

**Questions for the Record Submitted to
Ambassador Luis CdeBaca
Senator Chuck Grassley (#1)
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
September 14, 2011**

Question:

Section 224 of the TVPRA (S.1301) would expand the number of agencies required to be trained in identifying victims of trafficking to include personnel from the Department of Labor and the EEOC.

- a. What will the cost of this additional training be on an annual basis?
- b. If your answer is that you do not know how much implementing this provision will cost, do you agree that given the difficult economic conditions, it is unwise to enact legislation without knowing how much it will cost U.S. taxpayers?

Answer:

The Department of State cannot accurately respond to specific questions about the costs associated for training personnel for the Department of Labor and the EEOC. We would refer you directly to those relevant USG agencies for those cost estimates.

**Questions for the Record Submitted to
Ambassador Luis CdeBaca
Senator Chuck Grassley (#2)
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
September 14, 2011**

Question:

There is a great disparity between the number of victims claimed to exist and the actual number of victims rescued. The Department of State has claimed in the past that as many as 50,000 victims per year were trafficked into the United States, although it later reduced that number to 14,500 victims, and that as many as 800,000 victims per year are trafficked around the world. The GAO has called those figures into question. And according to the latest DOJ figures available to the Committee, there have been only about 1900 victims discovered in the United States from Fiscal Year 2001 to 2009.

- a. What is the most reliable estimate of the number of victims trafficked each year in the United States?
- b. What has the Administration done to try to pin down the number of victims?
- c. If there is no reliable figure for the number of victims, how can the Administration—and Congress—determine the appropriate measures to fight this crime?

Answer:

Trafficking by nature is a hidden crime and victims often do not self-report for fear of retribution or authorities, illegal immigration status, or inability to speak the local language. The Department of State no longer uses the referenced estimates for TIP victims within the United States, which are based on out-of-date research. Estimates of the number of victims both in the United States and around the world are difficult to quantify.

Reputable international research from the International Labor Organization (ILO) and Dr. Kevin Bales estimate the number of victims worldwide at 12.3 million people (ILO) and 27 million people (Bales).

**Questions for the Record Submitted to
Ambassador Luis CdeBaca
Senator Chuck Grassley (#3)
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
September 14, 2011**

Question:

Although they are not in the version of S.1301 which was introduced, it is my understanding that the sponsors of the bill intend to add several sections as amendments. One of those sections requires the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and relevant offices and bureaus, to formulate and distribute guidance to prevent child marriage and to promote the empowerment of girls at risk of child marriage in developing countries. It also requires the annual State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices to include reporting on child marriage.

- a. How much will it cost U.S. taxpayers to implement this provision?
- b. If your answer is that you do not know how much implementing this provision will cost, do you agree that given the difficult economic conditions, that it is unwise to enact legislation without knowing how much it will cost U.S. taxpayers?
- c. Have you or any other official at the Department of State been consulted about this provision? If so, when did that occur?

Answer:

Our office cannot accurately respond to specific questions about the costs associated with formulating and distributing this guidance as primary responsibility for this issue resides with USAID and/or other bureaus within the Department of State. We refer you directly to USAID and/or the relevant bureaus within the Department of State for any cost estimates.

While we cannot speak for other bureaus, or offices within the Department of State, our office has not been consulted on this provision, nor have we seen draft legislative language or been asked for comment.

**Questions for the Record Submitted to
Ambassador Luis CdeBaca
Senator Chuck Grassley (#4)
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
September 14, 2011**

Question:

At the hearing, you testified that: [I]n the last two years my office has received 998 applications for assistance from 546 organizations requesting a total of \$547 million. Our foreign assistance budget for the last two years was \$39.1 million, not even 10 percent of the ***demonstrated need***, and we took a 24 percent pay cut, as it were, in the spring down to under \$17 million in program funds. (Emphasis added).

At a later point in the hearing, you testified: There is a lot of unmet need. As you may know, the State Department's Trafficking in Persons Office budget for programs was cut by about 24 percent earlier this spring. So we're down to a little bit under 16 1/2 million dollars in a world in which there's about 27 million people who are enslaved. And so we're not talking even a dollar a person at that point.

