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# Summary Sheet

This Summary Sheet captures the headlines on the three-year ‘Tackling Modern Day Slavery Programme - Nigeria’ programme performance, agreed actions and learning over the course of the review period until July 2019.

|  |
| --- |
| **PROGRAMME TITLE:** Tackling Modern Slavery Programme - Nigeria |
| **Country and Region:** | Nigeria (Benin City along with Lagos, Abuja, Delta) |
| **IATI Unique ID:** |  |
| **HMG Partners (LEAD in bold):** | Home Office, Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) |
| **Total Budget:** | ODA  | Non-ODA |
| **Budget this FY:** | ODA | Non-ODA |
| **Spend this FY:** | ODA | Non-ODA |
| **Original Programme Start Date:** January 2018 | **Planned End Date:** March 2021 |
| **Outputs[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Score[[2]](#footnote-2)** |
| Return and reintegration support provided to victims of trafficking* 1. Victim support packages provided to VoTs
	2. VoTs complete programme-supported reintegration package
 | C |
| Law enforcement capabilities strengthened to investigate trafficking suspects2.1 People trained2.2 Useful training2.3 Investigation system and mechanism enhancements developed | B |
| Judicial capabilities strengthened to prosecute trafficking suspects3.1 Judges trained3.2 Useful training3.3 Judicial mechanisms developed to enhanced prosecution effectiveness3.4 Judicial infrastructure supported | C |
| Strategic communication tools and mechanisms supported 4.1 People trained4.2 Useful training4.3 Strategic communication mechanisms and tools developed | B |
|  |  |
| **Overall output score: B** |
| Outcome Assessment: At this point, an outcome assessment cannot reliably be provided as data on this level is currently still being collected/to be collected in all pillars. We have given each pillar an intermediate outcome ranking below that predominantly shows the lack of evidence against the ToC and indicators. |
| Outcome Score: NA | Risk: High |

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of Programme Performance** |
| Year | 2017/2018 | 2018/2019 | 2019/2020 | 2020/2021 |
| Programme Score | NA | B |  |  |
| Risk Rating -**low/medium/high** | NA | high |  |  |
| How has the programme changed during this period?: | The programme planning has been iterative in nature, as intended to enable the programme to be adequately responsive to the needs in context. In line with this there have been some innovations in programme planning that go beyond the scope of the current results framework. For Pillar 1 this includes the addition of a component to strengthen and support safehouses. In Pillar 2 the refurbishment of a Lagos safehouse was agreed. In Pillar 4, a six-week communications campaign was added. Programme implementation level changes to note:Delays in start of Pillar 1; co-funding of the Pillar 4 campaign through DFID.  |

**What support did the UK provide in FY 17/18 and 18/19?**

Due to the yearly breakdown not being clear, the below shows the spend since the beginning of the programme to August 2019.

* Pillar 1 (Victim Support): Not clear; however, according to IOM records, £ 228,586 was spent between January and August 2019
* Pillar 2 (Law Enforcement): £ 384,000 (includes safehouse refurbishment);
* Pillar 3 (Judiciary): £ 193,000;
* Pillar 4 (Strategic Communications): £ 696,000 (this includes £ 500,000 received from DFID/Border Force).

**Key results for FY 17/18, 18/19 and beginning of FY 19/20 (August 19):**

**Pillar 1:**

* 178 beneficiaries identified who are in the process of being screened for support;
* 18 shelter assessments completed;
* Reintegration packages not yet provided or received by victims of trafficking (VoTs);
* Other activities completed include a high-level event with religious leaders in Abuja, a migrant centred service delivery training provided to shelter operators and counsellors and capacity building training provided to health care providers. However, these are not currently part of the programme results framework. The proposed revised results framework does take them into account.

**Pillar 2:**

* People trained: 24 NAPTIP staff (in 3 trainings);
* Useful training: Generally positive perceptions by individuals trained;
* Investigation system and mechanism enhancements developed: Not clear. However, office equipment was procured as well as crime scene search kits and associated equipment, which do not originally fall under this indicator;
* Enhanced conviction success of investigated and prosecuted HT cases: 1 conviction; 4% of total cases investigated;
* Other activities completed include: JBTF Mentor hired and in place in Benin City; training needs analysis completed by mentor; list of equipment needs completed by mentor.

**Pillar 3:**

* People trained: 8 Nigerian Federal High Court judges (7 from Lagos, 1 from Benin City) plus 8 trained on IT equipment;
* Useful training: varying levels of engagement reported by trainers (no evaluation or feedback on usefulness from trained judges);
* Judicial mechanisms developed to enhance prosecution effectiveness: not clear;
* Judicial infrastructure supported: Courtroom updates completed; IT equipment procured to allow vulnerable witnesses to give evidence virtually, 1 use case reported;
* Enhanced conviction success of investigated and prosecuted HT cases: 1 conviction; 4% of total cases investigated.

**Pillar 4:**

* People trained: 4 in-person trainings and one online course for NAPTIP staff completed, though overall number of participants unclear;
* Useful training: positive feedback collected and skills enhanced. However, no self-evaluation tool on usefulness employed;
* Strategic communication mechanisms and tools developed: not clear;
* Other completed activities include a six-week communications campaign aimed at changing attitudes of young women vulnerable to trafficking and an evaluation report submitted.

**Summary of progress and lessons learnt/actions taken since last review:**

All four pillars started their activities in FY 18/19. However, the four pillars are at different stages of progress, which has impacted the availability of information and documents.

The grant agreement with the victim support component (Pillar 1) lead IOM (and local implementing partners (IPs)) was delayed substantially. It was formalised only in January 2019 with a kick-off meeting in March. Therefore, by the end of FY 18/19, IOM had just started planning activities and recruitment of key programme staff. Other substantive activities were carried out at the beginning of FY 19/20. A lesson to be learned in this regard centres on how to streamline the process around signing memoranda of understanding (MOUs) with partners. The process was slower than planned due to difficulties in funding and MoU processes between the Home Office (HO) and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO). This delay has resulted in activities under Pillar 1 starting late, which in turn will mean activities will have to be completed in a shorter timeframe, possibly impacting outcomes.

The law enforcement/NAPTIP investigative support (Pillar 2) and judicial capacity building (Pillar 3) pillars were delayed over the course of FY 17/18 and into FY 18/19. In February 2018, the Nigeria’s National Agency for the Prohibition of Trafficking in Persons (NAPTIP) mentor position was advertised and a courtroom equipment supplier procured and contracted, kicking off the activities under both pillars. Until August 2019, a number of trainings for NAPTIP staff and judges were conducted with generally positive feedback from NAPTIP staff. No feedback was collected from the judges, though trainer impressions were recorded. Equipment for both NAPTIP and courtrooms was procured as well, though under Pillar 2 this falls outside the scope of the current results framework. Data against indicators in the original programme results framework are currently not systematically collected and lessons learned on the two pillars’ activities remain difficult to assess at this point.

Activities under the strategic communications pillar (Pillar 4) are delivered by the Government Communication Service International (GCSI) and began in April 2018. GCSI supported NAPTIP in a first programme phase, including through trainings, a six-week stand-alone communication campaign and an evaluation, which has been completed at the time of this review. The pillar had achievements against its stand-alone results framework, but it remains difficult to assess progress against the programme-wide results framework and the specific indicators set for Pillar 4 therein. The third-party evaluation of the pillar’s activities, for example, focuses only on the “Not for Sale” campaign, while indicators such as “Strategic communication mechanisms and tools developed” are not evaluated. The pillar’s communications campaign was co-funded by DFID and the border force.

