to deliver institutional capacity to ASEAN, member countries and trafficking units, and efforts are generally characterised as follows:

- **Products** – *Case Analysis System (CAS), Standard Operating Procedures (SOP), Training Curriculum, Handbook, International Quality Standards (IQS) and Research Products*. The technical veracity and quality of the products appear to be of a high standard based on peer review and acceptance through international reviews/validation and the uptake materials, eg. IQS and ASEAN Handbook, across other TIP expert fora and donor agencies, eg. UNIAP & UNODC, and NGO, such as IOM.

Assessment 1: In ASEAN, ARTIP products are likely to deliver short to medium term sustainable outcomes, however, the Project has the potential to make a more targeted intervention at the country program level. Importantly, the consolidation of existing activities is required if this is to be achieved with longer term impact and the institutionalization of training programs and products (particularly in targeting the uptake of these products in units and training academies).

Assessment 2: It is not sufficiently clear if the strategic intent is to focus on dissemination of regionally endorsed materials and/or the institutionalisation of new practices at the national level – which should be tied to a more deliberate planning and strategic approach for the Project.

- **Skills/Training** - *Law enforcement, Prosecutors, Judiciary, and Training of Trainers.* The technical veracity and quality of the training appears to be of a high standard based on participant feedback, interviews with response units and prosecutors (secondary sources were utilised to validate quality on the judiciary training courses) and harmonisation of training courses with other donors, such as IOM.

Assessment 3: Some early and partial changes in behaviour were noted across law enforcement, prosecutors and the judiciary – yet there are barriers to the full adoption of new practices due to significant resource constraints in country government programs, such as Cambodia. This is an opportunity area for ARTIP to identify bilateral and regional engagement, such as through the HSU, for AusAID beyond 2011.

Assessment 4: There has been a focus on skills development and the provision of guidelines and products at the cost of a broader approach to institutional capacity development, such as policy and legislative initiatives and work with the ATU and prosecutors offices to imbed business and governance systems in TIP, eg transfer of CAS data to AFP donor programs, such as CMIS.

- **Policy/Legislative Influence.** *Memoranda, Policy, Legislation and Conventions.* The quality and impact of policy and legislative change directly attributable to ARTIP is difficult to assess. New TIP laws in each of the countries now exist and ASEAN is progressing a convention on TIP. Quality can partly be assessed on the basis of the expertise provided by ARTIP and ASEAN and HSU representatives interviewed all supported ARTIP and acknowledge the leading expertise maintained in the Project team. A range of outcomes attributable to the HSU process were identified including increased rates of arrest and cross country communications on TIP issues.

Assessment 5: Some structural change at the regional & national levels was noted through assistance to the development and implementation of memorandums of understanding, legislation and conventions, however, in some cases, such as Cambodia, the potential for policy influence is yet to be fully realised by ARTIP. This can in part be assisted by an increased emphasis in specialist and advisory services, strategic and operational planning for the TWG and HSU processes, and more emphasis in tailoring TIP products and skills for the ATU.

Improving the Impact of the Project

The challenge for the Project is that any end-state that proscribes a handover to ASEAN and only predicates the strategy based on an endorsement and sponsorship of materials and processes, is likely to remain unrealised. This is particularly the case when funding and resourcing are no longer available to sponsor meetings and progress critical reform processes, such as the continuance of the HSU or the adoption of the International Quality Standards.

The corollary to the strong emphasis by ARTIP on training products and services is that development projects that are overly focused on policy dialogue and training delivery can be difficult to translate into sustainable approaches, defined outcomes and clear changes in performance. While there was some limited evidence available to the MTR of the impact from these ARTIP activities – there was limited evidence available on quality of the deliverables. It is also acknowledged that in an environment, such as TIP, where there is a pre-existing absence of quality data, this can further constrain the ability to define an effective approach and project impact assessment. Project tools, such as the CAS, can improve the ability to calibrate interventions and approaches, yet there are challenges in using and applying this as any longer term utility is also tied to issues such as the funding and the institutionalisation

of processes. For example, ASEAN endorsed products, such as the International Quality Standards and Handbook, need to be better institutionalized within the operating standards and processes for the HSU, TWG and the ATU. The value of ARTIP products will be realised more through the use and reference made by donors and governments, of which there is some evidence – but more needs to be done at the sub-national level and across the trafficking units to change behaviours.

The impact of ARTIP products, services and training activities is yet to be fully realised. Work undertaken across many of the ATU and HSU is only beginning to be adopted and institutionalized. Yet there are concerns about the absence of evidence across the Project on the actual impact of the outputs. In particular, a capability to articulate a coherent and clear strategy forward to maximise the impact and institutionalisation of ARTIP and better align and prioritise key services, expertise and outputs, into a strategic framework.

The adoption of a prescriptive series of rolling six monthly planning cycles has decreased the visibility of the Project to a more immediate range of responses, rather than an informed and strategically focused planning framework (this is not to be confused with course schedules and work activities which already appear to cover most of the period out to August 2011). This underpins a key concern by the MTR team on the requirement for the Project to better plan and define the strategic operating environment and to design a planning framework to support the Project going forward (this is examined further in the subsequent sections of the report).

Recommendation 2: The Project should seek to articulate a clear and more measurable range of end-of-project outcomes in anticipation of the period from August 2009 being extended to August 2011.

EFFICIENCY

ARTIP has the potential to realise significantly greater efficiency in approach, delivery of products, and planning. Key factors that inhibit or restrict the efficiency of the Project include:

- The CAS remains a blunt instrument when applied as an ARTIP/Project evaluation tool as it measures change at the higher-order system level (while acknowledging there are two types of CAS) – is it a project tool or is it expected to be integrated into partner systems for planning and/or evaluation purposes – and there is no coherent strategy on the approach to integration for the CAS at the country or regional level. For example, this could be partly facilitated through the imprimatur of ASEAN and to inform decisions on priority and intervention in the HSU process.
- The institutionalisation of training into partner systems has been started, but will require a more comprehensive approach than the training of trainers and the provision of curricula.
- The endorsement of SOPs and guidelines will not necessarily result in the adoption of new practices without a comprehensive strategy for institutionalisation.
- The project has not yet conducted a full analysis of the factors that affect the sustainability of intended outcomes.

The Strategic Framework – Planning Ahead

Assessment 6: The MTR assesses that strategically the Project is struggling and there is an absence of a strategic framework and end-of-project plan to 2011, which is a **HIGH RISK ISSUE** for ARTIP and AusAID in taking the Project forward.

Normally this section would be addressed within the later reporting on sustainability and capacity development, but the importance of the issue and its impact on the Project's design and delivery is critical and impacts a wide range of Project issues, particularly resourcing and

sustainability. The absence of a clear strategy is a major impediment in achieving sustained outcomes at the regional and member country levels – which was a concern that was also identified during the TAG August 2008 visit.

The continued absence of end-to-end planning and a delivery framework for the Project has resulted in too great an emphasis on outputs without a clear end-point. The expected outcomes leading to the institutionalization at the country level need to be better reflected in project resourcing and programming, that is, there is a need to address key questions such as which countries are important to the program and what is the level of effort required to meet each of the country capacity outcomes, and how will this be delivered. Any latitude in the allocation of resources is diminishing as the Project moves towards the second half of delivery. Resourcing must be more precisely aligned, priority areas must be targeted, a clear critical path for the project established, and staffing/expertise tied to the strategic requirements of the Project. The contractual reality is that not all of the activities across each of the country environments can be delivered so decisions on expected outcomes, approach, priorities, and cost management, need to be better reflected in planning and delivery.

The institutional capacity planning for each country is limited and outcomes cannot be based only on training and SOPs – the selected interventions must add up to a clearly defined outcome. How many more law enforcement officers need to be trained and when does this begin to have a downstream impact on institutionalisation? Not all of the countries can have the same levels of resourcing and the effect will vary - so what is required from each and how does this fit within a wider strategic and regionalised framework?

The Strategic Plan/Framework

The ability to prioritise requirements and align these to a strategic framework, allows critical choices and options to be assessed against budgetary pressures and broader mandatory contractual requirements (the must do versus the might do). An approach to the management of the strategic process should begin with the following steps:

Step 1 - Categorise and define the country specific requirements. Involves examining each country and regional requirement including workplans, training schedules and other interventions to analysis priorities, requirements and approach.

Step 2 - Align the categories to the TIP states (source, transit & destination). Involves assessing the strategic requirements at a regional level to determine which thematic or functional issues are critical, important and non-essential, for the Project.

Step 3 - Match key training services, products and expertise to requirements. Involves prioritizing activities and products against an agreed range of weighted attributes to assign what has been successful, what more is required to be done, what activities are of highest value etc.....

Step 4 – Identify where the benefits and institutionalisation is required. Draws on earlier priorities, risks and strategic planning criteria to better define which activities, countries and priorities offer the best approach to institutionalize outcomes.

Step 5 – Align the workforce planning schedule to the critical path. Allocates personnel and specialists to critical areas and critical, important and non-essential criteria for the Project.

Step 6 – Align the critical path to the resourcing and cost schedule. Similarly, balances cost and resources against key priorities and critical, important and non-essential criteria for the Project.

Step 7 – Review. Involves revisiting expectations and priorities against cost and resourcing and begin the process again.

A critical part of the strategic planning process is the inclusion of partner governments and agencies, particularly in ASEAN, in the planning process going forward. ASEAN and the HSU, in particular, should be involved in the strategic planning for the regional and national

outcomes and the TWG in strategy and approach at the sub-national and organisational level (or on issues that are specific to country and ATU operating environments).

Recommendation 3: CardnoAcil develop a detailed strategic framework which includes the prioritisation of country and regional activities, the alignment of workforce and resources, and an exit strategy. Key tasks should include:

- CardnoAcil integrate the work completed in capacity mapping assessment and sustainability factor analysis into the strategic planning framework.
- CardnoAcil consolidate current training efforts and align ARTIP training and products to the strategic plan and framework.
- CardnoAcil consolidate resources on the prosecutor and judiciary training (a real ARTIP niche).
- CardnoAcil provide a fully reconciled resource schedule by activity and effort (based on the approved strategic framework) for approval by August 2009.
- TAG facilitate and provide on-going support to strategic planning, design and scheduling of the Project

ARTIP Strategic Planning – Key Issues

In terms of consolidating and taking forward the gains already achieved by the Project against key strategic priorities, the MTR identified the following key issues:

- Contention exists regarding the extent to which a heavily training focused approach addresses the motivation of institutions to adopt new behaviours and change performance, not just through increasing knowledge and skills. Similarly, is the evaluation system able to distinguish between the learning and training, and the enabling environment, following the training in-country and at the unit level.
- The value of courses such as the front line officer training appears to have provided the initial leverage required to better facilitate access and openness. Furthermore, most of the interviews undertaken by the MTR identified strong and enduring support for the prosecutors and judiciary training programs – which is high value, a niche area for the Project and there are few competing donors. The potential benefits in consolidating and re-focusing training are considerable given that influencing a single prosecutor or judge (who presides over numerous cases), compared to the relative value realised in the delivery of law enforcement training to many front line law enforcement officials (who are rotated or no longer working in TIP related areas), is potentially significant.
- There is an increased investment to be realised from ARTIP engagement with the ATU in the institutionalisation of SOP and training courses for law enforcement across the academies and learning institutes. This approach improves the institutionalisation (and has already been a target area for ARTIP), particularly in the second half of the Project in a more financially and resource constrained environment. Similarly, the newly proposed ATU Commanders Course, while potentially of value, must be prioritised against wider ARTIP strategic planning, the consolidation of existing training requirements, and the further effort required to institutionalise existing practices and products into the ATU (and other areas) – so unless there is a high enough priority allocated to this course and funding is not available in the existing budget, it should not be further developed (unless the strategic planning identifies opportunity costs and/or realises savings).
- Similarly, the Project should seek to identify the relative priority of research and other discretionary spending in responding to CAS requirements to meet strategic priorities (and to ensure delivery of the Project within budget). This is not to be confused with the requirement to maintain a degree of flexibility in the identification of new opportunities, whether training, research based or in extending short-term experts. It is about ensuring the requirements are known and tied to an end-to-end project framework that is strategically focused and which allows stakeholders and member countries to reach planning decisions based on known priorities and requirements.

