



NGO experiences of the first round of evaluations by GRETA

Reporting

Most NGOs received the questionnaire either from their government or from the GRETA secretariat. The latter was much appreciated. Some NGOs indicate that just receiving the questionnaire made it difficult for them to provide input, it was not clear what was expected from them. Most NGOs have both contributed to the governments questionnaire and completed (parts) of the questionnaire by themselves. Once the guidance of LSI and ASI was developed in 2012, most NGOs used this to draft an alternative report and did not work on the questionnaire by themselves. In the process of completing the questionnaire, 40% indicate that there was a cooperation with governmental bodies but only in 15%, there really was a joint process where NGOs and government worked together. When drafting an alternative report, many respondents choose to cooperate with other NGOs in the country, in some case already existing networks, in others collaborations set up for this purpose. Several respondents indicate the added value of working together with other civil society actors on this. In one country, the collaboration of NGOs during the drafting of the report has resulted in a permanent NGO network on trafficking in human beings.

Looking at what could have supported NGOs in responding to the questionnaire, they indicate a **clearer indication from GRETA** on what is expected from NGOs and a **clearer structure for reporting**, it would help if they would have had **examples on how others NGOs** have done it. The guidance developed by LSI and ASI was a great asset according to many NGOs.

Country visit

As for the country visits, all NGOs appreciated the roundtables and indicated that GRETA was very receptive to their input, especially during the visits to shelters. They indicate that GRETA experts were very well prepared; so much could be done in a short time. The communications with the secretariat prior to the meeting also added to this and was much valued. But NGOs also indicate that **the time reserved for the meeting was rather short** to discuss all the issues that they wanted to address. In some countries, the meeting with the government was prior to the roundtable with the NGOs which was seen as a pity as therefore, the report was very much focussed on the governmental replies. It would be good if in the second round, **the first meeting during a country visit is with the NGOs**. Some NGOs also had communications with individual GRETA members or with the secretariat after the country visit on specific issues, which was very much appreciated.

Report

Most NGOs were happy with the end result (Very good 41%, Good 29%, Satisfactory 29%), the country reports and did see much of their input included in the report and all issues were covered, only a small group of NGOs did need see their input reflected in the report. Several NGOs indicated though that GRETA took on a very positive and polite tone when formulating the recommendations. **Stronger language could have been used.**

NGOs use the report and recommendation for advocacy work on the rights of trafficked persons and justify their actions and activities with it. Policy papers have been drafted that include the recommendations and one NGO is preparing a campaign 'One year after GRETA', the summary and recommendations have been translated by NGOs to enhance the impact on national level.

Expectations/Recommendations for the second round of evaluations

NGOs are both interested in completing the questionnaire as well as in providing an alternative report the latter often in cooperation with other civil society actors. As for completing the questionnaire, it is indicated that clearer instructions on what is expected from NGOs could be helpful. A guidance such as the one developed by LSI and ASI would be appreciated which could help both the completing as well with drafting the alternative report.

All NGOs indicate that it would be an added value if the governmental response to the questionnaire would be public before the country visit of GRETA so that NGOs can respond to it, fill the gaps and counterpart some of the information. *It would give additional value to compare and to exchange information from different sources in order to inspire integral and holistic measures to deal with trafficking in human beings.* It was mentioned that actually, the government should disseminate the draft and organise public discussions before submitting the report to GRETA. The main reason why NGOs believe that the governmental response should be public, comes from their experiences that the information the government supplies on implementation is theoretic and the NGO input is based on what happens in practise. Further, it was also suggested that the government should allow funding for NGOs to organise and have the capacities to do good shadow reporting.

Several respondents indicate that it would be highly valued if, at the next round of evaluations, more time to discuss with NGOs could be included in the agenda. Not only a longer roundtable meeting, but also individual meetings with NGOs, as in some countries, also amongst civil society not everybody can speak openly.

Also, NGOs would very much appreciate a session with GRETA specifically on the implementation of the recommendations of the first evaluation round, apart from the country visit for the second round.

Topics in the second round

Many are very positive that GRETA attention is on all forms of trafficking, especially on labour and not only focusses on sexual exploitation, it is recommended to continue and also include services and assistance for men and children. All respondents advise GRETA to strongly continue to focus on the Conventions provisions on victims' rights, such as compensation, non-punishment clause, reflection and recovery period, identification continuation of support after return and most of all on the assistance and support **unconditional** to the cooperation with the authorities.

According to NGOs the second round of evaluations should definitely look at the implementation of the recommendations made in the first round. Especially as the respondents value the recommendations and are a bit sceptical that if there is no follow up on the implementation, the recommendation will easily be 'forgotten' by the government.