In general, it appears that no baseline information is available for the programme’s existing results framework. Moreover, for at least two of the pillars there is limited data being collected against the results. Lessons learned therefore centre on strengthening the data collection and M&E activities in order to better draw out wider programme lessons in the near future and to inform the second phase of the programme.

**Summary of recommendations for the next year:**

* Change the current ToC to be ambitious yet realistic and reflect an updated results framework that aligns with programme changes and outputs delivered while maintaining a focus on impact. This will also allow the programme team to better adapt the programme to lessons captured through monitoring, evaluation and research on each of the four pillars.
	+ This will achieve two objectives. 1) It will be less challenging to measure progress and achievements because the indicators will be more reflective of programme activities and ambitions. 2) This will also ensure data reported on Pillar 1 and 4 are in line with the TMS Programme’ results framework to better assess progress, generate lessons and draw conclusions on effectiveness, efficiency and relevance for the programme as a whole.
* Ensure previous data reported on Pillar 2 and 3 are reliable. Develop simple data collection tools to verify the data to the extent possible.
* Data reported on Pillar 1 and 4 should be in line with the TMS Programme’ results framework to better assess progress, generate lessons and draw conclusions on effectiveness, efficiency and relevance. Include in the changes to the ToC and results framework, relevant results and indicators proposed by IOM and GCSI in their recent project plans to minimise additional effort required by IPs for data collection and reporting.
* The Strategic Communication Pillar has made the most progress against output indicators. Encourage Phase Two to include outcome data, which in turn can help testing the underlying assumptions of the ToC. Furthermore, in the next FY, the capacity building component of the pillar should be examined to learn about effectiveness and relevance. As the Phase 1 campaign did not prioritise NAPTIP capacity building as part of the “Not for Sale” campaign despite its priority in the existing results framework, Phase Two should consider integrating capacity building into the campaign more.
* Reporting for all pillars should be focused on reporting against indicators agreed as part of the revised results framework. Toward this end, develop a simple and specific monthly reporting template so that routine monitoring is relevant while not overly burdensome for IPs.
* Ensure financial monitoring is done in a way that allows value for money analyses and record programme changes centrally. This also includes recording any reasons that make a change necessary to make sure activities and money spent either still align with the ToC or require adapting the ToC.
* Ask IPs to create project specific risk registers.
* Better integrate gender and conflict into all four pillars. IPs should consider possible conflict dynamics in their programme documents and ensure staff are aware of these. Although modern slavery and trafficking is a highly gendered crime, gender considerations are weak across the programme pillars. Specific gender strategies should be built into the pillars. At the minimum, wherever possible, indicators should include sex and age disaggregated targets. If targeting in such a manner is not possible, data on achievements must at least include sex and age disaggregation, as relevant.

# A: Introduction and Context Programme Review

This document assesses the performance of the three-year ‘Tackling Modern Slavery Programme - Nigeria’ (TMS Programme). It shows progress against output and outcome indicators. It also discusses challenges and, where possible, lessons learned and recommendations for programme implementation and monitoring and evaluation.

Gaps highlighted below show that parts of the programme’s *current* Theory of Change (ToC) and associated assumptions remain difficult to validate and assess due to a lack of monitoring data. In light of some significant programme level changes at the output level with a view to actual activities carried out, Seefar suggests a thorough adaptation of this current ToC, results framework and indicators to better align the programme’s results framework with actual activities that are planned and being carried out and therefore with Her Majesty's Government (HMG) objectives.

This programme review primarily serves as a high-level overview of activity completed to date and the programme’s status against *existing* indicators. The recommended adaptations of the ToC and results framework will allow Seefar to better monitor and evaluate progress and achievements over the remaining programme period. *Future programme reviews will assess the programme against the revised ToC and indicators proposed by Seefar in the inception report, if these are approved.*

Each of the four programme pillars (victim support, law enforcement and judicial capacity building, and strategic communications) are reviewed below. An overall performance summary is presented as part of each pillar’s review.[[3]](#footnote-3)

## Outline of the Programme

The trafficking of women from Nigeria to Europe is widely recognised as one of the most persistent and entrenched of global trafficking flows. The International Organization for Migration (IOM) notes that approximately 80% of girls arriving from Nigeria to Europe through irregular migration channels match indicators that make them potential victims of trafficking for sexual exploitation.

A comprehensive report leading to the development of the current ToC has broadly identified drivers of human trafficking in Nigeria which the programme seeks to tackle[[4]](#footnote-4):

* Poverty (conditions of economic hardship and a lack of opportunity that may result in a sense of despair);
* Human trafficking itself as a driver, where victims of trafficking (VoTs) are highly vulnerable to being re-trafficked;
* Social complicity (resulting from endemic poverty and hopelessness and serving as an enabler of human trafficking; narratives and community-engrained attitudes);
* Impunity of traffickers (emerging from a lack of deterrence where traffickers exploit an imbalance in the cost / benefit of trafficking);

The TMS Programme has been designed to reduce these factors through four programme pillars: Victim support services (Pillar 1); law enforcement/NAPTIP investigate support and capacity building (Pillar 2); judicial capacity building (Pillar 3); and strategic communications (Pillar 4).

The victim support component of the programme will target victims of trafficking in Nigeria through a tailored support package that will complement and strengthen Nigeria’s National Agency for the Prohibition of Trafficking in Persons (NAPTIP) systems and the National Referral Mechanism (NRM). The law enforcement capacity building component aims to strengthen the capacity of NAPTIP to prosecute trafficking cases. The judicial capacity building component aims to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the court systems to prosecute trafficking cases. The strategic communications component’s objective is to enhance NAPTIP’s communication capabilities by working through their Public Enlightenment Department and the Press Unit to improve their public communication capacity and facilitate innovative awareness raising approaches.

The programme’s current ToC and results framework aim to achieve the following outcomes:

* Victims of trafficking reintegrated into Nigerian society;
* Enhanced state capacity to investigate and prosecute trafficking suspects;
* Enhanced public awareness reduces complicity in and increases deterrence from human trafficking.

These, in turn, were designed to ultimately enable the overall programme impact, currently stated as: The prevalence of human trafficking from Nigeria is reduced.

**Complementarity and ‘additionality’ with other HMG funded interventions:**

* IOMs work in trafficking and victim in reintegration in Nigeria is also funded by DFID and the EU Trust Fund. DFID funding supports those returned from Libya by the Nigerian Government while the EU Trust Fund covers other returnees. Funding from this programme is designed to fill gaps in the EU Trust Fund provision and enhance those services.
* The communications campaign implemented under Pillar 4 is co-financed by DFID and the Border Force.

# B: Performance and Conclusions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RESULTS FRAMEWORK IN PLACE:** Yes; however, it is important to revise the results framework in line with changes to the programme and to facilitate monitoring and evaluation of activities. Seefar is currently working on suggested revisions as part of its inception report. | **DATE OF LAST REVIEW/UPDATE:**NA |

### Narrative and key lessons

The four programme pillars are at different stages of progress, which, in part, has impacted the availability of information and documents. Targets (numeric or qualitative) are also not currently set, making progress tracking more difficult at this stage.