What we've seen is, over the last two years, almost a thousand – 998 applications for assistance requesting \$547 million. That's for prosecutor training, for police training, for shelters for the victims around the world. And our foreign assistance budget that we were able to get out the door for that was about 39.1 million (dollars) in total. So not even 10 percent of the ***demonstrated need*** being met from what we've been able to do -- and, again, the 24 percent reduction this spring.

And we certainly know shared sacrifice, and we're making our money go as far as we can. But that's -- it's something that certainly is starting to play out in the field in that there are some countries in the world in which, if we aren't funding the victim care, it's just not getting funded. (Emphasis added).

It appears that according to your testimony, all of the requests for funding that you and the State Department receive in this area constitute part of a “demonstrated need.” Your testimony stands in stark contrast to the

testimony of Ms. Leary from the DOJ, who admitted that certain DOJ grants which had questionable expenditures were “failures.”

- a. Is it your position that every one of the 998 applications for funding you referred to should have received funding?

Answer:

As set forth in our answer to question 2, as many as 27 million men, women, and children may be victims of modern slavery. Human trafficking affects every region and country in the world and no country can claim immunity from its reach or from the responsibility to confront it.

The scope of the problem far outweighs the resources appropriated for the US Government to respond to this heinous crime. With very few exceptions, the applications for funding that our Office receives show tremendous merit and demonstrate genuine need in some aspect of this fight. Not all of them meet our technical specifications. Not all of them are in line with our office’s priorities, which are primarily protection-focused programs in Tier 3, Tier 2 Watch List, and in some cases Tier 2 countries. Not all use approaches we would support, but the needs identified are credible. Indeed, due to the paucity of funding, hard decisions must be made. The fact that we choose certain projects over others reflects our need to prioritize projects

based on the constraints of our Congressional appropriation. If anything, the self-identified need for funding demonstrated by anti-trafficking organizations formulating these proposals is a gross understatement of the true need required to effectively combat this crime.

- b.** Were any of the 998 applicants you referred to rejected because of questions of potential corruption, evidence of actual corruption, concerns about misuse of funds or evidence of actual misuse in the past? If so, identify those applicants and the set forth in detail the reasons they were rejected.

Answer:

No applicants were rejected for these reasons.

- c.** Were any of the 998 applicants you referred to rejected for other reasons? If so, shouldn't those applicants be subtracted from the "demonstrated need" you referred to?

Answer:

"Demonstrated need" as used in my testimony is neither an official term nor a term of art in our programs review process. It reflects the needs asserted by the applicants, rather than the eventual funding decisions following an in-depth review.

- d.** Explain in detail the background investigation that the State Department conducts on grantees before they are awarded a grant under the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA).

Answer:

We uniformly apply all review procedures and maintain all relevant standards applicable to grant awards mandated by Congress and implemented across the federal government.

In addition to reviewing any information submitted by the applicant regarding organizational capability to conduct the proposed project, G/TIP determines whether the applicant is included on the Excluded Parties Listing System maintained by the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA). This system is a centrally maintained government-wide database that includes the names of organizations and individuals that have been debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or been voluntarily excluded; the reasons for that status; and the duration of that status. All applicants must also secure a Data Universal Numbering System (D-U-N-S) number, a unique nine-digit code that helps identify and link more than 100 million companies worldwide. This allows us to provide consistent name and address data for electronic grant application systems, and to better track how federal funds are awarded and dispersed.

All applicants must also register with Central Contractor Registration (CCR).

In order to register with the CCR, international entities must obtain a NATO Commercial and Governmental Entity (NCAGE) code - a five-character ID number used to support a variety of mechanized systems throughout the government and provides for a standardized method of identifying a given facility at a specific location.

Additionally, G/TIP participated in the pilot of a recently mandated grants management system (GrantSolutions), which has the ability to conduct control checks throughout the grant award process.

- e. Explain in detail the oversight that the State Department conducts on grantees under the TVPA.

Answer:

In full support of this Administration's effort to make government more transparent and accountable, this Office has made oversight of grantees and responsible use of taxpayer dollars top priorities.

In recent years, G/TIP has placed increased emphasis on ensuring sound project design *before* a project is awarded, and subsequent

monitoring and evaluation (M&E) to measure the effectiveness of funded programs.

To improve program design, in FY 2010, G/TIP began requiring that all applicants submit a logical framework as part of their application package. A logical framework demonstrates the relationship between the project goal(s) and objectives and includes performance measurement indicators for outputs and outcomes of each objective. Increased focus on project design has improved the quality of funded projects and has facilitated assessment of a particular program's effectiveness and outcomes.

