



Presidential
Transition



Improving Data to Combat Human Trafficking

Authors:

Dr. Heather J. Clawson, ICF International

Ms. Erin Williamson, ICF International

Ms. Ashley Garrett, ICF International

Passion. Expertise. Results.



Abstract

Human trafficking, modern-day slavery, is a crime against the most vulnerable individuals worldwide. Traffickers abduct, deceive, and sell individuals, including young children, for personal pleasure and monetary gain. Victims/survivors are treated as commodities who endure incomprehensible brutality, exploitation, and mental and emotional abuse. While the issue of human trafficking is not new, the complexity of the problem has increased exponentially as a result of the growth of the global economy and increased international mobility. Despite the horrific nature of this crime and enhanced efforts to combat it, current data related to human trafficking is highly questionable and varies greatly, and an accurate assessment of the scope of this problem still eludes governments and the anti-trafficking movement.

As we approach the 10 year anniversary of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA), policy makers and direct service providers continue to struggle with questions regarding the scope of human trafficking and effective ways to combat this problem. Despite some initial efforts to estimate the scope of human trafficking and the effectiveness of anti-trafficking programs, the field still lacks a clear data tracking system and methodology necessary for proper estimation and evaluation. Deficient data tracking systems and methodologies for estimation and evaluation significantly increase the risk that programs targeting this population will be ineffective, valuable resources will be wasted, and efforts to rescue and serve victims/survivors will be severely undermined.

While the United States attempts to collect data on trafficking abroad, the lack of a streamlined methodology and data tracking systems creates significant challenges to securing accurate numbers. Even within the United States, federally funded data tracking systems are currently incompatible with each other and inaccessible to individuals skilled in data analysis for this population. Integration and standardization of data collection systems, as well as assessment of local cross-agency data tracking systems, would significantly enhance the ability of direct service providers and government agencies to assess the issue of human trafficking and evaluate programs operating in this field. Resources for data tracking, measurement, and assessment are imperative to ensure that programs are effectively targeted to meet the needs of victims/survivors, combat traffickers, and eradicate the issue of human trafficking.

Recommendations

In an effort to accurately estimate the extent of human trafficking on a local, national, and global basis, and to assess our progress in combating this crime, significant efforts must be taken to strategically and systematically document, collect, share, and analyze information on victims/survivors, traffickers, and johns that currently exists within non-governmental organizations (NGOs), government agencies, and other institutions. Specific actions that will enhance and potentiate these efforts include:

1. **Agree on core indicators, with related definitions within and across U.S. Government agencies.** Creating a streamlined set of definitions and core indicators across government agencies would be greatly beneficial to systematizing all data collection efforts related to human trafficking. Within the United States, evaluation and technical assistance is needed at the state and Federal levels to assess ways to integrate/standardize current data tracking systems and/or create a hub for all data collection. This would help streamline data collection, thus providing a clearer understanding of human trafficking in the United States and the government's efforts to combat trafficking.



2. **Coordinate major data sets across agencies to eliminate duplication and enhance data integrity.** Government agencies can create compatible policies, procedures, and standards to eliminate duplication and facilitate information sharing across agencies (GAO, 2006). This would be especially helpful for data tracking systems such as the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) database for per capita funding and the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) Trafficking Information Management System (TIMS), which both collect information on service provision funded through the Federal Government. In the United States, it is important to look to the Senior Policy Operating Group (SPOG) or a similar committee to help identify and facilitate data coordination within and across Federal agencies.
3. **Collaborate and formulate strategies to address concerns around sharing of information.** Information must be accessible within and across government and non-government agencies, as well as outside researchers, where appropriate, for examination and analysis. Government agencies, researchers, and service providers need to develop strategies to facilitate information and data sharing in a way that addresses concerns about confidentiality and data security. Establishing minimum acceptable data security measures is one necessary step toward improved data sharing. Technical assistance can be provided to facilitate the development of these strategies and measures and to identify possible means of information sharing that is compliant with current laws and does not harm the confidentiality of victims/survivors. Until information is shared between and across agencies at the grassroots and government levels, it will be impossible to obtain a true understanding of the issue of human trafficking in the United States.
4. **Allocate resources for enhanced data collection systems, especially in underdeveloped countries.** In terms of data on international human trafficking, the U.S. currently highlights the importance of the issue of human trafficking on an annual basis through its *Trafficking in Persons (TIP)* report. By standardizing data collection and reporting within the U.S., the Federal Government can serve as an example to other governments interested in tracking information on human trafficking. Enhanced resources for data collection systems, especially in underdeveloped countries, are essential to secure, accurate, on-the-ground reports of the problem and efforts to address it. Additionally, the U.S. government should work with qualitative and quantitative experts on researching the issue of human trafficking to create a standardized method for reporting on human trafficking in other countries. While this presents numerous challenges, it is imperative for the government to have open standards regarding its classification and published numbers to improve proper assessment and evaluation of progress towards eliminating human trafficking.
5. **Assess current data systems as a valid source of information for policy and programmatic decision making and the assessment of funding impacts.** Once data is collected both domestically and internationally it is important that mechanisms are put into place to facilitate the dissemination of findings. Developing and implementing a feedback loop ensures that programs are able to learn about and from best practices, and modify programs, strategies, initiatives, and resources accordingly. Data serves not only as a means to evaluate current efforts but also as an important tool to facilitate the development of new policies and programs aimed to target traffickers and provide services to victims/survivors.