Furthermore, most outcomes are currently focused on medium to longer-term changes (for example, Outcome 1: Victims of trafficking are reintegrated into Nigerian society). Evidence on these outcomes will only be collected as the programme continues, with Seefar suggesting revisions to the ToC and results framework – including outcomes – in its monitoring and evaluation inception report.

It may be argued that Pillar 2 and 3 are moving towards achieving their stated outputs and outcomes (law enforcement capabilities strengthened to investigate trafficking suspects; judicial capabilities strengthened to prosecute trafficking suspects): Trainings of NAPTIP staff and judges have been completed and some, though varying, feedback on their usefulness collected, possibly indicating an improvement of capabilities. Data around the output and outcome indicators, however, are not systematically collected at this point and at times fluctuate in existing monthly reports. A key lesson learned is therefore the need to refine M&E data collection for the two pillars. This will likely result in more reliable evidence on the link between outputs and outcomes of the two pillars in the course of the programme.

Meanwhile, a number of trainings have been completed in the communications pillar, with generally high attendance and positive results, according to GCSI reports. These, in part, diverge in data collection methodologies from the original results framework. For example, a skills assessment was conducted but a self-evaluation tool and analysis of training usefulness is lacking. Ideally, the latter would be further examined to be able to better understand possible linkages to outcome indicators. Furthermore, a six-week standalone (and DFID co-funded) communications campaign has been delivered. While the evaluation can be significantly improved to better show results against output and outcome indicators (enhanced public awareness reduces complicity in and increases deterrence from human trafficking), there has been recognition of the campaign and some – even if minor – attitude changes shown.

Pillar 4 has been evaluated with technical assistance from King’s College London (KCL). However, the evaluation of this first phase of Pillar 4 was conducted on the basis of a stand-alone results framework, with limited linkages to the TMS Programme’s ToC and indicators. This will need to be addressed going forward. Seefar is working with the GCIS proposed results framework for Phase Two activities under Pillar 4 to align the internal GCIS results framework with that of the broader programme.

A similar challenge may come up in Pillar 1, which also currently has a standalone results framework, increasing the risk of monitoring and evaluation of activities not supporting the programme’s learning and adaptation with a view to its overarching ToC and results framework. Seefar is adopting the same strategy as for Pillar 4 by attempting to integrate the internal IOM proposed results framework with that of the broader programme. However, there will be a need for further discussion with IOM to close some of the gaps in the results framework.

The programme’s Theory of Change has not been adapted since the beginning of the programme and assumptions underpinning the ToC have not been tested at this point. This is primarily due to a lack of evidence, preventing relevant and accurate findings around the interlinkages and alignment of the different pillars and the contribution of individual activities to the respective outcomes. Progress of outputs and outcomes has also not been tracked systematically throughout the last fiscal years. Though monthly and quarterly reports exist, these are currently not well-aligned with the programme’s results framework. Data collection for monitoring and evaluation with a view to outputs and outcomes will, however, be changed in FY 19/20.

### Has the results framework been updated since the last review?

No

# C: Detailed Output Scoring

# Victim Support Pillar

This component of the programme supports victims of trafficking in Nigeria through a tailored package that will complement and strengthen NAPTIP systems and the National Referral Mechanism (NRM). This is being delivered by the IOM, including through local implementing partners (IPs).

Prior to our field visit, Seefar had not received a detailed monitoring framework from implementing partners for the IOM component. A programme proposal and standalone ToC and results framework were provided in August 2019.

## Performance review

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall performance** | Work on the Victim Support Pillar was delayed due to issues around contracting, with a Grant Agreement signed in early 2019 with IOM. As the kick-off meeting with IOM took place only in March, most subsequent activities and achievements outlined below were completed at the beginning of FY 19/20. As the pillar is in its early stages and the data that has been reported on outputs is only partially relevant to the current ToC there is currently insufficient progress for Seefar to prepare a comprehensive review of progress against all indicators allowing for reliable lessons learned that could be used for programme adaptation. At this point, half of the targeted number of beneficiaries (178 out of 350) have been identified according to IOM and are in the process of being screened to receive support. While the programme is still in the early stages of the support cycle, identification and screening are the only activities completed that speak to the output indicators specified below. While no targets or milestones were set, the IOM project plan shows that providing “immediate rehabilitation and recovery support to VoTs” (the only output activity reflecting the current TMS programme results framework), commenced in April 2019. Yet, no direct assistance has been provided at this point. Furthermore, only 13 men have been screened despite IOM underlining the importance of providing support to male VoTs, indicating a need to ensure that the VoTs who will benefit are reflective of those needing support.The status ranking below is based on the progress against indicators set in the current HO/FCO programme results framework. The status ranking may change significantly should suggestions for a new framework in the monitoring and evaluation inception report be agreed as IOM’s activities do reflect progress against indicators set in its standalone results framework. In this case, the output status related to the overall programme output indicators was assessed as C in light of very limited progress made on providing victim support packages since signing the grant agreement (and an increased focus on activities not directly linked to the support packages). |
| Status ranking - progress against indicators[[5]](#footnote-5) | B - Insufficient/unreliable/incomplete evidence to demonstrate likely contribution to outcome.C - Outputs substantially did not meet expectation. |
| ***Indicator and definition*** | ***Baseline*** | ***Target*** | ***Performance*** | ***Data sources - planned in RF*** | ***Data sources - actual*** | ***Gaps*** |
| **Outcome**  | **Victims of trafficking reintegrated into Nigerian society** |
| Assumption(s) | Effective reintegration support reduces recidivism rates amongst victims of traffickingVictims willingly engage in supporting investigations with testimony |
| VoTs express successful reintegration into their desired community and espouse no ambition of irregular emigration.Successful reintegration assesses economic, social, and psychological aspects of reintegration support as achieving its objective of ensuring victims are integrated and supported within their community. | - | -  | * It is too early in the programme cycle to measure this outcome
 | * Victim perception survey
 | * NA
 | * Neither baseline nor ongoing victim perception data available
* While it is too early for the victim perception survey the lack of baseline data is problematic
 |
| **Intermediate outcome**  | **Counterparts adopt and implement programme-supported outputs** |
| Victims utilise provided support.VoTs make use of support as intended to be done or undertaken, measured as proportion of total victims that receive support package. | - | - | * No support provided as of yet
 | * Victim support survey
 | * IOM June/July 2019 “Progress Update”
* IOM High-level update and forecast – Aug 2019
 | * Neither baseline nor victim support data available
* Due to M&E gaps and the programme being in its early stages no reliable assessment of progress against indicator possible at this point
 |
| **Output**  | **Return and reintegration support provided to victims of trafficking** |
| Assumption(s) | Victim support packages are relevant and appropriate to the specific needs of each of the beneficiaries that receive the support  |
| Victim support packages provided to VoTs.The total number of victims of trafficking that receive (initiate) and participate in the full scope of programme-supported reintegration packages, including basic assistance in their return, and support for rehabilitation and reintegration into Nigerian society. | - | 350 VoTs assisted[[6]](#footnote-6) | * No support packages provided as of yet
* While the pillar is making progress, activities thus far have focused heavily on preparations over providing packages; data reported do not currently represent the indicator and include:
* 178 (165 female / 13 male) VoTs identified and being assessed for complementary support
 | * Project records
 | * Project records: Monthly programme reports
* IOM June/July 2019 “Progress Update”
* IOM High-level update and forecast – Aug 2019
 | * IOM Progress Update (“dashboard”) showing limited data on relevant programme indicators; e.g. data on number of beneficiaries identified and shelters assessed not relevant to current output and indicator in programme results framework
* IOM High-level update and forecast show progress on outputs identified in the standalone results framework but currently to not reflect the overall programme indicators
* IOM target (see column “target”) not matched to current results framework
* Definition of “packages” and when the “full scope” has been received not clear, hence data collected thus far not necessarily relevant to indicator
 |
| VoTs complete programme-supported reintegration package.The total number of victims of trafficking that complete the full process and scope of programme-supported reintegration packages. | - | - | * No support packages provided at this point
 | * Project records
 | * IOM June/July 2019 “Progress Update”
* IOM High-level update and forecast – Aug 2019
 | * The same issues as identified above apply to this output as well (e.g. definition of “complete” and “full process and scope” not clear)
 |