Through a combination of desk and on-site monitoring, Program Officers engage in continuous dialogue with grantees to ensure that program goals and objectives are being met. This involves continuous communication and evaluation through telephone calls, e-mails, and analysis of reports. At the same time, monitoring also gives us the opportunity to provide training and support to our grantees in developing improved measures to establish baseline data and assess program impact. In recent years, we have increased the number of on-site monitoring visits and implemented

a standardized procedure to assess fiscal and administrative management and programmatic progress while on-site.

We have also increased our attention to conducting rigorous evaluations of promising practices or programs identified through our monitoring activities. In Fiscal Year 2008, G/TIP began supporting evaluability assessments (EA) as the critical first step in moving toward funding well-targeted, cost-effective impact evaluations. G/TIP is currently funding impact evaluations of two programs that provide comprehensive services to victims of trafficking that were the subject of earlier EAs. In FY 2010, G/TIP funded EAs of additional projects. Impact evaluations of these projects will be conducted if the evaluability findings indicate they are worthy of this type of evaluation.

- f.** How many State Department grantees that received funds under the TVPA have been audited during the last three years? If any, what were the results of those audits?

Answer:

Of the 98 projects G/TIP funded in FY 2010, approximately 35 were implemented by U.S.-based organizations, and 19 of those organizations have been audited in the last three years. These routine audits were performed in accordance with the standard provisions of OMB Circular

A-133 for states, local governments and non-profit organizations based in the United States and expended more than \$500,000 per year in U.S. Federal assistance funds. Fewer than eight percent of grantees were shown to suffer significant deficiencies or material weaknesses, and of those grantees that did show such findings, those deficiencies and weaknesses were not related to their G/TIP award. Furthermore, all reports reflected an overall assessment that grantees were “low risk.”

- g.** How many State Department grantees which received funds under the TVPA have been investigated by law enforcement agencies (in the U.S. or abroad) during the last three years? If any, what were the results of those investigations?

Answer:

Demonstrating the effectiveness of our monitoring and oversight procedures, G/TIP referred one grantee to the DOS Office of the Inspector General’s Office of Investigations following a regular on-site programmatic and administrative review which uncovered inadequate fiscal and administrative controls, a violation of the grant agreement.

Access to funds was terminated. More specific information is not available at this time.

- h.** Have any grantees of funds under the TVPA been required to return funds during the last three years? If any, identify those grantees and how much was returned?

Answer:

G/TIP cannot comment on the status of TVPA funding from other entities. In terms of the Office's funds, G/TIP has taken back approximately \$183,000 from a grantee that was referred to the OIG Office of Investigations (mentioned above in answer 4.g). More specific information is not available at this time.

We would also note that G/TIP monitors grants and cooperative agreements throughout the project period and the Office has established procedures for recouping unexpended funds after a project has ended. In some instances, a grantee has unexpended funds that have not been released to the grantee's bank account and these funds are taken back through an administrative process. To date, these funds total approximately \$283,800.

In other instances, funds may be in the control of the grantee, but not expended for purposes of the project. In this situation, the grantee would return the funds by check. The disposition of recouped funds depends on the year and type of appropriation. Some funds are re-programmed for

other anti-trafficking projects and some funds are returned to the U.S.

Treasury. In recent actions to recoup funds, most of the funds have gone to the Treasury.

- i. Do you believe that any grants made by the State Department during the last three years were mistakes? If so, identify the grants and provide a detailed explanation of why each such grant was a mistake.

Answer:

I am confident in our review and evaluation process, and I am confident that in the time I have overseen this office, we have not made any decisions to fund a project that were inconsistent with those standards, or reflected an error in judgment or carelessness. We allocate our foreign assistance through an open, competitive process that includes input from our embassies and several inter-agency review panels. We work collaboratively with regional and functional bureaus to ensure that funds are used to produce maximum and lasting results.

However, we recognize that that not all programs will achieve their strategic goals and objectives. This does not mean that the initial decision to fund them was an error. A number of external factors, such as natural disasters (Haiti) or political turmoil (Cote d'Ivoire) can change how a program operates or affect program outcomes. Through

continuous monitoring, we are able to promptly identify issues and risks related to program implementation and work with grantees to improve rates of success or redirect funding if it becomes apparent that a grantee is unable to fulfill its commitment.