Discussion of the Problem

The issue of human trafficking has received increasing recognition from domestic and international government officials over the past decade. In 2000, the U.S. government authorized the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA), which allows the United States to institute sanctions against governments not taking action to combat



human trafficking. Since 2001, U.S. government agencies have provided approximately \$447 million in foreign assistance to combat human trafficking overseas (GAO, 2007). While specific numbers on the amount of funding the U.S. government has provided domestically is harder to come by, the U.S. Department of Justice awarded more than \$30 million from 2004–2006 to fund anti-trafficking task forces and victim/survivor service programs (DOJ, 2006).

Despite this enhanced attention and funding, as we approach the 10 year anniversary of the TVPA and review the decade's efforts to combat human trafficking, mechanisms for accurately estimating the number of human trafficking victims/survivors and evaluation examining the impact of anti-trafficking programs remains noticeably absent. This is due, in large part, to the lack of data regarding the issue of human trafficking at the local and global levels.

While a number of estimates regarding the scope of human trafficking have been widely quoted by U.S. governmental authorities, NGOs, and the media, the methodology by which these estimates have been calculated, as well as the assumptions underlying these estimates, are relatively unknown—leading researchers and even some within these institutions to question their validity (GAO, 2006; Laczko, 2002; Laczko & Gozdzik, 2005; Laczko & Gramegna, 2003; GAO, 2007). An exception is the transparent methodology developed by ICF International for the National Institute of Justice regarding generating credible and reproducible estimates of the magnitude of human trafficking into the United States. Unfortunately, the data necessary for producing a credible estimate based on the methodology was sparse at best (Clawson & Layne, 2007). In general, data quoted tends to be inconsistently defined, often absent for some countries, and narrowly focuses on the trafficking of women and children for sexual purposes, potentially underestimating its impact as a result of the exclusion of men, transgender individuals, and other forms of trafficking (Clawson, Layne, & Small, 2006; Laczko & Gramegna, 2003).

It is likely that interventions and policies based on inaccurate information and estimations such as these will be ineffective in combating human trafficking (Kelly, 2002). Lack of accurate data hinders governments' abilities to measure trends and movements related to human trafficking in their countries; therefore, programs cannot be modified accordingly. Additionally, data estimating the scope of trafficking in communities is necessary to determine where and what interventions are needed, as well as the impact of funded project interventions (GAO, 2007). Without a clear understanding of the magnitude of human trafficking, it is impossible for governments and institutions to prioritize the issue of human trafficking as it relates to other local and transnational threats and concerns (UN GIFT, 2009).

Challenges Concerning Data Collection

There are a number of challenges for practitioners, researchers, and government officials interested in obtaining data on the issue of human trafficking. One of the greatest challenges is victim/survivor identification. Unlike other crime victims, victims/survivors of human trafficking remain a predominantly hidden population during, as well as following, their captivity. The crime of human trafficking often goes unreported for a variety of reasons, including fear of retaliation from traffickers, as well as the fact that many victims/survivors are unaware, unwilling, or unable to identify themselves as victims/survivors of trafficking (GAO 2006; GAO, 2007; Laczko, 2002; Laczko & Gozdzik, 2005). Even when victims/survivors do present themselves to law enforcement and/or NGOs, they are often misclassified by agency personnel who lack training on the identification of trafficking victims/survivors (Laczko & Gramegna, 2003).