Other activities and progress outside of current results framework are as below:

* 18 shelter assessments conducted; 5 shelters located in Lagos, Edo, Delta, Uyo and Enugo states (3 NAPTIP/2 CSOs) selected to receive capacity building support;
* Ongoing re-mapping of active victim assistance service providers;
* 1 high level event involving traditional and religious leaders in Abuja and signing of ToR to establish formal network;
* 1 migrant centred service delivery training provided to shelter operators and counselors from Lagos, Edo, Delta and Abuja;
* Capacity building training provided to health care providers from Edo, Delta and Lagos state providing services to Victims of Trafficking, and other vulnerable returnees.

# Law Enforcement Pillar

The Law Enforcement/NAPTIP Investigative Support Pillar aims to strengthen the capacity of NAPTIP by providing training for NAPTIP Zonal Command in order that NAPTIP can more effectively fulfil its mandate of investigating and prosecuting traffickers. The support will focus on the following areas: i) increasing the number and quality of trafficking prosecutions undertaken by NAPTIP Zonal command through enhanced training and the provision of investigative equipment; and, ii) ensuring that investigations and prosecutions are conducted in a legally compliant manner, conforming to national and international standards.

## Performance review

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall performance narrative** | This pillar was delayed over the course of FY 17/18 and into FY 18/19. In February 2018, the NAPTIP mentor position was advertised and subsequently filled with some delay, kicking off the activities. Until August 2019, equipment for NAPTIP was procured (see below), speaking to some progress made against the indicator “Investigation system and mechanism enhancements developed.” However, data on NAPTIP organisational processes and mechanisms are missing. Similarly, a number of trainings for NAPTIP staff were conducted (see below) with generally positive feedback. No targets were set for the number of trainings/staff to be trained.Data against output and outcome indicators are currently not systematically collected. While some data on the outcome level exist, these are subject to monthly fluctuations and currently show only limited progress. As no baseline data or targets exists and there were only very few ongoing progress measures, there is little available data for adequately evaluating the activities of this pillar.Lessons learned therefore remain difficult to assess at this point and mostly focus on strengthening monitoring and evaluation practices in the coming months. Going forward, reporting templates provided by Seefar are expected to enable data collection against key indicators and the M&E methodology proposes some retrospective measures to the effectiveness of training.Under this pillar the NAPTIP Lagos safehouse was refurbished and handed over to NAPTIP in December 2018. Results were considered to positively impact the situation of VoTs, though this is beyond the scope of the results framework and not currently reflected therein.  |
| Status ranking - progress against indicators | B - Incomplete evidence to demonstrate likely contribution to outcome.B - Outputs partially or moderately did not meet expectation (see narrative). |
| ***Indicator and definition*** | ***Baseline*** | ***Target*** | ***Performance*** | ***Data sources - planned in RF*** | ***Data sources - actual*** | ***Gaps*** |
| **Outcome** | **Enhanced state capacity to investigate and prosecute trafficking suspects** |
| Assumption(s) | NAPTIP has adequate organisational capacity to absorb increased capabilities supported by the programme |
| Enhanced conviction success of investigated and prosecuted HT cases.Number of successfully prosecuted HT cases (measured as a conviction) as a proportion of the total cases investigated. | - | - | * Active investigations: 145 (as of August 2019)
* Closed investigations: 26
* Active prosecutions: 7
* Convictions: 1

Proportion: 4%[[7]](#footnote-7) | * NAPTIP data (investigations)
* Judiciary court data (convictions)
 | * Project records (quarterly/monthly reports)[[8]](#footnote-8)
 | * Data sources for programme reports unclear
* Data sources not clear and likely not comprehensive (monthly fluctuations)
 |
| **Intermediate outcome** | **Counterparts adopt and implement programme-supported outputs** |
| Enhanced organisational capacity for HT investigations.Senior managers within NAPTIP able to identify organisational-level improvements in capacity to undertake HT investigations as a result of programme support. | - | - | * No data available
 | * NAPTIP investigation support survey
 | * None
 | * NAPTIP investigation support survey not completed
* Due to M&E gaps no reliable assessment of progress against indicator possible
 |
| **Output** | **Law enforcement capabilities strengthened to investigate trafficking suspects** |
| Assumption(s) | NAPTIP has adequate organisational capacity to absorb increased capabilities supported by the programme |
| People trained.The total number of full-time NAPTIP staff that receive programme-supported training or capacity building to enhance HT investigation capabilities. | - | - | * NAPTIP mentor in place
* Number of trainings: 3
* Attendees total: 24 (unclear if full-time staff)
 | * Project records
 | * Project records (quarterly/monthly reports)
* Information from FCO focal point
 | * No systematic data collection
* Data sources not clear
* Number of people trained not tracked systematically and provided by FCO focal point
 |
| Useful training.‘Useful training’ assesses individuals’ own perceptions of the relevance and degree of potential application and use of the training material within their organisational affiliations. | - | - | * Training rated as overall “good” to “excellent”
* “Interviews”, “search”, “investigation” cited as most useful from training
* “National Decision Model”, “peace model” “planning” and “interviewing” most cited as first piece of learning applicable in workplace
 | * Self-evaluation tool
 | * 16 “K1 feedback sheets” (raw feedback data)
* SCJS K1 Course Evaluation
 | * Degree of relevance and potential application not measured in feedback forms (qualitative data only)
* Data from feedback only partially relevant to indicator, thouh raw data appear generally reliable
 |
| Investigation system and mechanism enhancements developed. ‘Investigation system and mechanism enhancements’ include changes to NAPTIP’s organisational processes or tools used to investigate human trafficking cases provided by programme support. | - | - | * No data available
 | * Project records
 | * None
 | * Due to M&E gaps no reliable assessment of progress against indicator possible
* Current activities appear to focus on “tools used” only, so hardware rather than systems, mechanisms and processes
 |

Other activities include:

* Procured office equipment (incl. laptops, printers, scanners) and generator (5 laptops, 9 desktops, 6 printers, 4 photocopiers, 4 scanners, 3 shredders (including Lagos safehouse));
* Vehicles for NAPTIP Benin City upgraded with bullbars and trackers, 2 minibuses, one each for Lagos and Benin.

However, it should be noted that 1) these data are not currently systematically collected, data sources in project records remain unclear, some data was provided by the FCO focal point; and 2) Seefar observed challenging working conditions for NAPTIP in Benin city (lack of electricity, cost of fuel to run generator) despite the purchases made.