- j. Do you believe that any grants made by the State Department during the last three years were failures? If so, identify the grants and provide a detailed explanation of why each such grant was a failure.

Answer:

Our office is charged with administering roughly \$16 million in foreign assistance to battle a crime that may victimize as many as 27 million individuals worldwide. There are techniques that we know are effective against this crime, and we have chosen often to fund programs implementing those techniques. But at the same time, 10 years into this struggle, the number of prosecutions is relatively stagnant, the number of victims identified is woefully anemic, and the level of service provided to survivors is inadequate. We will continue funding the activities that we know work. But we also realize that making measurable progress against this crime will require innovation. G/TIP has built a staff of anti-trafficking experts who are unparalleled in any government in the world, and I have publicly encouraged potential grantees to not settle for “safe”

proposals if by so doing they fail to innovate and simply create a moribund anti-TIP “industry.”

When we’re brought a project that pushes the envelope, my staff and I will review that project using all of the knowledge and experience at our disposal, because at the end of the day, we’re going to need to break the mold if we’re actually to put an end to modern slavery.

I learned this when I was a federal prosecutor. District Attorneys who boast of a 100 percent conviction rate are not innovators—they may be playing it safe and only indicting when there is proof beyond a reasonable doubt, rather than taking the hard cases for which there is probable cause.

Fighting this crime is an unpredictable endeavor. Our partners are working to effect change in the social and cultural norms and the legal systems of countries often marked by corruption, limited resources, and low institutional capacity. This can take several years – or even longer – and we may not necessarily see the full impact at the end of a given project period. This does not mean that a project was a “failure.” In recent years our Office has increased the award amount ceiling to

\$750,000 and funded more two and three-year long projects, allowing for more time for interventions to take root. We have moved away from funding one-off trainings with no planned follow-up, and instead put more resources into institutionalizing training curricula for police, judges and prosecutors that can have impact long after the project has been completed. We have also provided more continuation funding for projects that have been able to demonstrate impact and are building sustainability.

**Questions for the Record Submitted to
Ambassador Luis CdeBaca
Senator Tom Coburn (#1)
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
September 14, 2011**

Question:

In your testimony, you claim there are as many as 27 million victims worldwide; however, the International Labor Organization at the United Nations estimates there are 2.4 million victims and the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women estimates 500,000 to 2 million a year. Further, Jay S. Albanese, Ph.D., a Criminologist at Virginia Commonwealth University has said: “The estimates of trafficking, both in the U.S. and worldwide, are not based on actual counts, and the basis for the estimates is not reproducible, so they fluctuate in unexplained ways and cannot be relied on to assess changes in the extent of trafficking.” Further, the 2007 Trafficking in Persons Report issued by the State Department say estimates range from 4 million to 27 million, but then a similar State Department report in 2010, which included a letter from you, it estimated there are 12.3 million “adults and children in forced labor, bonded labor, and forced prostitution around the world.”

- a. On what evidence did you base the 27 million victim estimate you provided in your testimony?

Answer:

The 27 million estimate is based on research by renowned trafficking expert Dr. Kevin Bales, and was peer reviewed and published in Scientific American. We believe this research represents the best analysis of the current global levels of trafficking victims.

The low numbers cited in this question stem from definitions of TIP that are predicated on movement, an element not included in the UN Palermo Protocol or the US TVPA definitions. The 12.3 million estimate cited in the 2010 TIP Report is from the ILO, but fails to account for all the bonded laborers. Accordingly, we are comfortable citing the Bales research as the high end of the estimated scope of the phenomenon globally.

**Questions for the Record Submitted to
Ambassador Luis CdeBaca
Senator Tom Coburn (#2)
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
September 14, 2011**

Question:

In your testimony, you state that “61 percent [of the G/TIP’s projects] provide direct services for victims.”

The Attorney General’s Annual Report to Congress and Assessment of U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons issued on July 2010 states: “The funds provided under the TVPA by the federal government for direct services to victims are dedicated to assist non-U.S. citizen victims and may not be used to assist U.S. citizen victims.” Are funds allocated under the TVPA available to provide direct services to U.S. citizen victims of human trafficking?