Recommendation 4: CardnoAcil redirect effort from areas such as the research component, regionalised meetings and new courses, and focus the emphasis towards the consolidation of country training activities and the institutionalisation of national programs.

Appropriateness of staffing arrangements

The initial stages of the project have allowed some latitude to CardnoAcil in how they have recruited and positioned short (STP) & long term personnel (LTP). The skills and expertise of the team appear to represent value for money and some maintain leading expertise in their areas of responsibility – which is a contributing factor to the strong reputation of ARTIP. In the second half of the Project, however, particularly in light of the need for increased attention in the management of Project costs and liabilities, the contractor will need to review the positioning and management of key country office services with STP & LTP requirements, in order to better align resources to country priorities and effort (particularly if the increased emphasis is to be on destination countries). For example, the reduction of country programs, such as in Indonesia, does not appear to be reflected in the relative strategic priority of the country as a TIP destination, the remaining level of effort allocated, or in the staff support needed to consolidate and institutionalise the gains already achieved.

A key staffing issue, which is tied to the requirement to better shape the Project's strategic framework, is the absence of any measures to establish sustainable de-mobilisation planning for country and personnel support activities. While the exit strategy will inform this, the workforce planning strategy will be a strong determinant of the face of ARTIP representation in-country, even after programs of training has ceased – so it will be important in the management of reputation to the contractor and AusAID to decide as early as possible how this is to be managed, particularly in locations where offices are established. For example, with few training activities remaining, how will the Cambodia country office be managed and what are the strategic requirements and intervention/institutionalisation strategies over the next two years (as it is not clear to participants, clients, or AusAID). Similarly, plans for basing the STP & LTP are not clearly articulated and has the potential, if not managed carefully with other country and regional activities, to carry a cost liability for relocations and additional travel, if personnel are then based in countries where training and services are no longer required or are simply not being delivered.

Contract Management

The issue of contract management is rarely problematic in the initial stages of an engagement, however, as cost management and expectations against each deliverable begin to be realised (or not), there is an increased focus on compliance by the contractor with the conditions of the contract..

Recommendation 5: As part of the next visit, the TAG conduct a Project wide review of the planning and project strategy in late 2009 to confirm acceptance and adoption of MTR strategy recommendations and contract compliance.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The ARTIP project management framework appears to be compliance based and structured as a rearward view of activities and scheduling. The current framework provides relatively little guidance or utility to the management of the Project in the forward planning of scope, scheduling, finances, control, quality or change management. Importantly, it does not provide sufficient clarity on project critical issues, such as the rationale for prioritisation and the mapping of control assurance activities. The Project documentation is extensive and while it is acknowledged that significant effort has been expended in the development of these products, much of this effort is misdirected and/or redundant.

There are weaknesses in the system of project management and method of control, particularly in the area of planning and documentation – many of the internal project documents have become unwieldy and have remained static since the Project commenced eg Project Logframe. The regular reporting formats are complex and do not present the information on planning and scheduling in an easy to read format or style (note further discussion on reporting in the section on Monitoring and Evaluation).

Assessment 7: At the Project level there is a limited degree of clarity across the reporting and a poorly understood range of accountability mechanisms in the Project which is a **MEDIUM RISK ISSUE** for ARTIP and AusAID in taking the Project forward.

At the country levels, there is an absence of effective project reporting systems to enable stakeholders to clearly identify intended outcomes, achievements, and relevant priorities for individual member countries. Reporting is rearward focused and does not inform or position AusAID to make decisions on key planning issues, which is potentially to the disadvantage of the Project and CardnoAcil.

The MTR is not advocating any particular style of project methodology, other than a simpler approach, format and style (while acknowledging the need to include more project planning issues). Rather, the issue is about clearly defined planning systems that are visible and which inform rather than confuse – which does not need to be complex or difficult to redress. The concern is that with nearly three years progress for the Project, simple project management reporting, structure and controls, are still problematic (which does not reflect well on the initial value of the project planning and design documentation).

The challenge is that the value of the project management processes and documentation are also tied to sound planning and performance management, which suggests that if the issue is only dealt with in isolation, it will simply perpetuate, or exacerbate, the problem. Rather than provide a simple and quick solution. Similarly, as the project moves towards the more difficult phase of delivery and cost management in its second half, the need for effective project management systems is heightened as there will be a greater requirement for more detailed knowledge of project controls, priorities, critical path analysis, etc.....

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

Extant Financial Reporting Systems & Controls

The Project operates across a confused financial planning and resource management framework that is difficult to interpret and reconcile against existing invoices. This appears to be contributing to a level of uncertainty and frustration in AusAID and the confidence in CardnoAcil to meet funding milestones, operate within budget, and to prioritise funding against key project deliverables.

Assessment 8: The MTR assesses that there is insufficient visibility of financial & resource management planning, which is a **HIGH RISK ISSUE** for ARTIP and AusAID in taking the Project forward.

The MTR identified a range of issues across the financial management, which include:

- Limited transparency for cumulative costs in BoP contract limits and existing and projected liabilities.
- Ill defined resource and country/regional budget management (which has the potential to impact on the capacity of CPCs to manage their programs and the relationships with partner governments).

- Inconsistent financial reconciliation processes, eg invoices to line items and a project schedule of expenditure.
- Inability to provide accurate financial estimate and reconciliation information to AusAID by CardnoAcil.
- Difficulty in assessing actual 'value for money' for country programs (there appears to be 'value' for specific courses but in the absence of data aligning LTP/STP to specific courses and research activities, value cannot be accurately assessed).
- Claims of cost savings on BoP line items being automatically assumed by CardnoAcil to be available across other contract schedules.

The management of ARTIP should be a single line entry process that is transactionally based with a simple and direct reconciliation of services and reimbursable expenses. Consequently, the financial accounting processes must be simple, practical and easy to understand – yet they are not. This is an issue that is internal to the Project and while it should be invisible to AusAID, the accounting of services and reimbursables should be represented in an easy to understand and transparent format that is directly aligned to invoices presented for payment by the contractor.

Assessment 9: The MTR assesses that if all activities, products and services as scheduled in the February-August 2009 six month rolling plan are approved, the Project will exceed the contract specified monetary limit, which is assessed to be a **MEDIUM RISK ISSUE** for AusAID and ARTIP in taking the Project forward.

Based on the information provided by CardnoAcil on 30 April 2009 to AusAID, if the current schedule of activities is approved then the Project is likely to be over-budget approximately three percent. It would be anticipated that further requirements will also be identified and expenditure (outside of the requirements of the Flexible Funding Pool) would be anticipated to increase given the Project has over two years remaining to completion and it would be reasonable to assume that based on the evaluation tools such as the CAS, that further opportunities are already being considered or will be identified (rather than any cost retractions or major savings being realised). The consequence is that if AusAID is to manage the Project within the existing allocation, there is an imperative to begin a process of prioritisation and strategic planning as early as possible – but this relies on transparency and a detailed knowledge of costs and liabilities, which is not visible in the existing process.

The financial reporting and planning must be capable of delivering the information and planning requirements for AusAID (and the contractor) to make informed decisions on progress and forward planning. Current financial reporting, which was provided largely through the six monthly reports, irregular reporting on allocations by CardnoAcil to AusAID, and from documents requested from the contractor by the MTR team, appear largely task orientated and focused on task-scheduling with no transparency of residual liabilities for short or longer term personnel against tasks.

Improving the Financial Reporting Systems & Controls

Moving towards an improvement in the financial management and reporting systems, there are a range of simple financial principles for any project that underpin the system of reporting, which include:

- **Flexibility** – Change is a constant and the structure and processes of a project shift so the financial information system must be capable of accommodating updated accountability and reporting requirements.
- **User friendliness** – The system must be simple to use by non-financial people and allow the introduction of data entry and information retrieval by users, rather than finance staff.
- **Multi-user access** – Must provide internal and external (financial) stakeholders across the project with a common and consistent source of information.

- **Robustness** – Must be able to handle large volumes of data and enquiries from a range of sources, both internal and external.
- **Speed** – Must provide information for real time decisions and be capable of coping with the dynamics of changing environments and organisational requirements.
- **Multi-dimensional** – Must be capable of presenting the information in a variety of ways, eg. from aggregate information to detailed transactions, by function, by type of expenditure etc.
- **Openness** – Must be capable of allowing for other applications to be integrated to the system and allow for the future development and integration of improved reporting processes to be readily added.

The existing financial monitoring and reporting needs to be better adapted to meet changed performance requirements in reporting and priorities, particularly given the Project is in the second half of delivery and the Commonwealth financial environment is retracting (putting pressure on AusAID and CardnoAcil to further demonstrate value-for-money). As with the project management concerns identified, there is no end-to-end visibility of costs, expenditure forecasts or the ability to prioritise requirements. Indeed, in the absence of a supporting strategic framework, the financial management of the Project appears to be about managing a shopping list of discrete tasks rather than against a proscribed planning framework against expected outcomes.

Recommendation 6: CardoAcil Provide a fully reconciled financial schedule covering the breakdown of all invoicing through to August 2009 with the scheduling and resourcing identified against all BoP including reimbursables and LTP/STP personnel, by activity and product.

RELEVANCE

Project Objectives

The five ARTIP Project objectives remain relevant for the delivery of the Project and continue to provide flexibility to the contractor. Recent work sponsored by AusAID and following TAG recommendations from August 2008 involving amendments to the M&E framework, reaffirm the potential of the Project to meet the contracted objectives. Furthermore, while not directly funded under the Australian Government's Action Plan to Eradicate Trafficking in Persons, ARTIP does directly contribute to the objectives of this activity so can demonstrate wider utility and relevance, particularly across the Australian WoG sector.

Outputs – Products, Services & Expertise

While stakeholders reaffirmed the relevance of ARTIP at the program level, for many others the visibility of specific ARTIP products, services and outputs, was limited. The Project has realised a range of outputs, however, the challenge is in ensuring the continued relevance of these across longer term and sustainable regional and country interventions. At the core of this issue was the continued importance (reaffirmed by stakeholders, clients and ARTIP) of the need to continue to focus on countries of transit and destination - yet a significant proportion of the effort is still directed at source and/or transit countries.