# Judicial Capacity Building Pillar

The judicial capacity building pillar aims to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the court systems to prosecute trafficking cases and increase the rate of prosecution. It targets 6-9 judges spread across Lagos, Benin City and Abuja for training to improve the prosecution rate for modern slavery cases. The training focuses on: i) improved case and trial management; ii) managing human trafficking cases specifically (sensitivity to victims, special measures in legislation, equipment for remote victim engagement); and iii) dissemination activities to raise awareness amongst the wider judiciary and legal community in Nigeria.

Pillar 2 and Pillar 3 share outcome level indicators.

## Performance review

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall performance** | In February 2018, a courtroom equipment supplier was contracted, kicking off the activities under this pillar. Equipment for courtrooms was subsequently procured. Two trainings, one in IT equipment and one giving an overview on the Human Trafficking Act, Conspiracy and running an efficient court were delivered by UK judges from the Judicial College. However, data against indicators in the original results framework are currently not systematically collected. On the output level there remains some confusion on what to measure and only limited progress has been made with regard to the indicator “Judicial mechanisms developed to enhance prosecution effectiveness.” Similarly, in contrast to the measurement specified for the indicator on usefulness of training, assessments are based on views from trainers rather than from participants. Data against output and outcome indicators are currently not systematically collected, despite two trainings having been completed in the FY 18/19. While some data on the outcome level exist, these are subject to monthly fluctuations and currently show only limited progress. Similar to the Law Enforcement Pillar, this pillar lacks baseline or ongoing monitoring data as well as targets. Seefar therefore proposes, as for the law enforcement pillar, retrospective measures for data collection. Lessons learned therefore remain difficult to assess at this point and mostly focus on strengthening monitoring and evaluation practices in the coming months. Going forward, reporting templates provided by Seefar will enable data collection against key indicators and the M&E methodology proposes some retrospective measures to the effectiveness of training. |
| Status ranking - progress against indicators | B - Incomplete Theory of Change/evidence to demonstrate likely contribution to outcome.C - Outputs substantially did not meet expectation. |
| ***Indicator and definition*** | ***Baseline*** | ***Target*** | ***Performance*** | ***Data sources - planned in RF*** | ***Data sources - actual*** | ***Gaps*** |
| **Outcome** | **Enhanced state capacity to investigate and prosecute trafficking suspects** |
| Assumption(s) | NAPTIP has adequate organisational capacity to absorb increased capabilities supported by the programme |
| Enhanced conviction success of investigated and prosecuted HT casesNumber of successfully prosecuted HT cases (measured as a conviction) as a proportion of the total cases investigated. | - | - | * Active investigations: 145 (as of August 2019)
* Closed investigations: 26
* Active prosecutions: 7
* Convictions: 1

Proportion: 4%[[9]](#footnote-9) | * NAPTIP data (investigations)
* Judiciary court data (convictions)
 | * Project records (quarterly/monthly reports)
 | * Data sources for programme report unclear
* Data sources likely not comprehensive (monthly fluctuations)
 |
| **Intermediate outcome** | **Counterparts adopt and implement programme-supported outputs** |
| Judges adopt and implement enhanced capacity and increase number of HT case prosecutions.Number of HT cases prosecuted in total by the targeted judges per year. | - | - | * No data available
 | * Judicial support survey
 | * None
 | * Judicial support survey not in place
* Due to M&E gaps no reliable assessment of progress against indicator possible (e.g. it remains unclear which judges prosecuted cases and in how far this represents enhanced capacity)
 |
| **Output** | **Judicial capabilities strengthened to prosecute trafficking suspects** |
| Assumption(s) | The judiciary, including targeted judges, desire the increased capacity and willingly provide the necessary resources to undertake the capability-enhancing support |
| Judges trained.‘Judges trained’ counts the total number of identified judges specifically mandated to prosecute HT cases and therefore targeted for programme support, who participate in capacity-building activities on various legal aspects of HT prosecution & victim sensitivity. | - | - | * 8 Nigerian Federal High Court judges (7 from Lagos, 1 from Benin City) trained
* Training on IT equipment delivered (8 attendees)
 | * Project records
 | * Project records (quarterly/monthly reports)
* Information from FCO focal point
 | * No systematic data collection and some data from FCO focal point
* Number of people trained not always tracked, instead reporting on number of trainings
 |
| Useful training.‘Useful training’ assesses individuals’ own perceptions of the relevance and degree of potential application and use of the training material within their organisational affiliations. | - | - | * Varying levels of engagement and satisfaction reported by trainers
 | * Self-evaluation tool
 | * Trainer report
 | * Self-evaluation tool not in place
* Available data on training and usefulness from trainers not participants (not representative of indicator)
* Due to M&E gaps no reliable assessment of progress against indicator possible
 |
| Judicial mechanisms developed to enhance prosecution effectiveness. ‘Judicial mechanisms’ include procedures, planning processes, or other systems within the judicial process designed to enhance the effectiveness that judges have in prosecuting human traffickers. | - | - | * No data available
 | * Project records
 | * None
 | * Due to M&E gaps no reliable assessment of progress against indicator possible
* No systematic data collection
* Not clear if and how this is tracked in project records also due to lack of clarity of the definition
 |
| Judicial infrastructure supported.‘Judicial infrastructure’ includes courtrooms related to the identified judges mandated to prosecute HT cases, where programme-supported equipment has been provided to enhance prosecution through allowing remote testimonies, digital recordings, and other similar procedural enhancements. | - | - | * Courtroom updates completed (8 Federal High Courtrooms upgraded with IT kits and internet connectivity, court proceedings can be recorded (audio and video), 1 use case reported
 | * Project records
 | * Project records (quarterly/monthly reports)
* Information from FCO focal point
 | * No systematic data collection
* Data sources likely not comprehensive (monthly fluctuations)
* Due to M&E gaps no reliable assessment of progress against indicator possible
 |

# Strategic Communications Pillar

This component aims to enhance NAPTIP’s communication capabilities. The Government Communication Service International (GCSI) received funding to build the public communication capacity of NAPTIP’s Public Enlightenment Department and the Press Unit and facilitate innovative awareness-raising approaches. Additionally, a six-week mass media campaign was rolled to raise public awareness of modern slavery.

This pillar has been ongoing since October 2018 and Phase One has been delivered. A second phase is due to be issued during 2019, although a contractor for that phase is yet to be determined.

