

# SLAVERY TODAY JOURNAL

*A Multidisciplinary Journal of Human Trafficking Solutions*

Volume 1, Issue 2

July 2014

## **Funding and Capacity Building Fuel Cooperation: A Case Study of Counter-Force Networks Fighting Sexual Exploitation and Trafficking in India**

**by Rodney Green, MSc**

Program Manager, Collaboratory for Strategic Partnerships  
and Applied Research, Messiah College

# **Funding and Capacity Building Fuel Cooperation: A Case Study of Counter-Force Networks Fighting Sexual Exploitation and Trafficking in India**

**by Rodney Green, MSc**

Program Manager

Collaboratory for Strategic Partnerships and Applied Research

Messiah College

## **Abstract**

Historically, organizations combatting trafficking for sexual exploitation in India have struggled to cooperate. Due to the multifaceted demands of protecting vulnerable populations and confronting criminal networks, a lack of cooperation can lead to interventions that are ineffective or detrimental. Multiple case studies have indicated that there are three interrelated challenges that hinder cooperation: complex political landscapes, limited vision and funding dedicated to inter-organizational relationships, and a lack of expertise in particular disciplines. One case study indicated that coordinated funding and capacity building fueled sustainable cooperation to form a counter-force that can more effectively combat sexual exploitation and trafficking in India.

## **Introduction**

The author worked in the sector combatting trafficking for sexual exploitation in India for almost two years, and was surprised at how little organizations worked together. Despite good intentions, organizations functioned independently and cooperation was challenging. “Feedback from a multiplicity of non-government organizations (NGOs) working on various issues of anti-trafficking...presents a picture of a lack of inter-agency understanding and appreciation.”<sup>1</sup> This is not surprising. Any form of public action or intervention in a complex multi-actor environment is political and contested.<sup>2</sup>

For example, while the author was in Bangladesh, an Indian organization was in the process of repatriating over twenty Bangladeshi survivors of trafficking for sexual exploitation to two Bangladeshi NGOs. At the border, an argument linked to funding arose between the Bangladeshi organizations over who would

---

<sup>1</sup> Sen, S & Nair, P. (2003) *A Report on Trafficking in Women and Children in India 2002-2003*, Institute of Social Sciences, New Delhi, pp. 361, 366.

<sup>2</sup> Dreze, J. and Sen, A. (1989) *Hunger and Public Action*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

receive the survivors into their care. This situation not only hurt the cooperative relationship between the NGOs, but also the survivors seeking assistance. The author also observed an organization in India providing institutional care suddenly deny social workers from another organization access to the survivors they helped rescue. There was no communication or attempt at solving any problem when the decision was announced; therefore, trust in the inter-organizational relationship was undermined.

While the author witnessed a few examples of cooperation in situations of necessity, proactive and trust-based cooperation remained elusive. Cooperation was simply a superficial concern amongst many more pressing concerns. Unfortunately, due to the complex and sensitive nature of protecting vulnerable women and children and confronting powerful criminal networks, a lack of cooperation can lead to interventions that are inefficient, ineffective, or even harmful.

### **The Building Blocks of Cooperation**

“If trafficking is an organized crime; it requires an equally organized counter-force to fight it.”<sup>3</sup>

Trafficking for sexual exploitation in India is embedded within highly organized criminal networks that exist across national, regional, professional, cultural, and ethnic boundaries. These networks are in the “exploitation business” to make money on anything that contributes to the vulnerability of people, such as poverty, unsafe migration, gender discrimination, weak law enforcement, lack of education/awareness, and weak social support systems. Estimates claim 15 percent (around 350,000) of India’s 2.3 million sex workers are children.<sup>4</sup> The magnitude of the numbers captures the power and footprint of these networks.

Confronting a criminal network and protecting women and children at this massive scale is too much for one organization. The only way to confront such organized and well-funded criminal networks is an organized and well-funded counter-force likewise existing across national, regional, professional, cultural, and ethnic boundaries.

---

<sup>3</sup> HAQ Centre for Child Rights (2008) *Compendium of Best Practices on Anti-human trafficking by NGOs*, UNODC and the Government of India, New Delhi.

<sup>4</sup> ECPAT International (2006) *Global Monitoring Report on the Status of Action Against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children: India* [online], ECPAT International, Thailand, <http://www.ecpat.net/sites/default/files/India%201st.pdf> (Accessed 24 April 2014).

## **The Key Actors of a Counter-Force Network**

International donors - Private foundations, and multi-lateral and government entities that provide funding to International Non-Government Organizations (INGOs) for anti-trafficking initiatives.