Other key considerations include the assumption that country programs absorb capacity and institutionalise TIP measures in a similar way, or at the same pace (which was identified across interviews on ARTIP conducted in Indonesia, Thailand and Cambodia). Generic packages do not appear to be realising the value that is intended and training and institutionalisation must be tailored to specific requirements that reflect the resource limitations in less developed countries (LDCs), particularly if they are to continue to be utilised.

In terms of validating the continuing relevance of outputs, there is a requirement to improve the training and product evaluation systems. While the Kirkpatrick Training Evaluation Model is referred to across ARTIP assessment methodologies, the evaluation of level two, three and four outcomes, still appears limited. For example, there are regular evaluations for courses at the completion of training to gauge participant reactions, but more should be done to understand participant capacity to adopt new practices on return to home units and to adjust materials to reflect this. A key issue identified in Thailand, Indonesia and Cambodia was the limited relevance of some training activities and manuals and the further need to tailor products on a specific-to-country basis, eg Thailand ATU discussions on SOP and Indonesia discussion with the Police Prosecutors Office. This is particularly the case for SOPs, which potentially require significant effort to institutionalise across the ATU (the MTR recognises that ARTIP is already progressing this issue). Further 'post training' validation and follow up, particularly on ToT programs (as these are effective delivery facilitation platforms), will likely realise significant benefit in improving access and better institutionalising teachings.

MONITORING & EVALUATION

TAG Familiarisation Visit Outcomes

During the last TAG visit a series of recommendations were made concerning the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and reporting of ARTIP¹. Key issues identified included:

- A lack of clarity around the expected end-of-project outcomes as most project objectives were open-ended without a definition of the expected end point for outcomes at both the regional and member country levels;
- A lack of clarity around what outcomes were expected to be sustained;
- A lack of clarity around what specific gender outcomes were expected to be sustained;
- There were several aspects of the M&E system that were not fully designed, or represented in an adequate methodological structure in order to provide a credible basis for findings from the M&E system.

Overall, the new M&E Supplement developed in March 2009, provides improved clarity over the expected end-of-project outcomes, and has done this in a way that allows the project some degree of flexibility to respond to the context at the regional and national levels. Objectives are still open-ended in that they describe an ideal that would be unlikely to be achieved, but allow the Project to target and communicate outcomes (or extent of progress to this ideal) more effectively. Once the strategic direction has been more clearly articulated, the end-of-project outcomes can be further refined to reflect intent at the regional and member country levels. The contribution of the M&E Specialist has had a major impact on how the team conceptualizes and understands the Project, and should form a sound basis for more detailed discussion on the sustainability and an exit strategy. The engagement of a suitable M&E advisor should continue for the remainder of the project and the cost should be borne by ARTIP as this is considered a normal requirement for project reporting and is specified as an output in the contract.

¹ As a result of the TAG August 2008 review, it was recommended that an M&E Specialist be engaged to assist in the articulation of outcomes and to finalise the M&E framework in order to generate information to meet the needs of AusAID and other stakeholders more effectively. A new M&E Specialist was recruited and a supplementary M&E plan was developed in March 2009, and reviewed as part of this MTR.

M&E Key Issues

Currently it is difficult for stakeholders to understand the M&E system when it is presented in two documents so it will be important to have a single document that fully describes the entire system, rather than referring to different aspects in another document.

Recommendation 7: CardnoAcil combine the original MEF with the new Supplement. (noting that the final integrated MEF should be quite brief in the description of the system, but detailed annexes should fully describe the specific methods, such as the baseline and CAS).

In the current version, the section on sustainability is more appropriately described as a description of key concepts, rather than making it clear how the project will; a) define sustained outcomes; b) provide evidence of progress toward sustainable outcomes; c) provide evidence of the quality and effectiveness of interventions to enhance sustainability. Currently there are no methods discussed to collect, analyse and report on this information. Although an important point, the team has not yet developed a sustainability/exit strategy. Before the M&E of sustainability can be developed, the team will have to provide the M&E Specialist with more guidance on the planning for an exit strategy. Once this is completed, the M&E system design should respond (see the following section on sustainability).

Currently the M&E system rests almost exclusively on information generated from the Baseline and the CAS. Although these two methods provide important information on developments within the sector, they do not provide sufficient specific information on the quality and effectiveness of the actual project interventions. For example, key evaluation questions on any development project would include: a) what has been the quality, reach and coverage of the interventions or outputs; b) are interventions having a sufficient impact on expected outcomes (has the design logic effectively supported outcomes); c) what are the factors that are inhibiting or supporting the achievement of outcomes; d) and questions about progress toward sustainability. Currently the design of the M&E system is strongly focused on a narrow series of questions around what are the key systemic changes occurring in the response to TIP. This is likely to cause difficulty during the ICR process in discussing achievements, particularly regarding the range of intermediary outcomes for the Project directly related to ARTIP interventions.

Importantly, the MEF needs to reflect other AusAID reporting needs (see reporting recommendations below). The MTR does not suggest a major review of this, but some consideration should be given to the heavy reliance on two evaluation activities that address higher order outcomes in the Project hierarchy. CardnoAcil should consider the conduct of two to three discrete evaluations to address specific issues of importance that are not reflected in the Baseline or the CAS.

Recommendation 8: CardnoAcil consider if the baseline and the CAS will provide a sufficient basis for all Project M&E and better address country reporting activities, in particular, investigations, prosecutions and changes in policy. Information should be collected systematically by Country Project Officers and reported in the Six Monthly Reports (particularly for inclusion in the AusAID QAI reporting process).

It is noted that the MEF mentions a series of court visits, information collected from third parties, analysis of policies and laws and the “ASEAN Study”. However, it is not clear exactly what these activities will be collecting information on, what tools will be employed to ensure reliability of findings, who will conduct the data collection and analytical work, and how they are resourced? With the court visits in the MTR Cambodia Case Study, these were not being systematically analysed as discrete work, rather, findings were being integrated into the CAS data collection process. This practice is not reflected in the current version of the MEF.

Currently there is limited M&E of some of the key project deliverables. An important aspect of the Project is the quality and intermediate outcomes of the training. That is, are participants able to practice new skills on return to the work setting? Also, to what extent is ARTIP work on training trainers institutionalised within government systems, and the extent to which SOPs and other guidance materials are not only endorsed, but adopted and applied in each country setting. Understanding barriers to achieving outcomes and sustained behaviour change are invaluable as lessons learned for AusAID and the donor community more broadly.

As an example, the Front Line Officer training is not evaluated beyond simple participant satisfaction sheets and anecdotal observations from the ARTIP team. For such a significant investment, it would have been expected that at a minimum there would have been a formal evaluation of individual participants' knowledge gained during the training, and ideally a look at the extent to which participants are able to practice new skills in their home work setting. Understanding barriers to application has important implications for the exit strategy and can be addressed cost effectively via small case studies and would not be expected to be carried out for all participants.

Currently there is no credible information that allows stakeholders to develop confidence that the FLO training has affected institutional performance. It should be noted that the HTI course did conduct evaluation workshops. Although methodologically very limited², it should be viewed as a reasonable attempt given that there were no M&E resource persons available at that time. For a project of this size that has invested significantly in training, it would have been justifiable to have the resources available to assist with more effective and rigorous training evaluation. Early and credible evaluation of training may have provided valuable insights to the continuing appropriateness of the original design framework. The current version of the MEF promises more attention to training evaluation, but it will be important to ensure the resources will be available to do this and the methodology fully developed and supervised by the M&E Specialist.

SUSTAINABILITY

Context for Sustainability

The ARTIP Sustainability Plan was endorsed by the RPCC in August 2008, however, issues of ownership, strategic direction and the prioritization of services and regional/country activities are not clear. The absence of an exit and strategic engagement strategy, suggests an ad hoc or short-term program of activities based on outputs and a view of the Project based only on the six month rolling plan. Yet even looking beyond this, other than the scheduling of courses and some products in the plan, there is still an absence of institutional factors and approaches in place to support many of the Project expectations of sustainability – there needs to be stronger link between inputs and development results which should seek to build on existing capacities in the ATU and 'learning by doing' for front line trafficking units, which are sound confirmatory measures and can result in better project sustainability. More actively involving ARTIP personnel technical capacities (which are leading experts in their fields) and short term experts, should be a priority as the expertise of the team was openly acknowledged by nearly every agency engaged - this is a real strength for the Project but the strategy and interventions need to be better approached.

The SOMTC TIP WG offers the platform for TIP issues into ASEAN and ARTIP has a strong relationship and recognised credibility across this forum - and has used it to provide the legitimacy and endorsement of ARTIP activities and products to better facilitate opportunities in the country environments. Other fora, such as the HSU, offer significant potential towards

² The evaluation workshop was not designed to capture negative perceptions effectively; even where this was addressed the question design would be unlikely to capture sufficient reliable and valid information. Also the respondent perceptions were simply reported rather than analysed and interpreted in any way – for example, the evaluation reports did not discuss the implications of participant perceptions to the on-going delivery of the project, or integration of activities into national systems.

increasing the sustainability of ARTIP outputs. Yet the reality is that without third party funding, support and/or the adoption of the HSU process into ASEAN, countries are unlikely to accord the priority for TIP, particularly given other competing criminal and security issues, such as counter-terrorism, border management, drugs, etc... Conversely, other fora, such as COMMIT, remain too regionalized and do not offer the same imprimatur that an association and endorsement from ASEAN carries. Furthermore, reducing donor interest and funding, along with an increasing malaise in TIP issues by governments (and donors), indicates that opportunities must be better harmonised across other donors, if sustainable outcomes in TIP are to be realised. The consequence of these issues is that if processes, such as the HSU are to continue, they will need to be assisted by donor funding (which could still be managed bilaterally but would need to be tied to an effective exit strategy and clear strategic priorities), particularly at the bilateral level for countries struggling with representation and an enduring commitment for engagement in the process.

Project Sustainability – Going Forward

There are challenges for the Project in providing a credible sustainability factor analysis and a strategically focused approach to sustainability planning. In taking the Project forward, there are a range of dependencies (many external to the Project and outside of ARTIP control), which include:

- Legal or policy framework supporting new practices and the adoption of new legislation and memoranda of understanding.
- Counterpart commitment to implementation and executive support for the adoption of new practices.
- Counterpart participation and ownership in the delivery of the activity (ACCRA).
- Integration into government institutions and systems (ACCRA).
- Absorptive capacity of national counterpart agencies.
- Recurrent budget implications of the intervention and the willingness and capacity of counterparts to commit to this new expenditure.
- Extent to which on-going training and continued organisational development can be carried out by counterparts.
- Evidence of external factors that may inhibit sustainability.
- Extent to which new technologies or approaches have been appropriate for the context.