## Performance review

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall performance** | Activities under the strategic communications pillar (Pillar 4) began in April 2018 and a first phase including NAPTIP trainings, a six-week stand-alone communication campaign and an evaluation have been completed at the time of this review. The pillar has made significant achievements, but it remains difficult to assess progress against outcome and intermediary outcome indicators as well as against at least one output indicator.This pillar has a standalone theory of change, and third-party M&E component supplied by Kings College London (KCL). Findings in respect to the impact of Phase One were presented in London on 31 July 2019. Seefar thereafter examined the standalone Pillar 4 results framework and the evaluation. Most indicators focus on the six-week communications campaign and only one impact indicator (“Increased capability within NAPTIP to deliver targeted and measurable behaviour-change campaigns to continue to inform citizens about modern slavery and human trafficking”), one outcome indicator (“Training of NAPTIP staff through GCSI e-learning course to develop and manage campaigns”) and one output indicator (“Existence of full operational Governance structure is in place and operational, with NAPTIP chairing the Governance Board, and co-chairing a strategic content team”) broadly reflect the overall TMS results framework in its focus on training and support of NAPTIP. In fact, the six-week campaign only included NAPTIP capacity building to a very limited degree.Nevertheless, Pillar 4 has made significant progress, specifically with regard to outputs. Only one output indicator lacks significant data, the others show gaps that can be addressed in Phase Two of the Pillar if agreed. |
| Status ranking - progress against indicators | B - Incomplete evidence to demonstrate likely contribution to outcome.B - Outputs partially or moderately did not meet expectation. |
| ***Indicator and definition*** | ***Baseline*** | ***Target*** | ***Performance*** | ***Data sources - planned in RF*** | ***Data sources - actual*** | ***Gaps*** |
| **Outcome** | **Enhanced public awareness reduces complicity in and increases deterrence from human trafficking**  |
| Assumption(s) | NAPTIP support will translate into organisation-level capacity resilient to staff turnover; Strategic communication support enhances organisational capacity to undertake effective strategic communication and awareness campaigns; Increased awareness of the negative aspects of human trafficking will catalyse behaviour change to dis-incentivise trafficking |
| Behavioural change that discourages human trafficking and lowers likelihood of individuals putting themselves at risk as a result of increased public awareness of the dangers of human trafficking.Proportion of individuals exposed to programme-supported strategic communication mechanisms and tools that report change in attitudes towards the costs / benefits of trafficking. | - | - | * Out of 1,680 interview respondents for final evaluation report on the “Not for sale” campaign, “72% of young women and 78% of family members did not agree with young women who go abroad for sex work”
* “65% of young women and 64% of family do not think it is safe for young women to be sent overseas for sex work”
* However, attitude changes from before and after the campaign are likely not significant, with between 2 to 7% differences
 | * Public perceptions survey
 | * “Not for sale” Nigerian Modern Slavery Campaign Evaluation Report
 | * Attitude or behaviour change on other channels such as social media (either campaign or NAPTIP) not tracked
 |
| **Intermediate outcome** | **Counterparts adopt and implement programme-supported outputs** |
| Strategic communication tools and mechanisms adopted. Proportion of programme-supported tools and mechanisms adopted’, where ‘adoption’ is understood to be the take-up or incorporation of programme supported tools into organisational approaches, structures or processes that support more effective strategic communication practices. | - | - | * No data available
 | * NAPTIP strat comms survey
 | * None
 | * No systematic data collection
* Due to M&E gaps no reliable assessment of progress against indicator possible
 |
| Target populations exposed to programme-supported strategic communication tools.Total number of people within targeted population groups reached by awareness campaigns. |  |  | * Exposure to NAPTIP media coverage unclear
* Out of 1,680 interview respondents for final evaluation report, 75% of young women and 71% of family members had heard of an information campaign called 'Not For Sale' in the last two months
* Over 631,000 views of campaign content on social media videos
* Over 30,000 engagements (likes, shares, comments) on social media videos
* 8 national print articles; 15 online news and blog placements; 2 national primetime; TV news coverage (AIT, NTA)
* 1,815 60-second radio spots and 2884 45-second radio spots; Radio sponsorship: presenters on 6 key programmes popular with young girls spoke about the campaign for 15 minutes, with 160 spots
* 7 town hall/community engagements; 7 markets visited; 8 schools visited; 8 churches and mosques visited
 | * NAPTIP strat comms survey
 | * NAPTIP media coverage summary
 | * Reach of campaign total not clear, e.g. unclear if online reach and engagement is organic or includes promotions; unclear readership and exposure to articles; number of participants at events not specified; Google Analytics for microsite not provided
 |
| **Output** | **Strategic communication tools and mechanisms supported** |
| Assumption(s) | NAPTIP is willing to allocate appropriate and adequate organisational resources to enhance its organisational capability with the programme's support |
| People trained.The total number of full-time NAPTIP staff that receive programme-supported training or capacity building to enhance communication capabilities. | - | - | * 6-week campaign strategy planned with NAPTIP Directors
* 8 junior members of NAPTIP team undertook GCSI’s online campaigns training out of which 7 passed
* 5-day face-to-face training with 20 NAPTIP staff in June 2018
* 3-day face-to-face training with 17 NAPTIP staff in July 2018
* final session of Summer training with NAPTIP held in early August (number of participants not clear)
 | * Project records
 | * “Not for sale” Nigerian Modern Slavery Campaign Evaluation Report
* GCSI June/July workshop reports
* Monthly comms reports[[10]](#footnote-10)
 | * Some conflicting information on the number of NAPTIP staff completing the online training (6 in January monthly report v. 7 in evaluation report)
* Reference made to a total of 4 trainings in September monthly report
 |
| Useful training.‘Useful training’ assesses individuals’ own perceptions of the relevance and degree of potential application and use of the training material within their organisational affiliations. | - | - | * June training
* Skills assessment before and after face-to-face trainings conducted: 5% skills increase after training on strategic communications skills; 21% increase in skill levels on press and media work; 14% increase in skills around communications campaigns
* Areas of most confidence/least confidence assessed but unclear whether pre- or post-training
* July training:
* Skills in quote writing between the start and end of module 2 increased by 16%; skills in press release writing by 29%; overall skills in press and media between module 1 and module 2 increased by 12% from baseline
* Feedback generally positive, with some participants indicating intended application of learning
* Summer training:
* “Average overall skills across all 4 workshops increased by 10%; Average overall utility perceptions across all 4 workshops increased by 9.5%; Average overall confidence levels across all 4 workshops increased by 7%”
 | * Self-evaluation tool
 | * GCSI June/July workshop reports (based in part on self-evaluation tool)
* Monthly comms reports
 | * Data focused on skills assessments before and after trainings and doesn’t assess relevance or degree of potential application
 |
| Strategic communication mechanisms and tools developed.‘Strategic communication mechanisms and tools’ include changes to communication campaigns, strategies and processes, or specific approaches and methods used by NAPTIP to raise awareness about the dangers of human trafficking. | - | - | * NAPTIP secured 161 positive online articles between March and June 2018
 | * Project records
 | * NAPTIP media coverage summary
 | * Progress since June 2018 unclear
* Unclear in how far this represents development of strategic communication mechanisms and tools
 |

# D: Value for Money and Financial Performance

### Key cost drivers and performance

Pillar 1 will likely receive the largest proportion of funding from the programme, though the precise scope was not clarified at the time of this review. Accordingly, revising the TMS Programme ToC and results framework to better reflect IOM activities under the programme will be key. This will then also allow an in-depth look at Value for Money.

Due to limited detailed financial data available at the time of this review, key cost drivers could not yet be determined. Pillars 2 and 3 were most cost intensive in FY 18/19, leading to the assumption that most money was spent on equipment and training. Determining VfM will require a better understanding of the pillars’ effectiveness and equity as well as access to financial data to then also be able to examine efficiency and economy. This can be done during the next programme review after output and outcome data have collected.

Seefar recommends using an approach to VfM which is not based on traditional cost-benefit-analyses as the benefits of a programme focused on attitude changes as well as learning are difficult to monetize. As a result, the VfM 4 E’s (effectiveness, efficiency, economy and equity) would ideally be integrated into the overall programme evaluation. Financial record keeping and rationale for costs will nonetheless be important for all four pillars.