Despite the recent international definition of human trafficking adopted by the United Nations, there continues to be varying definitions used at the national, and even agency levels, resulting in inconsistent data collection (Clawson, Layne, & Small, 2006; GAO 2006; GAO, 2007; Laczko, 2002; Laczko & Gozdzia, 2005; Laczko & Gramegna, 2003; U.S. Department of State, 2005). There are also no agreed upon indicators for identifying victims/survivors of human trafficking, so agencies do not screen in consistent manners (Laczko, 2002; GAO, 2007). Once a victim/survivor has been identified, problems associated with defining someone as a victim/survivor of sex trafficking and/or labor trafficking lead to further inconsistencies in data reporting (Clawson, Layne, & Small, 2006).

Another challenge to data collection is the low prioritization given to this population by governments and law enforcement. While data on other victim populations is often collected by law enforcement (e.g., UCR Part II Crime Data), human trafficking, and thus the collection of data related to human trafficking, is a low priority for many governments (GAO, 2006; Laczko & Gozdzia, 2005; Laczko & Gramegna, 2003). Human trafficking is a low priority because legislation in many countries, especially those placed on tier three and the tier two watch-lists in the U.S. Department of State's *Trafficking in Persons (TIP)* report are often inadequate and/or not enforced (Laczko & Gramegna, 2003). Additionally, many countries have structural and legal disincentives such as a lack of witness protection and a low rate of convictions, discouraging law enforcement officers from pursuing these cases (Laczko, 2002; Laczko & Gramegna, 2003).

Finally, data collection is significantly hindered by insufficient resources. Even when agencies are equipped to identify and serve victims/survivors, data collection by NGOs and other agencies serving this population greatly depends on the resources available to them (Laczko & Gramegna, 2003). Many international organizations and governments do not have the capacity to collect data, and require significant technical and financial assistance to improve their current data collection capabilities (GAO 2006; GAO, 2007; Laczko & Gramegna, 2003). For this reason, programs often rely on victims'/survivors' stories and anecdotal evidence of the problem instead of quantitative measurement and hard statistics to secure funding and support. International organizations and governments that have the capacity for data collection too often lack the capacity and expertise to thoroughly analyze their data sets in a systematic fashion (GAO, 2006; Laczko & Gramegna, 2003).

Historical Overview

Data Collection within the United States

At the Federal level, a recent GAO report identified eight entities within the U.S. Federal Government that house data related to human trafficking (e.g., Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement) (2006). Data activities employed by the Federal Government include interviews, document reviews, focus groups, panel discussions, e-mails, ACCESS databases, and regional site visits (Clawson, Layne, Small, 2006). While the Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center has been tasked with collecting and coordinating information on trafficking between agencies, it reports that its current capacity does not allow it to systematically analyze the information received (GAO, 2006). Incidentally, this data is typically inaccessible to researchers who have the capacity and expertise in assessment and evaluation (Clawson, Layne, & Small, 2006).

Within the United States, there are three major databases exclusively focused on the issue of human trafficking. The U.S. Department of Justice's Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) initiated the creation of the first data system to systematically track information on the services provided by its grantees to victims/survivors of human trafficking in



2005. The Trafficking Information Management System (TIMS) is a Microsoft Access® based program, designed and developed by ICF International, which allows OVC grantees to submit electronic information on OVC-eligible clients, children of victims/survivors who may be in need of assistance, and potential victims/survivors who have been identified as such by their case managers. OVC-eligible clients include individuals served by OVC grantees who have been determined a victim under the definition set forth by the TVPA, are not a U.S. citizen, and agree to work with law enforcement. While TIMS tracks a significant amount of information from grantees, the specific victim/survivor information includes: name (optional), gender, date of birth, adult/minor, country of origin, type of trafficking, intake date, program's referral source, immigration status, and association with legal cases. TIMS also collects information pertaining to service provision and housing (OVC, 2005).