In terms of developing an exit strategy that integrates and institutionalizes the Project outcomes, in consultation with key development partners in ASEAN and member countries, the team should now seek to conduct a comprehensive analysis of sustainability, particularly for the period beyond 2011. It would have been expected that this had progressed further, as during the previous TAG familiarity visit in August 2008, ARTIP had been provided with comprehensive guidance (and training) on how this could be approached and what were the requirements for an effective sustainability strategy. There has been no clear progress on this work to date. This is now an urgent requirement that will need to be facilitated and supported by the TAG during the future proposed strategic planning workshops. The broad concepts remain as defined in the initial TAG visit and the key steps are attached as **ANNEX C**

CAPACITY BUILDING

There are challenges in capacity building in an ASEAN committee based environment that largely progresses work inter-sessionally (and on a discretionary basis), rather than through a permanent secretariat. The challenges in capacity building in this context, at least in the case of ARTIP, have broadly been addressed through a two pronged response comprising in the first instance, planning interventions in order to achieve specific outcomes, and secondly, the ability to flexibly respond to capacity building opportunities as they arise. Yet the

opportunities in both of these cases will increasingly diminish, or at least be more restrictive, as financial planning and prioritisation is applied.

Initial assumptions of a traditional approach to capacity building through mentoring and side by side coaching would be unlikely to be successful given the closed nature of TIP issues and the hierarchical structure of the agencies involved in the criminal justice management and response to trafficking. Yet similarly, the dependence on training is also unlikely to realise the longer term capacity building goals of the Project. While this issue is addressed in the earlier section on effectiveness, nevertheless it remains a key issue that is tied to the broader concerns regarding an improved approach by ARTIP to strategy and a more effective project management system of control. Furthermore, it is also closely tied to workforce and resource planning and the increasing requirement to do more with the regional experts in law enforcement and prosecution.

A Capacity Building Strategy

As a precursor to the development of the exit strategy, ARTIP should now be more actively seeking to develop a clearer picture of the Project's approach to building capacity, particularly given the limitations and dependencies on issues related to changed approaches to training, areas of emphasis and country priorities. The current capacity building plan is focused on a series of outputs rather than more detailed assessments and strategies and should include more detail and approaches to areas such as how the ATU capacities are to be increased and sustained, specific areas where they are seeking changes in performance following training and general measures to fill gaps in performance against the IQS in country TIP programs. Other considerations include:

- Desired performance within the target groups or organisations at regional and national level (this could be linked to the broader CAS for member countries);
- What are the necessary capacity outcomes that will allow this level of performance;
- What actors are working in each context to contribute to specific capacity outcomes;
- What capacity outcomes ARTIP will contribute to;
- How ARTIP will approach the development of capacity outcomes; and
- Identification of any critical gaps and an analysis of the implications for reaching the desired level of performance during the life of the project.

During the MTR mission, the team was provided with some general guidance on how to approach capacity mapping, and to integrate capacity building into the M&E system. A preliminary broad framework was commenced that can guide a more detailed discussions in the short term and the TAG can provide more detailed guidance if required to complete this task.

CROSS CUTTING ISSUES

Gender

Despite a well developed Gender and Development Action Strategy (GDAS), ARTIP implementation of the GDAS remains focused at the level of materials development. Gender issues have been adequately mainstreamed into all relevant training materials and other ASEAN endorsed products, and this has been an important achievement. It is the view of the MTR that this is most likely to be the most useful practical response to gender equity possible given the resources available at the member country levels. The Project has appointed gender focal points, but the type of investment that would be required to enable these representatives to bring about even modest change, would be limited.

The gender database is designed to provide detailed information on achievements with respect to the GDAS. The database provided to the MTR focused on training and identifies the number of women trained, but does not identify the approach to gender mainstreaming proposed in the strategy. The six monthly report on the gender review infers that there are

other data bases which provide more substantive information on gender mainstreaming, but these additional databases were not requested by the MTR team at the time of reporting.

Although the selection of women for training and government positions is a preliminary step to achieving gender equity outcomes, there have been limited direct actions to bring about actual gender equality outcomes expected in the GDAS. The last six monthly report on the gender review makes some assertions about gender outcomes achieved and attempts to make a link between the adoption of national laws and the project GDAS, but this link is not convincing. For example, in the Cambodian case study, ARTIP influence on the formulation of the law was limited and involved the provision of comments on a law developed with Japanese technical assistance. However, the MTR would confirm the assertion that small changes with respect to the court processes (protection of women) reflect early signs of change. The Project does not provide an evidential basis for other claims of gender equity outcomes, such as participants behaviour change in the work setting. Although increased awareness of judges on gender issues, especially those related to the recognition of labour trafficking of men, is another important first step, yet there is no evidence that this has resulted in changed practices.

Interviews with ARTIP Law Enforcement training participants in Cambodia revealed that there was limited residual knowledge on gender issues for TIP, and there was no evidence of behaviour change (it should be noted that this assertion should be viewed with some caution as the issue was not fully explored given the competing demands of the TOR).

An examination of the Cambodian Gender Review shows that there remains a strong emphasis on the number of women participating in training rather than other activities designed to mainstream gender equity. Despite the fact that the GDAS has objectives and indicators clearly defined, the review did not report against these. For example, for Cambodia Component 1, the indicators were:

- Percentage of men and women trained in general, reactive and proactive investigation courses (this information is reported on)
- Pre and post course training assessment of gender and HR issues (not reported on in review)
- Gender profile of ATU considered appropriate by ATU and team relative to caseload and tasks (not reported on in review)
- LE support structures available to and appropriate for all victims regardless of gender (not reported on in review)

The emphasis of the results has been on the number of women participating in training and working in ATU and FLO units. In the six monthly plan, there is some analysis of the findings and key issues identified that impact on progress towards improved gender outcomes, but these were not directly linked to proposed activities for the next reporting period and it was difficult to tease out what the Projects response to the identified issues would be. A more complete analysis against each of the gender outcome objectives would be useful (the MTR team recognises that the documentation provided in Cambodia as the GDAS Review may not represent a more formal and comprehensive review developed in Bangkok - even so, it is what is understood by the CPC that will have the greatest effect on implementation of the GDAS at the member country level).

The Gender logframe, which was recently reported against by the M&E Specialist, only addressed progress against activities rather than reporting against outcomes or indicators in the logframe. In the future it would be useful to respond to the following types of questions in a gender review:

- What progress has been made toward the stated gender equity outcomes
- What is the quality and continuing relevance of the interventions carried out according to the GDAS

- What are the key barriers to enhancing gender equity outcomes
- What are the implications of the current situation to meeting the expected GDAS outcomes
- What actions should be taken to enhance gender equity outcomes for the remainder of the Project?

PARTNERSHIPS

This is a strong point for the Project and the MTR identified a wide range of contributions, while also recognising many of the limitations that are outside of the Project's control. ARTIP has assisted in the design and facilitation of a range of fora through which country-to-country relationships and regional engagement can be improved, such as the HSU and TWG. The first three years of the Project have been characterised by the following regional and country contributions:

- **ASEAN** - Strong contribution towards more sustainable partnerships between ASEAN and member countries on TIP, as well as bilateral relationships through activities such as the establishment of the SOMTC TIP permanent working group and engagement in the HSU process (which has resulted in a small number of cases of substantive cross border cooperation).
- **Member Countries** – Contribution to sustainability in some countries in the adoption/establishment of networks, shared products, services & processes (although this is yet to be fully realised in some locations, such as Cambodia).
- **Australian WOG** - Contribution to the strategic approach and consistency in message for Australian anti-trafficking policy and strategy, including through briefings, provision of products and assessments, and coordination on TIP, via AusAID to the Australian Government's Inter-Departmental Committee on People Trafficking.
- **Member Country to Member Country** - Contribution to sustainable country-to-country relationships in anti-trafficking operations involving the HSU & TWG as evidenced by an increasing preparedness to exchange information on TIP cases (although this is yet to be fully realised and is on a case by case basis more than a strategic approach).
- **Donor Harmonisation** - Contribution to regional donor harmonisation, however, in some country programs ARTIP requires a more proactive engagement strategy & approach (while also acknowledging these are crowded donor environments)

Please refer to the Cambodian case study for additional examples of outcomes from these relationships, particularly donor harmonisation and Australian Whole of Government partnerships.

Principles for Partnership Engagement

The first four of the Project's objectives relate to the development of sustainable and effective partnerships through either exchange of information or the promotion of better working relationships. Importantly, objective four specifically requires the Project to engage and maximise regional and country-to-country relationships. The partnership environment for ARTIP is a major determinant in regionalising, extending and providing for a sustainable and effective exit strategy. Yet the environment remains complex and is cluttered with competing donors, particularly in the areas of social services, victim support, and law enforcement, most notably in countries such as Thailand and Cambodia. So in modelling an approach to capacity building and sustainability, the partner environment should be a major element in mapping an approach that harmonises partner opportunities as well as building on niche areas of expertise and success.

For example, the Australian Federal Police initiative involving the case management information system (CMiS), which is being rolled out across the region, offers significant opportunity for the Project to leverage the CAS and other products, along with being able to provide informed and credible reporting on TIP issues to another Australian donor program. Some work has commenced in Indonesia with ARTIP assisting in the migration of data, but

more needs to be done in major destination countries such as Thailand. Across the whole partner environment, whether regional or country based, more could be realized across the HSU and TWG processes in particular, through a systematic approach that maps the Project through to an end-state and begins to identify handover points and partner institutionalization strategies eg UNIAP and UNODC.

If the end point is a strategic and sustainable member country government-to-government partnership, then this will not be realised in the development of only training services or technical skills. Rather, sustainable partner relationships should exhibit a high degree of mutuality, that is, a realised benefit to both parties, inferred sharing of roles and responsibilities, equality in decision-making, and be based on levels of trust. The key principles for partnership criteria include (particularly relevant in the ASEAN environment):

- High level executive support from both country and regional forums (eg SOMTC & TIP WG).
- Selection of the right national and partner bodies (eg. HSU & TWG).
- A high degree of trust across partner environments (eg. Exchange of case reporting and intelligence on TIP).
- Equality in decision making and full participation by partners (eg. CAS & ASEAN engagement).
- Agreed purpose and planning (eg. HSU & TWG).
- Sufficient 'Quality Time' together (preferably working together on joint activities rather than only discussing issues in workshops). (eg TWG support to institutionalise SOPs and cross border coordination/collaboration).

Partnerships – Going Forward

The SOMTC and TIP Working Group appear (WEF 15 April 2009) to have been moved from the Specialised Programs Unit to the new Security Cooperation Division, Political and Security Directorate, ASEAN Political and Security Community Department (this appears to merge the Specialised Programmes Unit and the ASEAN Regional Forum's Support Area) – which appear to offer a more functional area for non-traditional issues, such as TIP.

Discussions by the MTR across the broader donor environment realised strong support for ARTIP, however, only UNODC and in part, UNIAP, offer the prospect of greater engagement and the potential sponsorship of products, training and expertise with a realistic commitment towards a sustainable partnership. For example, UNODC identifies in its five year planning an intent for growing engagement in anti-trafficking in persons activities, particularly in the criminal justice sector across law enforcement, prosecutors and the judiciary (refers to Sections 1.2.3, 1.2.4 & 1.2.5 in the five year plan), along with a increased engagement directly with ASEAN and the SOMTC. While it is not presumed that this is a simple replication of ARTIP, it does allow AusAID to potentially offset efforts beyond 2011 with the possibility of bilateral and more targeted interventions in specific areas of need or expertise, along with the potential for the development of legislation and policy in anti-trafficking with ASEAN. Similarly, work through NGOs such as IOM and partner government programs such as the ISITAP United States Department of Justice programs in Indonesia in the training of front line law enforcement officers and prosecutors, could potentially realise more substantive gains than is currently possible in countries by ARTIP alone.