- i. If funds allocated under the TVPA are available to provide direct services to U.S. citizen victims of human trafficking, specifically what direct services does G/TIP provide, either directly or through grants, to U.S. citizen victims of human trafficking?

Answer:

G/TIP receives foreign assistance funds, which may support anti-trafficking programs outside of the U.S. To our knowledge, these programs have not provided services to U.S. citizens who have been victims of trafficking overseas.

- ii. How much money does G/TIP spend, either directly or through grants, providing direct services to U.S. citizen victims of human trafficking?

Answer:

As mentioned, G/TIP receives foreign assistance funds, which support anti-trafficking programs outside of the U.S. To our knowledge, these programs have not provided services to U.S. citizens who have been victims of trafficking overseas.

- iii. How much money does G/TIP spend, either directly or through grants, providing direct services to noncitizen victims of human trafficking?

Answer:

In FY 2010, G/TIP obligated a total of \$33,436,925 in foreign assistance funds to support a total of 98 anti-trafficking projects outside of the United States. Approximately \$7.2 million supported projects that provide direct services for non-U.S. citizen victims of trafficking outside of the U.S. To our knowledge, these programs have not provided services to U.S. citizens who have been victims of trafficking overseas.

- iv. What percentage of the appropriations G/TIP receives is used to provide direct services to U.S. citizen victims of human trafficking?

Answer:

G/TIP foreign assistance funds support anti-trafficking programs outside of the U.S. To our knowledge, these programs have not provided services to U.S. citizens who have been victims of trafficking overseas.

- v. What percentage of the appropriations G/TIP receives is used to provide direct services to noncitizen victims of human trafficking?

Answer:

More than 20 percent of G/TIP total funding administered in FY 2010 supported projects that provided direct services for non-U.S. citizen victims of trafficking; ninety percent included a victim protection component.

**Questions for the Record Submitted to
Ambassador Luis CdeBaca
Senator Tom Coburn (#3)
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
September 14, 2011**

Question:

It has been well-documented that in 2005, USAID funded Sampada Grameen Mahila Sanstha (SANGRAM), an organization that was comprised of brothel owners and was actively trafficking in persons.

- a. Can you confirm that the Department of State is not currently funding SANGRAM?
- b. What assurances can you give that such an egregious mistake will not be repeated in the future?

Answer:

G/TIP is not currently funding this organization nor has it in the past. In addition, according to FACTS Info, an integrated data collection system and repository that includes budget data from a range of State and USAID reporting systems, no other Department of State office is currently funding SANGRAM.

G/TIP allocates foreign assistance through an open, competitive process that includes input from our embassies and inter-agency review panels. We work very collaboratively with regional and functional bureaus

to ensure that our finite funds are used to produce maximum impact and lasting results. We draw on embassies' first-hand knowledge of a country's deficiencies on counter-trafficking efforts and of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) working within that country. Our Office takes very seriously its responsibility as a steward of taxpayer money. With these procedures, coupled with rigorous oversight, it is extremely unlikely that our foreign assistance could end up in the hands of a corrupt organization.

**Questions for the Record Submitted to
Ambassador Luis CdeBaca
Senator Tom Coburn (#4)
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
September 14, 2011**

Question:

More recently, the State Department provided funding to Casa del Migrante, “a shelter located in Tijuana, Mexico.” Casa del Migrante “provides temporary lodging and other services to migrant workers who are stranded in Tijuana while attempting to cross the U.S.-Mexico border without documents.” Thus, the government was funding an organization that advertises itself as giving shelter to illegal immigrants who voluntarily leave home and attempt to cross the border and enter the U.S. illegally.

- a. Is the Department of State still funding Casa del Migrante?

Answer:

G/TIP does not and has not funded the program you describe in Tijuana, Mexico, with which we are unfamiliar. We are currently funding an organization titled Casa del Migrante Scalabrini, A.C., a faith-based organization operating in Tapachula, Chiapas, on the Mexico/Guatemala border. The program we support provides assistance to victims of trafficking.

**Questions for the Record Submitted to
Ambassador Luis CdeBaca
Senator Tom Coburn (#5)
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
September 14, 2011**

Question:

The amount of money authorized to combat human trafficking has increased exponentially over the years – from \$31.8 million in 2001 to \$185.5 million in 2009; however, almost none of the agencies have any method for tracking the effectiveness of their programs.