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), has a similar database for its sub-grantees. USCCB's online database, which was put into operation in December 2008, has information on all USCCB subcontracting agencies and the victims/survivors receiving services under its subcontracts. In addition to demographic information, USCCB collects information on service provision, case progress, legal progress, and expenditures per case. Additionally, USCCB collects information on family derivatives who receive services through USCCB. As with TIMS, USCCB-eligible victims/survivors must not be US citizens; however, they can be certified or uncertified as a victim/survivor of human trafficking. Therefore, many victims/survivors who receive services through OVC eventually receive services through HHS under USCCB once they are certified, creating duplication between databases. Unfortunately, the TIMS and USCCB databases are currently not compatible and so data is not transferable and/or assessable across databases (Mestars, 2009).

While TIMS and USCCB's databases focus on victim/survivor service provision, the Human Trafficking Reporting System (HTRS) is an incident-based collection system, which collects data on human trafficking cases investigated by law enforcement from the 42 Bureau of Justice Assistance-funded human trafficking task forces. HTRS is funded by the U.S. Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). Data is collected on a monthly basis through an online data portal and includes types of trafficking, the investigating agency, the number of victims/survivors and suspects per incident, victim/survivor and suspect characteristics (gender, race, age, and citizenship status), and arrest information (charges filed, court adjudication information, sentencing information). While all incidents are retained in the database regardless of whether it is determined that the incident ultimately involved human trafficking, to be confirmed as a victim/survivor of human trafficking in HTRS, the case must result in an arrest and have been confirmed by law enforcement, or the victims must have had a *continued presence* requested on their behavior or have received an endorsement for a *T* or *U* Visa application. HTRS is the only major database that collects information on U.S. domestic victims/survivors. BJS is currently working to make improvements to the HTRS system, which will expand data collection to include law enforcement agencies that are not covered by the Federal task forces. This expansion is expected to take place by January 2010 (Kyckelhahn, Beck, & Cohen, 2009).

Data Collection outside the United States

Data from countries outside of the United States varies as a result of limited availability, reliability, and comparability. In these countries, data on human trafficking is often combined with data related to smuggling and irregular migration, greatly distorting the actual human trafficking numbers (GAO, 2006; Laczko, 2002; Laczko & Gozdzik, 2005; Laczko & Gramegna, 2003). Significant discrepancies exist between the estimated and observed number of victims/survivors (GAO, 2006). The country estimates cited in the *TIP* report are often simply averages of the number of victims/survivors that have been published by NGOs, governments, and international organizations.



However, these estimates are based on different definitions, methodologies, data sources, and data validation procedures and are often unreliable themselves. Additionally, data on trafficking within the country is often not collected at all (GAO, 2006).

In February 2009, the United Nation's Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking (UN GIFT) published a report on countries' legislative, institutional, and criminal justice response to trafficking. While the report did not attempt to assess the scale or nature of trafficking, the findings verified much of what has previously been reported. Specifically, they noted the discrepancies of definitions used to define trafficking between and within countries, and the segmentation and dispersion of data related to this issue. In total, 155 countries and territories provided data for this report; however, UN GIFT found that some countries did not even collect basic data related to human trafficking, and many did not collect data in a manner that was evaluative. It should also be noted that this report, like many others, only vaguely describes the methodology used for data collection and decision making; therefore, it is difficult to assess its validity (UN GIFT, 2009).

Internationally, the International Organization for Migration's (IOM) Counter-Trafficking Module (CTM) Database serves as a model data collection system. The CTM is currently the largest world-wide database on human trafficking containing only primary data (IOM, n.d.). Originally implemented in 2002 in the Balkans, CTM has been expanded into a global database that gathers information from all of the IOM Counter-Trafficking programs throughout the world (Laczko & Gramegna, 2003). The CTM collects first-hand information from in-depth interviews with victims/survivors, based on a standardized questionnaire, conducted by IOM mission staff. These interviews gather information on socio-economic and family background, victims'/survivors' trafficking experience—from recruitment and migration to violence and exploitation—and victims'/survivors' current conditions and needs related to health, protection, and return. Information also is collected on the reintegration process. Each mission enters the data into its database, which is shared between the various missions focused on human trafficking (Laczko & Gramegna, 2003). It should be noted that IOM's presence is primarily in countries of origin; therefore, this database contains limited information on transit countries or countries of destination (GAO, 2006).