Recommendation 9: CardnoAcil develop a strategy to effectively engage UNODC and UNIAP in the sustainability of regional responses to TIP, particularly for Thailand and Indonesia and the wider regional engagement for ASEAN.

Beyond August 2011

Key interventions beyond 2011, on the premise of being complemented by supporting work from other partner donors and NGO, could include (but are not limited to):

- Bilateral engagement with destination countries such as Indonesia, and source/transit countries, such as Cambodia and Vietnam.
- Prosecutor and judiciary expertise interventions through targeted workshops and limited support/advisory services.
- Targeted/bilateral funding support to the SOMTC and HSU process/activities.
- Limited technical interventions to promote institutionalisation such as ToT assistance in select areas.
- NGO funding assistance to parallel programs, such as those run through UNODC or IOM, in niche areas of the criminal justice sector or human rights issues.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Overall, the risk management framework has remained largely static from Project commencement, other than a range of key points being raised in each of the six month rolling plans. The program and activity levels appear largely typical of AusAID projects more broadly and seek to identify and draw out risk control systems based on a simple matrix covering risk identification and consequence/mitigation (a causal and effect linear relationship). Risk management is organised around a calendar based entry system of work schedules with no decision tree or risk response evaluations. Early project documentation contains a long list of potential risks with little analysis or further elaboration with many of the entries simply remaining static.

Project tools, such as the CAS, assist in identifying issues but the analysis and identification of the risks can also provide a valuable project forecasting tool. The outcomes of this reporting and analysis in particular, will be important in shaping an improved risk management approach across country programs and the development of products, training and application of expertise – but greater work needs to be done in providing the current risk management system with the utility to be applied effectively.

The MTR recognises the further work undertaken by the Project in risk modeling provided in the amended M&E framework in early 2009, which is a step towards an improved risk and control based assurance framework. Yet there is still limited evidence of an active risk management system and culture of management across task, activity and country planning (particularly as it might relate to strategic planning across the Project). Given the team is experienced and knowledgeable across many of the risk issues identified, it would be expected that many of these considerations would be intuitive in the operating and country environments, but there is little visible evidence of the impact of this planning across project documentation, planning, scheduling and work plans.

CONCLUSION

The Project has realised a wide range of outputs that inform and support anti and counter-TIP in the criminal justice sector, particularly in shaping policy and legislative change, awareness raising, development of specialist skills, and in accelerating reform, coordination and facilitation processes at the regional, national and sub-national levels, on TIP. The technical expertise of the team was acknowledged across nearly every government and donor agency and department interviewed by the MTR. The Project from this point forward, however, should be seeking to shift and modify the emphasis and approach in strategy if sustainable and institutionalised outcomes, and thereby an effective exit strategy at the regional and country program levels, are to be delivered.

The MTR identified a range of achievements, areas of opportunity and key concerns. There are five key areas the MTR identified as medium to high risk issues with the potential to

directly impact on the effectiveness of the Project end state. The issues include the strategic framework not being clearly defined, management systems not providing sufficient clarity about project implementation, insufficient visibility of finance & resource management planning, limited progress towards an effective approach to sustainability and no exit strategy. All of which are now more critical as the Project moves towards the second half of delivery and the discretion on strategy, planning, priorities, resourcing, costs, workforce planning and risks, must now be better focused.

The major concern is that strategically the project is struggling and the cost of doing nothing will increase as the emphasis in the second half of the delivery cycle shifts towards a greater emphasis on cost management and the need to ensure any interventions are of high value and contribute towards an agreed strategic agenda and framework. Despite a number of achievements by the Project and wide spread stakeholder and client endorsement for ARTIP, any gains can potentially be quickly eroded if the Project outcomes are not effective or within budget and delivered in the agreed resources – so the cost of doing nothing is potentially high for AusAID.

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS

The MTR identified a range of Project findings which are as follows:

Assessment 1: In ASEAN, ARTIP products are likely to deliver short to medium term sustainable outcomes, however, the Project has the potential to make a more targeted intervention at the country program level. Importantly, the consolidation of existing activities is required if this is to be achieved with longer term impact and the institutionalization of training programs and products (particularly in targeting the uptake of these products in units and training academies).

Assessment 2: It is not sufficiently clear if the strategic intent is to focus on dissemination of regionally endorsed materials and/or the institutionalisation of new practices at the national level – which should be tied to a more deliberate planning and strategic approach for the Project.

Assessment 3: Some early and partial changes in behaviour were noted across law enforcement, prosecutors and the judiciary – yet there are barriers to the full adoption of new practices due to significant resource constraints in country government programs, such as Cambodia. This is an opportunity area for ARTIP to identify bilateral and regional engagement, such as through the HSU, for AusAID beyond 2011.

Assessment 4: There has been a focus on skills development and the provision of guidelines and products at the cost of a broader approach to institutional capacity development, such as policy and legislative initiatives and work with the ATU and prosecutors offices to imbed business and governance systems in TIP, eg transfer of CAS data to AFP donor programs, such as CMIS.

Assessment 5: Some structural change at the regional & national levels was noted through assistance to the development and implementation of memorandums of understanding, legislation and conventions, however, in some cases, such as Cambodia, the potential for policy influence is yet to be fully realised by ARTIP. This can in part be assisted by an increased emphasis in specialist and advisory services, strategic and operational planning for the TWG and HSU processes, and more emphasis in tailoring TIP products and skills for the ATU.

Assessment 6: The MTR assesses that strategically the Project is struggling and there is an absence of a strategic framework and end-of-project plan to 2011, which is a **HIGH RISK ISSUE** for ARTIP and AusAID in taking the Project forward.

Assessment 7: At the Project level there is a limited degree of clarity across the reporting and a poorly understood range of accountability mechanisms in the Project which is a **MEDIUM RISK ISSUE** for ARTIP and AusAID in taking the Project forward.

Assessment 8: The MTR assesses that there is insufficient visibility of financial & resource management planning, which is a **HIGH RISK ISSUE** for ARTIP and AusAID in taking the Project forward.

Assessment 9: The MTR assesses that if all activities, products and services as scheduled in the February-August 2009 six month rolling plan are approved, the Project will exceed the contract specified monetary limit, which is assessed to be a **MEDIUM RISK ISSUE** for AusAID and ARTIP in taking the Project forward.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The MTR identified a range of Project recommendations which as follows:

Recommendation 1: The MTR recommends that the Project continue through to August 2011 with a range of conditions and expectations on performance, planning and outcomes established and agreed between AusAID and CardnoAcil.

Recommendation 2: The Project should seek to articulate a clear and more measurable range of end-of-project outcomes in anticipation of the period from August 2009 being extended to August 2011.

Recommendation 3: CardnoAcil develop a detailed strategic framework which includes the prioritisation of country and regional activities, the alignment of workforce and resources, and an exit strategy. Key tasks should include:

- CardnoAcil integrate the work completed in capacity mapping assessment and sustainability factor analysis into the strategic planning framework.
- CardnoAcil consolidate current training efforts and align ARTIP training and products to the strategic plan and framework.
- CardnoAcil consolidate resources on the prosecutor and judiciary training (a real ARTIP niche).
- CardnoAcil provide a fully reconciled resource schedule by activity and effort (based on the approved strategic framework) for approval by August 2009.
- TAG facilitate and provide on-going support to strategic planning, design and scheduling of the Project.

Recommendation 4: CardnoAcil redirect effort from areas such as the research component, regionalised meetings and new courses, and focus the emphasis towards the consolidation of country training activities and the institutionalisation of national programs.

Recommendation 5: As part of the next visit, the TAG conduct a Project wide review of the planning and project strategy in late 2009 to confirm acceptance and adoption of MTR strategy recommendations and contract compliance.

Recommendation 6: CardoAcil Provide a fully reconciled financial schedule covering the breakdown of all invoicing through to August 2009 with the scheduling and resourcing identified against all BoP including reimbursables and LTP/STP personnel, by activity and product.

Recommendation 7: CardnoAcil combine the original MEF with the new Supplement. (noting that the final integrated MEF should be quite brief in the description of the system, but detailed annexes should fully describe the specific methods, such as the baseline and CAS).

Recommendation 8: CardnoAcil consider if the baseline and the CAS will provide a sufficient basis for all Project M&E and better address country reporting activities, in particular, investigations, prosecutions and changes in policy. Information should be collected systematically by Country Project Officers and reported in the Six Monthly Reports (particularly for inclusion in the AusAID QAI reporting process).

Recommendation 9: CardnoAcil develop a strategy to effectively engage UNODC and UNIAP in the sustainability of regional responses to TIP, particularly for Thailand and Indonesia and the wider regional engagement for ASEAN.

ANNEXES

- A List of ARTIP Interviews
- B Cambodian ARTIP Case Study
- C A Sustainability Strategy – A Step by Step Process

Annex A ARTIP Stakeholder Interviews

INDONESIA		
24 April 2009	ASEAN	Mr Dhannanjaya V. Sunoto Principal Director Ms Khine Myat Chit Specialised Programme Unit Ms Ananda Fadila ASLOM Technical Officer
23 April 2009	Indonesian National Police	Sr Supt Eko Daniyanto Head of Unit 3/PPA
24 April 2009	Attorney General's Office	Ms Ibu Lila Prosecutor
24 April 2009	ARTIP Team	Mr Rick Meyers Regional Law Enforcement Ms Rita Nurhaida Country Coordinator
25 April 2009	Australian Federal Police	Mr Mark Travers AFP Liaison Officer
25 April 2009	International Organisation for Migration	Ms Fitriana Nur Coordinator IOM
25 April 2009	AusAID Indonesia	Ms Jessica Hoverman First Secretary Asia Regional Coordination
28 April 2009	USDOJ-ICITAP (telecon)	Mr Damianus Bilo Technical Adviser Trafficking in Persons Program
THAILAND		
21 April - 4 May 2009	AusAID Bangkok	Mr Phillippe Allen Minister Counsellor Ms Bridie Rushton Regional Program Coordinator Ms Pitchanuch Supavanich Assistant Program Officer
22 April 2009	Canberra-Based WoG IDC on People Trafficking Consultation (videocon interview) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• AusAID• Attorney General's Department• Department of Foreign Affairs & Trade• Commonwealth Department of Public	Ms Patricia Kehoe Ms Fareeha Ibrahim Mr Scott Wilson & Anthony Coles Ms Lauren Knight & Ms Anna Garretson

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Australian Crime Commission • Australian Federal Police • Department of Immigration and Citizenship • Australian Institute of Criminology • Office for Women 	Ms Lyma Nguyen Ms Samantha Chard Ms Kirsty Wade Ms Cheryl Morton Ms Jacqui Joudo Larsen Ms Megan Leahy
21 April – 4 May 2009	ARTIP Bangkok Team	Mr Willem Pretorius Project Manager Ms Sophie Pinwill Deputy Project Manager Mr Albert Moskowitz J&P Adviser Dr Anne Gallagher TIP Expert/Adviser Mr Paul Holmes Senior LE Adviser
27 April 2009	ASEAN SOMTC (telecon with Deputy due to Lead Sheppard on TIP attending a conference in Geneva)	Assistant Secretary Oscar Valenzuela Acting Chairperson
28 April 2009	Office of Foreign Affairs & Transnational Crimes – Dept of Special Investigation	Mr Chatchawan Bunmee Director
28 April 2009	ILO - IPEC	Ms Thetis Mangahas Project Manager
28 April 2009	UNIAP	Mr Mathew Friedman Regional Project Manager Dr Lisa Taylor Project Manager TIP
29 April 2009	Royal Thai Police	MAJGEN Churd Choovej Deputy Director Children & Women Protection Centre
29 April 2009	Attorney General's Office	Prosecutor Jumpon Phansumrit Expert Public Prosecutor
30 April 2009	Ministry of Social Development and Human Security	Mr Samatchai Chomwinya Director
30 April 2009	Institute of Police Development	LTCOL Surasak Laohapiboolkul Lecturer
1 May 2009	UNODC	Mr Gary Lewis Representative Ms Melissa Stewart