- a. How does your agency measure success and failure in a given time frame?
- b. Do you plan on introducing any specific metrics for measuring success in the near future? And, if so, what metrics will you use?

Answer:

In recent years, G/TIP has placed increased emphasis on ensuring sound project design before a project is awarded and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) to measure the effectiveness of funded programs.

To improve program design, in FY 2010, G/TIP began requiring that all applicants submit a logical framework as part of their application package. A logical framework demonstrates the relationship between the project goal(s) and objectives and includes performance measurement indicators for outputs and outcomes of each objective. Increased focus on

project design has improved the quality of funded projects and has facilitated assessment of a particular program's effectiveness and outcomes.

Through a combination of desk and on-site monitoring, Program Officers engage in continuous dialogue with grantees to ensure that program goals and objectives are being met. This involves continuous communication and evaluation through telephone calls, e-mails, and analysis of reports. At the same time, monitoring also grants us the opportunity to provide training and support to our grantees in developing improved measures to establish baseline data and assess program impact. In recent years, we have increased the number of on-site monitoring visits and implemented a standardized procedure to assess fiscal and administrative management and programmatic progress while on-site.

We have also increased our attention to conducting rigorous evaluations of promising practices or programs identified through our monitoring activities. In Fiscal Year 2008, G/TIP began supporting evaluability assessments (EA) as the critical first step in moving toward funding well-targeted, cost-effective impact evaluations. G/TIP is currently funding two impact evaluations of programs that were the subject of the EAs

of two victim protection programs providing comprehensive services to victims of trafficking. In FY 2010, G/TIP funded EAs of additional projects.

As mentioned above, G/TIP has taken several steps to enhance our monitoring and evaluation of funded anti-TIP projects. The Office has also been engaged in developing metrics that can be applied to programs with similar activities and objectives.

First, G/TIP developed a set of standardized output and outcome indicators based on the “3P” paradigm of prevention, protection, and prosecution. Standardizing the performance indicators for our programs with similar activities enables us to better monitor results and identify and highlight promising practices and programs.

On a broader scale, G/TIP actively is participating in the U.S. Department of State’s initiative to revise and streamline the performance indicators used to measure long-term results of foreign assistance, including human trafficking. This initiative, which involved subject matter experts and includes collaboration with the U.S. Agency for International

Development (USAID), is working to develop a system to evaluate the effectiveness of counter-TIP programs.

In addition, the Senior Policy Operating Group (SPOG) Grant-making Committee facilitates the sharing of information about TIP projects funded by the USG. This interagency group is reviewing performance indicators used by USG agencies in TIP-related grant-making and expect to utilize the indicators developed by the group mentioned above to build a framework for evaluation of anti-trafficking programming that can be used government-wide to improve the efficiency and efficacy of limited resources.

**Questions for the Record Submitted to
Ambassador Luis CdeBaca
Senator Amy Klobuchar (#1)
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
September 14, 2011**

Question:

Combating human trafficking would seem like something that all countries could or should agree on, but do you ever run into obstacles with countries that are reluctant to take the necessary steps to address the problem? Or do some countries just not have the resources to tackle the issue?

Answer:

In the 2011 Trafficking in Persons (TIP) Report, 23 countries were ranked in our lowest tier, Tier 3. Pursuant to the TVPA, countries placed in Tier 3 have governments deemed not to fully comply with the TVPA minimum standards and not to be making significant efforts to do so. While these assessments take resources and capabilities into account, it is not a lack of resources that has determined a country's placement in the lowest tier; the governments of Tier 3 countries generally have not shown the political will to address human trafficking in any meaningful way.

While political will is sometimes demonstrated financially, ingenuity, dedication, and expertise can make up a lot of ground that money otherwise would provide. For example, the creative government anti-trafficking team

in Latvia inspired regional units to participate in home-grown awareness raising campaigns. Instead of funding expensive, public-relations developed billboards, the regional teams distributed brochures they designed and produced themselves. In Tajikistan, the government gave officers incentives to work on trafficking cases by increasing the salaries of officials in the anti-trafficking unit by ten percent. Despite minimal resources, the Albanian government took progressive steps to improve its TIP response in 2010. Specifically, they provided economic reintegration assistance directly to victims, appointed a victim-witness coordinator, and assigned two specialized anti-trafficking prosecutors to improve the litigation of trafficking cases and treatment of victims who agree to serve as state witnesses.