Coordination across Data Collection Systems

While all of the databases discussed above collect valuable information on victims/survivors of human trafficking, their independent construction has resulted in incompatible identifiers and data fields, and inconsistent definitions restricting cross-analysis of information (Laczko, 2002). This is even true for the two distinct databases currently funded by the U.S. Department of Justice, which use different definitions and indicators to identify victims/survivors.

The absence of equivalent data fields and coordination between data collecting systems and entities also happens at the local and programmatic levels. Data collected at the agency level tends to be program-specific and based on the individual agencies' own needs (GAO 2006; Laczko, 2002; Laczko & Gramegna, 2003). Additionally, duplication exists between agencies where there is client overlap (Clawson, Layne, & Small, 2006; Laczko, 2002). Unfortunately, within the United States, as well as many other countries, no single agency at the regional or national levels acts as a hub for all data collection (Laczko, 2002; Laczko & Gramegna, 2003). In an effort to improve coordination, key stakeholders involved with case documentation and data tracking need to ensure that data tracking systems are compatible with other tracking systems so that data can be shared across agencies and duplications can be eliminated (Clawson, Layne, & Small, 2006).



Currently, there is significant reluctance to share data by local organizations, as well as government agencies, which greatly restricts the creation of compatible data systems and the ability to research, assess trends, and evaluate programs related to human trafficking. Direct service agencies and other NGOs working with this population cite a variety of reasons for not sharing their data with other organizations and/or outside agencies. These reasons include privileged communications, concerns over confidentiality, scarce resources, concerns over the quality of the data, or an unwillingness to share information that may result in public scrutiny regarding their efforts to combat human trafficking (Clawson, Layne, & Small, 2006; Laczko, 2002; Laczko & Gramegna, 2003; GAO, 2007). Countries also do not share data on human trafficking for a variety of reasons. Governments often regard data as classified information, have policies and/or legislation that restrict dissemination of data, are reluctant to share information that may be unfavorable, and are disinclined to share data with source countries where it is believed that authorities and law enforcement are involved in the trafficking of humans (Laczko, 2002; Laczko & Gramegna, 2003). When data is shared across these agencies or countries it often happens on an ad hoc basis (Laczko, 2002; Laczko & Gramegna, 2003).

Call to Action and Conclusion

The issue of data as it relates to human trafficking has received increasing attention over the past few years, especially as a result of the GAO's 2006 and 2007 findings. While the current numbers on human trafficking appear to be staggering, the true scope of human trafficking will remain unknown until the issues surrounding data collection are adequately researched and addressed. As trends in human trafficking change and as traffickers become more sophisticated, data tracking systems remain an imperative tool to measure these changes and address them in a quick and comprehensive manner. Additionally, without proper data tracking systems, program coordinators and funders—including the U.S. Government—will be unable to measure efforts to provide services to victims/survivors and combat human trafficking on a larger scale.

It is true that the issue of data as it relates to human trafficking is complicated; however, neglecting its importance carries the risk of creating ineffective programs, wasting valuable resources, and ultimately undermining the issue as a whole. Effective data tracking systems and subsequent evaluation using these data can identify areas for improvement and ensure that programs build on success, while also providing imperative information necessary to effectively combat human trafficking.

About the Authors

This paper was written by Dr. Heather J. Clawson, Ms. Erin Williamson, and Ms. Ashley Garrett of ICF International. Dr. Clawson, a principal at ICF, has more than 12 years of experience managing and conducting needs assessments, performing program evaluations, and providing evaluation training and technical assistance in the areas of victim services, juvenile justice, and criminal justice. Over the past 7 years, Dr. Clawson has directed the development and implementation of numerous human trafficking studies, including needs assessments of victim service providers, law enforcement, and prosecutors, evaluations of direct service programs, and the development of performance measurement systems for programs serving victims/survivors of human trafficking. Ms. Williamson brings experience in analyzing policies, conducting research, and preparing complex reports on issues related to child welfare and human trafficking. Ms. Garrett specializes in grant management, and training and technical assistance programs, which build collaboration amongst diverse stakeholders at the community, national, and international level on migration, gender, and crime victims. She has assisted government and non-governmental



agencies in more than 20 countries develop and implement collaborative programs to respond to human trafficking.