		Project Manager/Adviser
1 May 2009	IOM	Ms hera Shanaj Programme Coordinator
1 May 2009	Royal Thai Police	LTCOL Krai Sonsi Deputy Superintendent Children Juveniles and Women Division ATU
1 May 2009	UNESCO	Dr David Feingold International Coordinator
CAMBODIA		
23 April 2009	International Labour Organisation	Rim Kleang Sisovann Ouk
23 April 2009	UNICEF-LEASECT Ministry of Interior	Law Enforcement Adviser Christian Guth
23 April 2009 30 April 2009	ARTIP	CPC Yi Yuth Virak
24 April 2009	Ministry of Interior Department of Human Trafficking	Director HE Maj Gen Bith Kim Hong
24 April 2009	Ministry of Justice	Undersecretary of State HE Ithy Rady
27 April 2009	Cambodian Women's Crisis Centre	Executive Director Vathany Say
27 April	International Organisation for Migration	Project Coordinator Bruno Maltoni
27 April 2009	UNIAP	National Project Coordinator Lim Tith
27 April 2009	AusAID Post	First Secretary Arthi Patel
28 April 2009	Asia Foundation C-TIP	Chief of Party Nandita Baruah
28 April 2009	ECPAT (Child Prostitution, Abuse and Trafficking)	Executive Director Chin Chanveasna
28 April 2009	Australian Federal Police	Senior Liaison Officer Border and International FA Philip Hunter
28 April 2009	Cambodia Criminal Justice Project (AusAID)	AFP Advisor Ian Bate
29 April 2009	Kandal Provincial Police Commission	Police Commissioner Ive Cham Roeun Chief DAHT Ros Sarin
29 April 2009	Takeo Provincial Police Commission	Police Commissioner Ouk Samnang Chief DAHT Chhem Sarath
30 April 2009	DAHT Police Trainers	Kem Pheap Ly Thon Hu

Annex B Cambodian ARTIP Case Study

B.1 Relevant Contextual Factors for TIP

Since 2003 the Deputy Prime Minister has clearly demonstrated a commitment to addressing TIP. There are general perceptions that the response to TIP is improving and there is certainly a significant amount of activities going on, but there is limited evidence base to these claims and prosecutions remain low.

What is apparent is that there are significant improvements in the openness to discuss and address TIP; there is increasing government commitment; there is some evidence to support the view that the community is increasing its confidence in the police; the new TIP law has been an important step, it is well supported by all stakeholders, and there are now clearer definitions of TIP; there are more police structures in place since 2000; concepts are now well expanded beyond sexual exploitation; and anti-trafficking units are more aware of the social impact on victims. Identification of TIP cases nationally is on the increase (1999: 40 cases; 2009: 600 cases), but since the UNICEF funded database was handed back to the Provincial level, reporting has dropped off again. There is an increasing demand from the Provincial level for training and support on TIP cases.

Since the financial crisis, some 50,000 young women have become jobless and are unlikely to return to their villages. These women are more vulnerable to prostitution, drug abuse, and criminality. Migration is a major factor that feeds TIP and domestic violence and child labour is playing a significant role in migration.

Issues that continue to challenge Cambodia are the limited information available to support planning; systems are not well institutionalised; there is general confusion with systems and structures; and there remains a limited cross-sectoral collaboration within the government sectors. Cross-agency roles and functions remain unclear and it remains difficult to achieve agreement on these. Although the national plan of action has been developed, there has been very limited movement on implementation. In addition, there are far more criminal organisations now working in trans-national crime, their methods are increasingly more sophisticated, and it is difficult to keep Cambodian police officers up-to-date with changing practices. Victims are still slow to report cases, communities' are not aware of their rights, and there is still a strong emphasis in Cambodia on the local settlement of breaches of the law.

Some of the key areas for donor support will be sustaining strong government commitment; ensuring effective structures and systems; the institutionalisation of entry level and refresher training for police, prosecutors and judges; and maintenance of a strong international presence on TIP.

With respect to law enforcement training on TIP, the donor and NGO sector is very crowded. This is discussed further in Section 5 below. For the judiciary, there are far fewer players and ARTIP remains the dominant actor in this sector.

B.2 ARTIP Achievement of Outcomes to Date and Progress Toward Sustainability

B.2.1 Reputation and Profile

It is important to begin this case study with a strong recognition of the progress ARTIP has made with respect to developing relationships and trust in this very sensitive sector. This usually takes several years with limited development outcomes, but ARTIP has been able to get significant traction through the delivery of their training and ASEAN endorsed products which has played a major role in developing the relationships that position them well to affect change in a complex environment. It is often underestimated the effort required of a project team to achieve this level of trust with a national partner government and a range of donors

in the sector. The MTR would like to ensure that this achievement is well recognised, along with the openness and willingness to engage by partner government agencies in Cambodia.

Other related factors that are seen to have impacted positively on the project's capacity to bring about change is that AusAID has been recognised as making a long-term commitment to TIP in Cambodia, and the credibility and reputation of the ARTIP Country Project Coordinator.

B.3 Law Enforcement

B.3.1 Progress Toward Outcomes

Police Skills Development

For the Front Line Officers, ARTIP has contributed to an increasing awareness of TIP issues including the new law, and improved investigation practices in responding to cases of TIP. Although raising awareness is not yet the desired behaviour change, it is a critical building block for ultimate behaviour change. Already Provincial anti-trafficking units are increasing their demand for TIP training and support. Visits to the provincial level noted minor behaviour change of FLOs with respect to prevention of TIP at the community level, and the adoption of interviewing techniques covered in training. A significant amount of the training was not practiced on return to the work setting (see Section 2.2.2 on sustainability below).

Some Victim Support Agencies report changing behaviour in police related to being more open, cooperative and responsive to TIP cases, however no specific changes in how victims are being treated were identified or reported to the MTR.

In Kandal province, police reported one successful prosecution of a trafficking case since their training. In this province relevant new skills were identified as better interviewing techniques and a better understanding of recruitment and transport of victims. In Takeo province no cases of TIP have been identified since the training and their focus has been on prevention activities. Police in both provinces report the conduct of community awareness raising activities on TIP which are supported by LEASECT and other NGOs. ARTIP documents are shared among colleagues at weekly staff meetings, and trainees have gone on to provide additional training to their own staff.

During the provincial interviews one province reported an actual case of cooperation on TIP with a neighbouring province. The cooperation was limited to telephone calls and there has not yet been a successful arrest.

No stakeholders were able to articulate changes with respect to special outcomes for women, and were not able to identify what expected outcomes for women might be.

Although it is not possible to attribute these early but important developments to ARTIP alone due to the crowded nature of donor engagement in this sector, the MTR team is confident that ARTIP has played a significant role. This claim is supported by ARTIP's profile within the sector and widely held perceptions that ARTIP has contributed significantly to the development of high quality materials, standards and SOPs.

Other donors or NGOs have participated in or used ARTIP materials for FLO training. In most cases, these organisations have gone on to disseminate this training across their own organisations and networks. This does extend the reach of ARTIP, and plays an important role in getting the same messages out across a range of avenues. Note continuing challenges in this area discussed in Section 5 on donor harmonisation below.

Police Anti-Trafficking Unit Strategic Planning

Although ARTIP aims to support the development of strategic planning in the anti-trafficking units progress has been limited to date. ARTIP advisers have begun a dialogue with the

national anti-trafficking unit (ATU) but this has not progressed well. The ATU did prepare and submit a draft plan, but this was returned for further consideration and has not progressed since. Note discussions on Australian whole-of-government coordination on strategic planning below.

B.3.2 Key Factors Affecting Sustainability

ARTIP has reached 164 officers directly with training which is a small proportion of national FLOs. With the limited reach of ARTIP, and the need for frequent up-dates to keep FLOs abreast of the ever changing trafficker techniques, it is important to be clear that ARTIP could not realistically be expected to result in sufficient FLO behaviour change to mount an effective national response to TIP (or even a partial provincial level response in selected provinces). ARTIP will need to focus their work in the final years on the institutionalisation of training (see below).

Training curricula endorsed by ASEAN is highly regarded and is viewed as an important legacy of the project in Cambodia among government and donor partners. The curricula is broad and comprehensive and although it has been adapted to the legal environment in Cambodia, it still includes many new practices that might be considered beyond the resource environment in which the Cambodian police are working. For example, two provincial anti-trafficking units reported significant constraints to conducting investigations, collaborating with other Provinces, and communicating information to the national level.

These constraints were driven by a lack of stationary, shelving and furniture, transport, petrol, other travel expenses, cameras, computers and printers. Other important constraints are related to the limited basic investigation skills and literacy levels for many FLOs. For many FLO trainees, training materials and concepts have been beyond their educational backgrounds. In addition there is no Coroner's Act, no pathology services, nor any autopsy services. This may be why donors tend to get locked in to special niche areas.

Finally, the law has not allowed for proactive response to TIP which limits much of what the ASEAN curricula is addressing.

Although these issues are beyond the scope of ARTIP to address, for the development of a sustainability strategy a thorough analysis of the implications to achieving intended project outcomes will be essential. It will also provide the basis for decisions relating to what ARTIP ought to focus on in Cambodia for the remainder of the project.

Some stakeholders assert that ARTIP has not succeeded in getting their curricula accepted more widely (as they have with the judicial training) as they have not invested sufficiently in raising awareness of these materials in the donor sector. Also, to work with government partners to discuss the value of a single curriculum that provides the basis for other donors or NGOs to adapt to meet their specific areas of focus.

The small number of TIP cases being experienced by individual provinces or anti-trafficking units must be remembered when we consider the investments being made. Although improved capacity will result in identification of more TIP cases, currently there is a very limited number of cases on which to practice new skills, consolidate training and further create demand for a better TIP response. The implications of this situation need to be carefully analysed in the sustainability strategy.

Institutional capacity development could be improved by broadening the approach from training. For example, there are limited on-the-job opportunities for trainees, especially the TOT, to gain experience in TIP. Consideration could be given to supporting national DAHT trainers (or other key individuals) to visit TIP investigation sites to follow-up and extract lessons from the limited number of experiences available.

B.4 Police Trainers

B.4.1 Progress Toward Outcomes

ARTIP has trained five trainers from the national anti-trafficking unit. They are expected to conduct on-going FLO training, in the most part, funded by other donors. They have already been selected by IOM to conduct training for an additional 800 FLOs. There is no evidence yet on the performance level of these trainers. Trainers report that an important legacy of ARTIP for their group is the training materials. They also believe that these materials are based on good technical knowledge which has built their confidence to apply them.