Some initial observations around broad VfM considerations include:

* The refurbishment of the Lagos safehouse made up a substantial part of the costs under Pillar 2. Though likely representing good VfM, it should be noted that this activity falls outside the current ToC and results framework.
* Similarly, some programme funding was used to support NAPTIP in handling some Federal Government funded flights returning potential victims from Libya to Port Harcourt. While the annual report notes that this flexibility in funding was pivotal to securing a meeting between the High Commissioner and the Nigerian Foreign Minister to push for more sustained Federal Government focus on tackling Human Trafficking and Modern Slavery, this also falls outside of the scope of the ToC and results framework.

**VfM performance compared to the original VfM proposition in the programme document**

N/A

### Assessment of whether the programme continues to represent value for money

Significant changes will need to be made to the ToC and results framework to assess VfM now and in the future of the programme. Learning and programme adaptation will be key to ensuring the TMS Programme represents good value for money.

### Quality of financial management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **VARIANCE AT YEAR END:** | **Against original allocated budget:****Against revised forecasts:** |

# E: Risk

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RISK REGISTER IN PLACE:** **Yes** | **DATE OF LAST REVIEW/UPDATE:****28th August 2019** |

### Overall risk rating

High

**Rationale**

This programme is currently rated as a high risk programme. This is due to the contextual and institutional risks outlined below as well as the difficult operating environment, the involvement of multiple implementing partners and sub-contractors, the length of the programme and its focus on learning and adaptation. There is also a possibility that some of the underlying assumptions of the ToC, interlinkages between the pillars and the potential for impact remain unclear or cannot be supported by evidence.

### Overview of programme risk

This section seeks to identify where the greatest risks to the programme achieving its aims arise. Seefar encourages the TMS Programme to enhance this with more detailed risk analyses by the IPs for each pillar and their specific risk mitigation/risk management strategy and to incorporate these into the overarching programme risk register.

**Contextual risks**

The ToC identifies poverty as a key driver of trafficking. There are a number of risks that could increase poverty and thereby lead to greater numbers of people being trafficked. Nigeria is at high risk of environmental hazards, such as floods and droughts. In 2012, widespread flooding affected almost the entire country including Edo state (although not Abuja or Lagos state). Climate change is making these events more severe and more unpredictable. They have knock-on effects on food production, in turn, increasing poverty and displacement. These factors tend to increase vulnerability to trafficking.

Numerous ongoing conflicts (described in Conflict Analysis in Seefar’s inception report) reflect deep social fractures and weaknesses of the political framework to settle competing claims to resources. The rising conflict level and the inability of the government to address it and enforce rule of law in a timely manner carries a risk to peace and stability in the country.

While the programme locations are in some of the most stable regions of the country, they nevertheless carry risks of political violence (especially in Abuja), threats from the ongoing herdsmen/pastoralists conflict in Edo state, and violent criminality generally. As poverty worsens and more people become displaced, vulnerability to trafficking grows, potentially overwhelming the programme’s prevention efforts.

These threats are not immediate and do not pose a direct threat to the programme at present but remain real risks that need to be monitored.

**Institutional risks**

The Law Enforcement Pillar relies on the assumption that capacity building will lead to efficiencies which in turn will free more time to hear more cases. However, systemic corruption and inefficiencies in the justice system pose a risk to this element of the programme. These can manifest themselves in numerous ways which can impact on the project results, for example: delays in the system as cases are simply not scheduled or processed; and information is not shared, so when cases are scheduled, prisoners, witnesses or even judges are unavailable. The risk register does include the risk of depoloyment allowances that are currently paid by the programme might be used for corrupt purposes and a mitigation plan in place. However there is currently no mitigation plan in pillars two and three for wider institutional corruption risks.

The perception of police as involved in corruption and human rights abuses affects relations between security forces and the civilian population. NAPTIP appears to have been relatively free of those concerns, but if further activities are planned under the law enforcement pillar (and indeed also under Pillar 4 with NAPTIP at its core), the design stage needs to include robust situation and needs analysis to pre-empt issues, covering

* its relationships with local and national level political and social figures;
* stakeholder analysis including of linkages between traffickers and conflict actors;
* the robustness of its policies and procedures in relation to prevention and investigation of abuses by its own staff.

**Programme risk**

There are also currently some key gaps in programming potentially posing a risk to the TMS Programme.

While the ToC explicitly linked ensuring individual capacity building to institutional capacity building, this remains a weakness in programme activities. The activities noted during the inception phase do not convincingly engage with the broader context. Explicit challenges to achieving the expected outcome have been raised in the ToC and in the regular programme reports.

With high levels of staff turnover noted in NAPTIP, and wider resourcing and planning weaknesses in both courts and NAPTIP, there is a danger that the efforts in training are wasted/not sustained. The programme needs to consider how to improve institutional weaknesses such as access to fuel and transport; reducing staff turnover; enhancing case management and quality assurance systems; measuring and prioritising use of court/judges time; increasing confidence of victims and witnesses to name just a few. Institutional capacity is affected also by political will for reform and this may vary according to the location and institution concerned.

Even at individual level, evidence suggests that the ability to operationalise new knowledge, attitudes, skills and intentions depends on support to translate those into new behaviours. This enhances the role to be played by the NAPTIP mentor for Pillar 2 and their capacity building may need to be considered as well.

The programme is strongly biased towards formal institutions and each pillar focuses on relatively narrow interventions, despite the broad contextual drivers of modern slavery in Nigeria. This is particularly pronounced in respect of the law enforcement and judicial pillars. Social change is not a top-down process, yet there is a notable absence of participatory, community-led interventions in the programme (including in Pillars 1 and 4). It is our experience that, especially in behavioural change programming, this component is essential for achieving impact.

We also note the absence of any inter-pillar learning or coordination built into the programme. A whole-system approach would ensure maximum learning and impact. Adding annual or semi-annual learning workshops across different pillars could be one way to promote that.

# F: Monitoring and Evaluation

### Evidence and evaluation

As outlined throughout this review, there is currently very limited systematic monitoring and evaluation in place to allow gathering evidence. The review and recommendations are therefore heavily focused on putting in place a comprehensive M&E system.

### Monitoring progress throughout the review period

Monthly progress reports have been created with some regularity which cover the activities of all four pillars (though Pillar 4 communications reports are referenced in these reports and no additional data on the pillar provided in the progress reports). A template will be provided to ensure that going forward data relevant to indicators will be collected.

# G: Cross Cutting Thematic Consideration (conflict, gender)

### Conflict Sensitivity

No conflict analysis has been prepared for any of the pillars of the programme. This analysis therefore provides an initial overview of the key conflict drivers in Nigeria, and the potential overlaps which should be addressed by pillar-specific conflict analysis.

Nigeria has a number of internal violent conflicts as well as social fractures that could trigger new outbreaks of violence. The programme is especially vulnerable because it involves allocation of resources (victim re-integration) and deployment of federal government agents (NAPTIP and Judiciary) and aims to challenge organised crime groups which often have direct and indirect linkages to destabilising conflict actors (‘spoilers’).

Conflict is fuelled by factors which operate at different levels. The proximate causes of conflict, potential triggers for outbreaks of conflict, and the role played by different actors needs to be mapped for each pillar and each location. For each it is important to consider structural as well as immediate causes of conflict (which can relate in complicated ways). Some key flashpoints could be:

* The reintegration pillar involves allocation of resources, a common driver of local level conflict. If resources are allocated in a way which is perceived to favour particular ethnic, religious or other groups or which cuts across social perceptions of morality, these could lead to conflict.
* In the law enforcement pillar, the association of NAPTIP with other national security forces accused of unlawful killings, arbitrary arrest and detention, extortion, sexual harassment, and disappearances could pose risks.
* In the judicial pillar there are fewer obvious conflict risks, but there are potential for tensions to erupt centring around national versus federal politics; ethnic/religious origins of judiciary versus the judged; perceptions of bias or corruption; cases which challenge the interests of local powerbrokers.
* Similarly, the communications pillar does not show obvious conflict risks, but the outputs need to be based on a full understanding of the local patterns of use and consumption of media to ensure proposed messaging does not inadvertently reinforce other conflict drivers.