The authors benefited from the input of staff across ICF who conduct work in juvenile and criminal justice, human services, and community development. The views expressed in this paper and any errors are those of the authors and not necessarily those of ICF International.

About ICF International

ICF International (NASDAQ:ICFI) partners with government and commercial clients to deliver consulting services and technology solutions in the energy, climate change, environment, transportation, social programs, health, defense, and emergency management markets. The firm combines passion for its work with industry expertise and innovative analytics to produce compelling results throughout the entire program life cycle, from analysis and design through implementation and improvement. Since 1969, ICF has been serving government at all levels, major corporations, and multilateral institutions. More than 3,000 employees serve these clients worldwide. ICF's Web site is www.icfi.com.

References

- Brunovskis, A., & Tyldum, G. (2004). *Crossing borders: An empirical study of transnational prostitution and trafficking in human beings* (Report number 426). Norway: Fafo Institute for Applied International Studies.
- Clawson, H. J., & Layne, M. (2007). *Estimating human trafficking into the United States: Development of a methodology. Phase Two Report*. Fairfax, VA: ICF International.
- Clawson, H. J., Layne, M., & Small, K. (2006). *Estimating human trafficking into the United States: Development of a methodology. Phase One Report*. Fairfax, VA: ICF International.
- International Organization for Migration. (n.d.). *Data and research on human trafficking*. Retrieved February 2, 2009 from http://www.iom.ch/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/policy_and_research/research/Data_and_Research_on_Human_Trafficking.pdf
- Kelly, L. (2002). *Journey of jeopardy: A commentary on current research on trafficking of women and children for sexual exploitation within Europe*. Paper commissioned by the Research and Publications Division, International Organization for Migration.
- Kyckelhahn, T., Beck, A. J., & Cohen, T. H. (2009, January). Characteristics of suspected human trafficking incidents, 2007-08. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*.
- Laczko, F. (2002, November 1). Human trafficking: The need for better data. *Migration Information Source*. Retrieved February 4, 2009 from <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=66>
- Laczko, F., & Gozdziaik, E. (Eds.). (2005). Data and research on human trafficking: A global survey. *International Migration* (Special Issue), 43(1/2).
- Laczko, F., & Gramegna, M. A. (2003, Summer/Fall). Developing better indicators of human trafficking. *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, X(1), 179-194.
- Mestars, N. (personal communication, February 9, 2009).



- Northeastern University. (n.d.). Developing a national human trafficking reporting system. *Human Trafficking Data Collection and Reporting Project: Online Resource Center*. Retrieved February 4, 2009 from <http://www.humantrafficking.neu.edu>
- Office for Victims of Crime. (2005, April). *Trafficking Information Management System: TIMS user's guide*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Suffolk County District Attorney's Office. (2007, April 4). *Teen Prostitution Prevention Project names among top 50 innovative government programs*. Retrieved February 9, 2009 from <http://www.mass.gov/dasuffolk/docs/4.4.07C.html>
- United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking. (2009, February). *Global reports on trafficking in persons*. Vienna, Austria: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2008, September 11). About human trafficking. *The Campaign to Rescue and Restore Victims of Human Trafficking*. Retrieved February 9, 2009 from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/trafficking/about/index.html>
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2006). *Report on Activities to Combat Human Trafficking: Fiscal Year 2001-2005*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of State. (2005, November 14). *Seminar on trafficking in persons research*. Washington, DC: Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons at the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. Retrieved February 4, 2009 from <http://www.state.gov/g/tip/rls/fs/2005/59133.htm>
- U.S. Department of State. (2008, June). *Trafficking in persons report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons.
- U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO). (2006, July). *Human trafficking: Better data, strategy, and reporting needed to enhance U.S. antitrafficking efforts abroad* (GAO-06-825). Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO). (2007, July). *Human trafficking: Monitoring and evaluation of international projects are limited, but experts suggest improvements* (GAO-07-1034). Washington, DC: Author.
- Wennerholm, C., & Zillén, E. (2003, June). *IOM regional counter-trafficking programme in the Western Balkans*. Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Department of Central and Eastern Europe.