After they have completed the devolved training by IOM/ARTIP these trainers are expected to act as resource persons within the anti-trafficking unit and deliver on-the-job training and support. They are also expected to act as guest lecturers and resource persons to the Academy when the basic training is handed over.

Provincial police trained as trainers report additional outcomes of their training that relate to improved relationships between the Deputy Police Commissioner and the FLOs on TIP. They also report delivering training to their colleagues and being invited by LEASECT project to train FLOs on their courses. This shows that the ARTIP trainees are getting the opportunity to apply their skills and consolidate their learning. Particular emphasis was given to the value of Module 5: Operational Planning for TIP cases, and that this has been applied in the work setting.

B.4.2 Key Factors Affecting Sustainability

Training was commonly reported as being too short. One participant of the TOT reported that he had only been able to absorb 30% to 40% of the training content.

Trainers report that “we don’t have the resources to implement much of what we learned, but we did gain knowledge on new laws and protocols”. There are very limited resources to conduct training without donor support. For example, provincial level officials reported that LEASECT has been paying national trainers \$50/day; local trainers \$25/day; and participants \$5/day. This cannot be replicated from local budgets.

Although there are limited resources in Cambodia to apply their training, there is still some case for delivering this broader suite of modules as it broadens awareness and expectations, and ultimately demand for a better service. However, this needs to be carefully managed so that participants don’t get despondent when returning to their work settings. This is particularly important with national trainers. They also need to be aware of how to manage the motivational issues related to this issue.

There is a general confusion about the roles and responsibilities of the Anti-Trafficking Unit trainers and how this will articulate with the Academy. Currently the curriculum at the Academy does not meet the full job descriptions of police, they only train a small number of recruits and focus on the level of captain and above.

There are also challenges with getting agreement across all the government agencies on TIP, and a long standing problem of high staff mobility within the Police Department.

As the MTR was not able to meet with the Academy personnel where training curricula will be integrated, it was not possible to make a reasonable assessment of how realistic this will be, and what actual constraints will be faced.

The on-going update of materials and curricula will be a critical issue for government agencies after the project – currently there is an expectation that ARTIP will continue to play this role. Given that trafficking approaches are changing rapidly, the capacity to keep up to date will be critical for sustainability. ARTIP does not appear to have addressed this key capacity and it ought to be addressed in the forthcoming sustainability strategy.

The cooperation between police and judges remains another key challenge and barrier to sustainability. Joint training has proved to be unrealistic, so alternative approaches will need to be considered.

There was no discussion with senior officials or trainers about how they will progress without ARTIP to a position of sustainability.

B.5 Prosecutors and Judges

B.5.1 Progress Toward Outcomes

ARTIP has conducted two levels of training. Two general awareness training reaching 35 judges and prosecutors (delivered in conjunction with C-TIP), then an advanced course reaching 22 participants (all of whom had completed the introductory course). This advanced course was delivered in conjunction with IOM.

Knowledge perceived to be important to partner government officials has improved case investigation techniques and how to prosecute cases – but the reach of training has not yet met needs in Cambodia.

Actual changes in behaviour *observed* by respondents include: there are now more cases of TIP reaching the courts; some judges and prosecutors are demonstrating improved capacity to handle evidence appropriately; a small number of judges have been conducting more research; and in a small number of cases a successful prosecution was achieved. There is a general consensus that developments are considered to be still quite limited at this stage.

B.5.2 Factors Affecting Sustainability

MoJ had appointed a specialist prosecutor on TIP, but due to the limited number of judges and prosecutors and the requirement for rotation of personnel every four years, this approach is no longer functioning. Instead only those trained in TIP will be allocated cases of TIP. A key factor in the low prosecution rate is that judges handle general criminal cases, have a heavy workload, and don't have the time to practice all they have learned to reach the desired outcomes.

The judge training curricula was endorsed by MoJ with ease due to the fact that the materials were ASEAN endorsed which was seen as very important. Although the training content was considered relevant to practice requirements in Cambodia, some training participants were not able to apply their training because they had less capacity to absorb the theoretical content and apply it in practice.

Another practical constraint is that by the time the cases reach the judicial system they are old and it is difficult for victim support agencies to provide the services needed for such a protracted period, which similarly to Australia can be as long as two years.

For the judicial work ARTIP has focused very strongly on the MoJ, but have not invested in developing relationships with other key players like the Ministry of Social Affairs. There are considered to be a number of other agencies that are allies of the TIP response. The focus of this networking would be to get ARTIP/ASEAN materials accepted and adopted by a broader range of agencies in Cambodia, further institutionalising achievements.

For integration of training into the Academy, there will be some barriers to sustainability post-ARTIP. There are limited qualified resource persons limited resources. The ARTIP trainers are expected to be guest practitioner/lecturers on the invitation of the Academy.

B.6 ASEAN Endorsed Materials and Products

B.6.1 Progress Toward Outcomes

Although SOPs, International Standards or the Handbook have been disseminated, they have not been institutionalised. The Police SOPs are expected to be endorsed in the future. Getting the SOPs adapted for local use is difficult when participants are in their normal work environment. It is commonly more effective to provide an incentive to complete the SOPs by removing participants to another location and have them work full time for about two weeks until they are completed. This is likely to cost about \$5,000 with a high impact.

The Case Analysis System (CAS) has been conducted once in Cambodia and only completed in April 2009. As such, it is not well integrated into government systems, and its current application is perceived by stakeholders as being focused on planning for ARTIP deliverables such as proposals for the flexible funding pool. All government officials interviewed did not immediately recall the CAS in discussions on tools for planning, monitoring and evaluation of the national response to TIP. One senior official considered that the role of the CAS was to allow the department to keep watch over suspects that were released to observe any changes in their behaviour.

Senior officials had heard of the Detention Study, but no one reported having seen it. No one was aware of the findings of this study even though data collection for Cambodia was carried out in May 2007. In fact, ARTIP had presented the report to the TWG and briefed key stakeholders, but it appears that the content and potential application of the findings was not internalised by partners. Further work will be required to integrate the study findings into Cambodian institutions where this is accepted by partners.

B.6.2 Factors Affecting Sustainability

The approach to institutionalise ARTIP products like the SOPs is not well defined in the documentation or for several stakeholders. It will require significantly more effort than getting materials endorsed. Key stakeholders will need to be well informed about the role of these products, and have a more systematic involvement in planning how to operationalise these materials, and integrate them into national planning (including identification of resources required for operationalisation). There is a high risk that the potential value of these products will not be realised if this is not addressed.

Currently the CAS has not been recognised as an important tool by government and donor partners. In several cases, senior officials had heard of it, but had not seen it or were aware of its actual content. Although through detailed discussion with respondents there was agreement about its potential application, this did not appear to have been a focus of ARTIP for them. UNIAP considered that the CAS was used as a training tool to generate cases for study during training. Expatriate advisers implemented the CAS on the first round. Although there may be good reasons for this as a first round, consideration will need to be given to the extent to which respondents in the CAS data collection will feel comfortable giving sensitive information to outsiders. Seeking opportunities for fully involving Cambodian personnel in the next CAS will be essential – despite early challenges experienced getting full engagement on the activity. This would also provide more value for money for the project as currently the costs of international staff conducting the CAS would be high. Also visits to the province to conduct the CAS would be an additional opportunity to carry out other tasks for national members of the anti-trafficking unit.

Another factor that may limit the likelihood of full integration of the CAS is that this is not an environment where reporting is strongly prioritised. People prefer to pass on information verbally. ARTIP would benefit from conducting a thorough analysis of the likelihood of integration of the CAS into partner systems. If this is not likely in the time remaining on the project, then resources could be directed toward areas of priority for government partners.

Government partners did not appear to be involved in, or carry any ownership of the Detention Study.

B.7 Heads of Specialist Units Process in Cambodia

B.7.1 Progress Toward Outcomes

The HSU Process in ASEAN is perceived to be strong amongst the HSUs at regional meetings, but is not yet operationalised at the national level. Cambodian officials reported that most of the content of the HSU meetings was about good and bad practice, rather than working on actual cases. Cooperation between Cambodia and other countries is variable. The cooperation with Thailand has been limited; however there has been substantive cooperation with Vietnam and Malaysia. Joint training of border police between Vietnam and Cambodia is planned. Cooperation with Malaysia has focused on victim rescue through NGO channels. Cambodian officials attribute these developments with Vietnam and Malaysia as a direct result of the HSU process and believe that after ARTIP has completed these relationships will continue. Cross border collaboration on specific cases of TIP has been less than fruitful to date with other countries in the region.

The MoJ reported that they see the need for the HSU process for the Judicial systems in ASEAN countries to support joint investigations or transfer of suspects. Although ASEAN has begun considerations for this, ARTIP is perceived to be suitable partners to support further developments. This is a reflection of the perceived effectiveness of ARTIP as enabling the HSU process.

B.7.2 Factors Affecting Sustainability

For the HSU process to result in actual cross border collaboration, there are significant barriers at the national level which were observed in Cambodia. Cross-border collaboration assumes that Cambodia is able to communicate and collaborate at the district, provincial and national levels. Barriers with respect to their capacity to reach crime scenes, investigate cases, and communicate within the country makes cross-border collaboration an unrealistic expectation in the short to medium term, and a significant challenge. Diplomatic relationships between countries also play a critical role in practical collaboration. Other barriers include the language barriers to communication, and a reluctance to be exposed to computer viruses.

Although it would not be sustainable for ARTIP to fund cross-border investigations for their own sake, there is some benefit in considering the role that actual joint work programs play in contributing to the establishment of future partnerships and the demand for new practices. The link between the operational personnel between countries is low and this must affect the capacity to work on extradition and sharing of information.

There is a perception among stakeholders that after ARTIP has completed; the HSU process will proceed in only a limited fashion as ASEAN cannot take an operational role in supporting the process.

B.8 Quality of Project Deliverables in Cambodia

B.8.1 Training

Overall for both the law enforcement and judges and prosecutor training all stakeholders (government partners and donors) have reported that the quality of training materials is high. ARTIP trainers have been considered very high calibre, and the project has developed a reputation for technical excellence. Government partners all reported that the training was relevant to their environment (although in several cases it went beyond the resource capacity of Cambodia).

The training methods were also considered to be highly effective. Many trainees commented on the modern methods applied by ARTIP and how much more effective they were

compared to their previous experiences in training. Most trainee respondents were able to clearly articulate what these modern methods were, and how they benefited from them. Senior officials commented on the quality of the adult learning methods which were considered very suitable for mature, experienced judges and conducive to their on-going participation and engagement.

There was a common theme that training was too short to develop a sufficient depth of understanding.

All materials have been peer reviewed to meet quality standards.

B.9 Technical Advisers

ARTIP technical advisers enjoy a very high reputation among government and donor representatives. There was a general expression of desire to have more access to long term advisors, especially in the judicial sector. This advisor was seen as an important resource for Cambodia and currently was being underutilised. Currently the advisor visits Cambodia about four times a year for the TWG meeting and stays for two to three days. The potential role this plays in broader policy outcomes and institutionalisation of materials and products is also worth considering for the remainder of the project.