### Gender

The ToC noted a need for a gender analysis to ensure that the programme and its delivery are gender aware and inclusive, as well as sensitive to the social-economic dimensions of the context in which it will be implemented. A thorough understanding of the interplay of gender inequity, communal power dynamics, social norms and gender roles would have been useful at the very early stages of programme design in determining which interventions and modalities of delivery would be most effective and would have ensured all partners were fully aligned with HMG priorities.

While it will be challenging to retrospectively conduct a gender analysis on a programme in which some key components have already commenced, Seefar recommends that for any new activity, the implementing partner conducts gender impact assessments to aid programme effectiveness.

It must be noted that at this point, gender considerations are not explicitly built into any of the pillars. For example, while the communications campaign specifically focused on young women as victims of trafficking, the victim support pillar also prioritises male VoTs and returnees. However, out of 178 beneficiaries identified and screened by IOM by August 2019, just 13 are men, speaking to inconsistencies with regard to gender considerations within individual programme pillars.

Within the law enforcement and judicial pillars, there is a need to ensure services are sensitive to the role that women play both as victims of crime, and as perpetrators. Moreover, where families are closely tied to trafficking, and young women have few socially accepted alternatives, there are strong moral and social pressures not to cooperate with law enforcement. Understanding how these gender dimensions could impact on referral, investigation and prosecution of these offences is essential and at this point not part of the programme.

# Recommendations

In general, it appears that no baseline information on the programme’s results framework exists, and for at least two of the pillars there is limited data being collected against the results. Lessons learned therefore centre on strengthening the data collection and M&E activities in order to better draw out wider programme lessons in the near future.

Responsive to this, Seefar’s monitoring and evaluation inception report will make recommendations on how to enhance the existing data through retrospective data collection strategies and ensure future monitoring is responsive to programme indicators while those which are still in the pipeline (hence, uncertain) may require further follow-up or supplementary data collection methods once finalised.

Recommendations on monitoring and evaluation include:

* Data reported on Pillar 1 and 4 should be in line with the TMS Programme’ results framework to better assess progress, generate lessons and draw conclusions on effectiveness, efficiency and relevance. Include in the changes to the ToC and results framework, relevant results and indicators proposed by IOM and GCSI in their recent project plans to minimise additional effort required by IPs for data collection and reporting.
* Ensure previous data reported on Pillar 2 and 3 are reliable. Develop simple data collection tools to verify the data to the extent possible.
* Reporting for all pillars should be focused on reporting against indicators agreed as part of the revised results framework. Toward this end, develop a simple and specific monthly reporting template so that routine monitoring is relevant while not overly burdensome for IPs.
* Ensure financial monitoring is done in a way that allows value for money analyses and record programme changes centrally. This also includes recording any reasons that make a change necessary to make sure activities and money spent either still align with the ToC or require adapting the ToC.

The ToC and results framework have not been updated since the beginning of the programme. This is despite its explicit focus on being adaptive to changes based on learning. A key recommendation is therefore to change the current ToC to be ambitious yet realistic and reflect an updated results framework that aligns with programme changes and outputs delivered while maintaining a focus on impact. This will also allow the programme team to better adapt the programme to lessons captured through monitoring, evaluation and research on each of the four pillars. The change will also serve two additional objectives.

1. It will be less challenging to measure progress and achievements because the indicators will be more reflective of programme activities and ambitions.
2. This will also ensure data reported on Pillar 1 and 4 are in line with the TMS Programme’ results framework to better assess progress, generate lessons and draw conclusions on effectiveness, efficiency and relevance for the programme as a whole.

Programmatic recommendations include:

* The Strategic Communication Pillar has made the most progress against output indicators. Encourage Phase Two to include outcome data, which in turn can help testing the underlying assumptions of the ToC. Furthermore, in the next FY the capacity building component of the pillar should be examined to learn about effectiveness and relevance. As the Phase One campaign did not prioritise NAPTIP capacity building as part of the “Not for Sale” campaign despite its priority in the existing results framework, Phase Two should consider integrating capacity building into the campaign more.
* Ask IPs to create project specific risk registers
* Better integrate gender and conflict into all four pillars. IPs should consider possible conflict dynamics in their programme documents and ensure staff are aware of these. Although modern slavery and trafficking is a highly gendered crime, gender considerations are weak across the programme pillars. Specific gender strategies should be built into the pillars. At the minimum, wherever possible, indicators should include sex and age disaggregated targets. If targeting in such a manner is not possible, data on achievements must at least include sex and age disaggregation, as relevant.
1. “Key Results should be at output (i.e. number of people trained) and, where possible/applicable, outcome (i.e. the result of the training) level. We should not be listing inputs (i.e. provision of a training activity) or activities here.” (CSSF template). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Ranking based on CSSF review template:

A+) Outcomes exceeded expectation OR likely to exceed, based on good Theory of Change/evidence; A+) Outputs exceeded expectation;

A) Outcomes met expectation OR are on course to meet, based on good Theory of Change/evidence; A) Outputs met expectation;

B) Outcomes partially or unlikely to not meet expectation OR insufficient/unreliable/incomplete Theory of Change/evidence to demonstrate likely contribution to outcome; B) Outputs partially or moderately did not meet expectation;

C) Outcomes substantially did not meet or unlikely to meet expectation OR no Theory of Change/evidence to demonstrate likely contribution to outcome; C) Outputs substantially did not meet expectation;

U) No Result Framework or Risk Register. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The review relies heavily on data and reports available to Seefar. Should there be additional data available, Seefar will include these in subsequent reviews, pending access to this data. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The below is taken from “Modern Slavery Unit: Nigeria Anti-Human Trafficking Programme Theory of Change & Results Framework,” January 2018. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Ranking based on CSSF review template:

	* A+) Outcomes exceeded expectation OR likely to exceed, based on good Theory of Change/evidence; A+) Outputs exceeded expectation;
	* A) Outcomes met expectation OR are on course to meet, based on good Theory of Change/evidence; A) Outputs met expectation;
	* B) Outcomes partially or unlikely to not meet expectation OR insufficient/unreliable/incomplete Theory of Change/evidence to demonstrate likely contribution to outcome; B) Outputs partially or moderately did not meet expectation;
	* C) Outcomes substantially did not meet or unlikely to meet expectation OR no Theory of Change/evidence to demonstrate likely contribution to outcome; C) Outputs substantially did not meet expectation;
	* U) No Result Framework or Risk Register. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Target from IOM Progress Updates (internal IOM target). No target set in current results framework. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Convictions/closed investigations. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. At the time of this review, Seefar only had access to monthly reports from January 2018 to May 2019. An additional monthly report (August 2019) was forwarded on September 2. Quarterly reports were only available until December 2018. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Convictions/closed investigations. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Seefar only had access to monthly reports from October 2018-January 2019 and the September 2019 monthly report. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)