The CPC was commonly viewed by government and donor respondents as being of an extremely high calibre by a wide range of stakeholders. He was considered to be credible in his knowledge, an excellent Ambassador for Australia, and in possession on a good understanding of the context.

B.10 SOPs, Handbook and other Products

There was a generally held view that ARTIP/ASEAN materials were of a high technical quality. All materials were considered to be based on international standards and were perceived with a high degree of credibility. This is important, especially in the law enforcement sector where there are approximately 14 organisations dealing with TIP training for law enforcement officers.

Materials and products were peer reviewed to meet quality standards.

The Detention Study had not been viewed by any government respondents in the Cambodia case study.

B.11 Perceptions on the Continuing Relevance of ARTIP Objectives

There was a commonly held view that ARTIP niche work in Cambodia was in the judicial system. With 14 organisations working on FLO training, ARTIP would best be focusing on institutionalisation of law enforcement training and the curricula rather than playing a role in extending the coverage of FLO training beyond the current 60% nationally.

There is a strong potential to use the long term judicial advisor to support the policy agenda setting and formulation and advocate for institutionalisation of ASEAN products more effectively.

In order to support the HSU process senior officials considered that ARTIP would be well placed to support joint investigations to develop cross border relationships and demonstrate the value of working together.

There were shared views that ARTIP was well placed to play an active role in the Prosecution Cluster of the new High Level Working Group. This would be a venue to promote ASEAN materials and support systematic implementation of ASEAN products by all actors in the sector. Policy agenda setting, provision of advice, on-the-job mentoring could all play important roles in institutionalising modest change based on the current track record of ARTIP.

B.12 Donor Harmonisation

This issue of poor donor harmonisation is most critical in the law enforcement sector. As mentioned earlier there are 14 organisations working on TIP. There is only limited government coordination of these efforts which focuses on avoidance of geographical duplication, but organisations are free to deliver the content of their choice and training curricula are not subjected to quality control. There are several UN and NGO groups who are working on coordination, however these are not well known and key actors are not aware of the range of coordination efforts underway. Recently there has been a real focus on training on the new TIP law which has been carried forward by a number of agencies.

Many of the donors have slightly different areas of emphasis. For example, ILO focuses on prevention, advocacy and awareness raising at the community level, and World Vision focuses on victim support. However other donors such as UNICEF:LEASECT work in the same areas as ARTIP as the FLO training.

ARTIP enjoys a high profile with a smaller subset of the donor community, especially with IOM supporting the devolved training for FLOs; and the Asia Foundation's C-TIP who are working with ARTIP to integrate the curricula into the police academy. C-TIP has its own TIP standards, which are narrower than ARTIP/ASEAN. C-TIP standards have been endorsed by the Ministry of Social Affairs, however, it is not clear how standards are understood when different Ministries have endorsed different "international standards". UNIAP has accessed ARTIP technical assistance (the CPC) during a Raid and Rescue workshop, and some NGOs have accessed ARTIP resources for the delivery of their training.

However, other donors such as ILO were not so familiar with the detail of ARTIP work. LEASECT had only a limited understanding of ARTIP but had worked with them on training for the new law, and although they had also been working on information management they had not seen the ARTIP CAS, and were not aware of the ASEAN IQS or SOPs.

In the judicial sector, donor activity is very low. There has been some training in the past – short one or two day courses, but nothing as substantive as ARTIP to date.

ARTIP has achieved a good degree of harmonisation in some areas. However this could be expanded further to a more proactive approach to effective harmonisation across a broader range of actors.

B.13 Australian Whole of Government Response

B.13.1 6.1 Australian Federal Police

There is potential overlap of AFP and ARTIP activities. The Australian Federal Police are also working on sexual exploitation and trafficking. They plan to conduct this training with the ant-trafficking unit. Although the AFP was aware of ARTIP, they had not yet discussed this training with them. They considered that if ARTIP had some good materials then it would be good to have them participate in the AFP training. The AFP is also working on the trans-national area of trafficking looking at barriers to investigations and cross-border collaboration. This offers the potential to better coordinate with the AFP to assist Cambodian Police in overcoming difficulties, particularly in Thai-Cambodia relations. The AFP has not discussed this work with ARTIP, but considers that collaboration through the HSU process could be beneficial. The objective behind the AFP regional training involving 12 South East Asian nations is to promote the AFP as a resource in the region. During the discussion they invited ARTIP to present the work they were doing at the forthcoming "Trans-national Sexual Exploitation and Human Trafficking" workshop.

B.14 6.2 Cambodia Criminal Justice Assistance Project

There is potential overlap with ARTIP activities. CCJAP has components focusing on the police, courts, prisons, HRM and planning. They are not focused on TIP although they are

working on national police strategic planning. They also focus on forensic skills and crime scene management. CCJAP considers that if ARTIP is working on strategic planning with the anti-trafficking unit, then they will need to coordinate with the CCJAP 5 year strategic plan for the police. Also, CCJAP was not aware of ARTIP's work on crime scene management. CCJAP is also developing SOPs, so they would like to see if ARTIP's SOP are supportive of the CCJAP sector wide SOPs. In the court sector CCJAP is working on setting up registration systems and providing training in writing judgements, so there is no risk of duplication or sending mixed messages.

Both groups have had meetings with ARTIP team members, but the result of these discussions has not progressed on to an operational relationship.

B.15 Project Management

B.15.1 Adequacy of Remaining Resources and Strategic Planning

The CPC was not aware of the resources available for work in Cambodia for the rest of the project. The national partner government has also expressed an interest in understanding the limitations that resources may pose to planning for future 6 monthly plans. It has been difficult for ARTIP Cambodia to make an assessment of priorities for planning and submission of proposals without a sense of what is expected for Cambodia for the remainder of the project.

Recent proposals have also been rejected in terms of funding allocated which has not been adequately explained at the national level. For example, a proposal for \$2,500 for provincial training was rejected and only \$1,300 made available. This had the potential to result in an inability of the project to bring in district level participants for the training. This was managed by reducing the number of trainings rather than the reach of a specific activity. It was not clear why this decision was made to reduce a proposed activity by such a small amount. Partners need to have a clear understanding of why their proposals are rejected otherwise there is a risk that the project will be seen as non-responsive which, in turn, may have a deleterious effect on ownership.

B.16 Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting

B.16.1 Monitoring and Evaluation

The CPC has seen the old M&E framework, but found that it was too difficult to understand despite participating in Focal Point training. This is a common problem where M&E is perceived to be a simple task for project managers, rather than a specialised task for personnel with adequate skills and experience who can understand and implement an M&E framework or plan. The perception of the CPC was that M&E was the task of the Cambodian Focal Point supported by ARTIP team in Bangkok. It is now apparent, that in Cambodia this is an unrealistic expectation. Focal Points in Cambodia do not have sufficient basic experience in M&E and it is most unlikely that this could be realised in the life of the project. The CPC is not aware that any M&E activities, aside from the CAS and the baseline which has not been followed up as yet. The ARTIP team members from Bangkok came to collect "information on indicators" but the CPC recalled that the task proved overwhelming. A number of training evaluations have been conducted aside from training reaction sheets submitted by judges and prosecutors, but presentation of findings, analysis and interpretation of lessons learned for the project were not available to the MTR to appraise.

B.16.2 Reporting

Currently the CPC is spending three days per month preparing the monthly reports. Although the quality of these reports is good, this is an inappropriate level of investment, and is compounded by challenges writing in English as a second language. It is not clear to the MTR team why this frequency of reporting is of value, and who reads and benefits from this effort. AusAID reports that monthly reporting in this level of detail is not required. This ought

to be resolved by the proposed workshop between AusAID and the contractor (in the main report) to finalise what actual reporting is useful and the frequency required.

B.17 Risk Management

Risks are seen as generic and similar for all member countries in the project. They are not tailored to each individual country work environment. There are a large number of risks identified (21), and the analysis and mitigation strategies are not well developed. The matrix is updated 6 monthly and no other work is carried out on risk management by the CPC during the year. It appears that risk management is mostly managed at the regional level (see main report for more details). Although the analysis and mitigation strategies are limited in the documentation, this is not a particularly unusual approach to risk management in the Australian Aid Program.

Annex C Sustainability Strategy – A Step by Step Process

C.1 SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGY

C.1.1 Step 1: Identify the Key Management Questions Relating To Sustainability

The following questions would need to be addressed by the sustainability strategy and be easily accessed in progress reports in a section dedicated to sustainability:

- What are the outcomes that are expected to be sustained?
- What are the factors that influence the outcomes we wish to sustain?
- What is the quality of our interventions on these factors?
- Are we moving toward or away from achieving sustainability?

C.1.2 Step 2: Identify the key outcomes to be sustained

Not all of ARTIP's development outcomes will be expected to be fully sustained. It is difficult to assess the conditions in the future, beneficiary behaviour is unpredictable, and the future context may be unstable.

C.1.3 Step 3: Identify key factors that may influence the sustainability of outcomes

A number of factors were highlighted that could have a strong influence on sustainability of outcomes. These were discussed with examples of how these factors were important in ARTIP.

- Differentiation between achieving partnership (influencing design and implementation) and ownership (taking responsibility for implementation and outcomes)
- The four features of ownership that must be addressed are: willingness to take ownership (incentives and motivation); accountability (being answerable to another); the capacity to take responsibility; and the opportunity in terms of power relations, and norms, between ARTIP and their partners.
- Institutional integration issues: such as sustainability of staff salaries; staff incentives to adopt new behaviours; allowances or resources to do the new work; and a quality supervision system to sustain staff behaviours. Structural issues such as integration of new work into existing units (such as trainers linked with training units); and integration of new committees into existing institutional structures.
- Training issues: the extent to which training addresses the motivation to adopt new behaviours not just knowledge and skills; the appropriateness and range of training methods; and the enabling environment on return to the work setting which includes executive support, a demand for the new behaviours, equipment and other resources to do the work.
- Absorptive Capacity: the number of donors/advisers in the sector; the capacity to take on new work; and the capacity to spend funds
- Financial Capacity: the extent of counterpart contribution; and the recurrent budget implications of the new work needs to be calculated and discussed
- Appropriate technology: in terms of technical, financial, gender, social/cultural and maintenance aspects
- Time horizons: the scope of the interventions are realistic in terms of the time available to reach the intended outcomes
- Policy context: is compatible both at the national level and at the level of a particular training outcome

C.1.4 Step 4: Identify ARTIP Approaches to Address Important Factors

Once the key outcomes have been analysed in terms of these, and other factors considered to be influential, specific strategies will need to be developed in response.

C.1.5 Step 5: Monitor the Quality and Effectiveness of Response Interventions

The M&E system ought to track the quality and effectiveness of only the important interventions that were designed to enhance sustainability. Good professional judgement reporting in progress reports would be acceptable for other, less critical factors. But the process of analysis of factors and discussions about suitable interventions and their success play an important role in improved project performance.

C.1.6 Step 6: Report on Implementation of the Sustainability Strategy

Commonly, once the Sustainability Strategy is developed, it is no longer used to inform the on-going delivery of a project. For ARTIP there ought to be a dedicated section in the Progress Report that addresses the five Management Questions listed above. There should be a mix of evidence generated from the M&E system, complemented by well informed professional judgement to provide confidence that progress is being made.