INGOs - Organizations usually based in the developed world or north, utilising funding from international donors and other streams to directly provide operational anti-trafficking efforts and/or partner with organizations in the developing world or south through the funding and monitoring of anti-trafficking initiatives.

Destination Area Organizations - Organizations based in urban areas where women and girls are trafficked to. Their interventions include: advocacy, legal services to support prosecution of alleged traffickers, rescue through law enforcement assistance, institutional care-recovery and rehabilitation services to survivors post rescue, and coordination with various State offices for survivors' return to their families.

Transit Area Organizations - Organizations based in urban areas that are transit points usually at the state capital of a region where people who are trafficked come from. Their interventions include transitional care through shelter homes and case management rehabilitation.

Source Area Organizations or Community Based Organizations - Organizations located at the district level of a region, usually rural, where those who are trafficked come from. Their interventions include development focused preventative approaches, detection in missing persons, early warning/interception through law enforcement assistance, and re-integration strategies using case management rehabilitation.

For these diverse actors to confront criminal networks, they must voluntarily cooperate or coordinate in order to prevent unhealthy competition and duplication. “Cooperation based on trust, or the confidence that partners will not act opportunistically, is also associated with the idea of people and organizations working together voluntarily and for mutual benefit...[and a] common purpose.”<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Robinson, D., Hewitt, T & Harriss, T. (2000) ‘Conclusions to Part 3 & 4: Key Concepts and Principles of Co-ordination and Co-operation’, in Robinson, D., Harriss, T, and Hewitt, T. (eds.) *Managing Development: Understanding Inter-organizational Relationships*, London, Sage Publications in association with the Open University, pp. 271.

Coordination on the other hand, “is about control through authority, but this can be imposed or agreed. Coordination mechanisms can emerge reflecting the capacities, legitimacy and expertise of the different parties involved, or they can be pre-designed and imposed.”<sup>6</sup> One of the most basic reasons for coordination is to help to minimize duplication.

To summarize, a counter-force of cooperative/coordinated inter-organizational relationships requires:

- a) Clear organization into cooperative/coordinated inter-organizational relationships based on trust
- b) Mutual benefit
- c) A clear and common purpose
- d) Complementary capacities or strengths
- e) The minimizing of duplication
- f) Funding

However, this framework is not new. Counter-force networks of public and civil society actors are already built and funded. In 2011, Google gave \$11.5 million towards anti-trafficking efforts in India. “The grant will be shared by newly formed coalitions of international anti-trafficking organizations. The bulk of the donation, \$8 million, will go to two coalitions led by International Justice Mission in India, with about half going toward direct intervention and government-led rescue operations, and half toward advocacy and awareness projects.”<sup>7</sup>

Action against Trafficking and Sexual Exploitation of Children (ATSEC) India is an example of an older counter-force network. According to one perspective, “ATSEC is the first network in South Asia to come up exclusively against trafficking. Today it is a formidable army of NGOs supported by several international agencies that fight human trafficking through extensive networking on prevention, prosecution and protection work.”<sup>8</sup> However, in the opinion of one prominent anti-trafficking activist in Kolkata, “restricted to state capital cities, ATSEC is in danger of becoming political platform for organizations rather than an example of services implemented effectively in cooperation/coordination.”<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., pp. 215.

<sup>7</sup>CNN Freedom Project (2011) *Google Joins the Fight Against Slavery* [online] <http://thecnnfreedomproject.blogs.cnn.com/2011/12/14/google-joins-fight-against-slavery/> (Accessed 11 November 2013).

<sup>8</sup> HAQ Centre for Child Rights (2008) *Compendium of Best Practices on Anti-human trafficking by NGOs*, UNODC and the Government of India, New Delhi.

<sup>9</sup> Interview, Roop Sen, Sanjog, Kolkata, India, 16 February 2013. Sanjog ([www.sanjogindia.org](http://www.sanjogindia.org)) was nominated in 2013 as a member of the Central Advisory Committee on Combating Trafficking in Women and Children, an inter-ministerial and NGO committee constituted by the Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India.

These contesting views indicate that building a counter-force is complex and challenging. A network of organizations is not guaranteed to confront trafficking networks more effectively. Uncovering the specific challenges can help develop strategies to empower each actor to play its role in improving cooperation/coordination, leading to better interventions that protect vulnerable women and children.

## **Challenges to Building an Effective Anti-Trafficking Counter-Force**

### **Multiple Case Study Research**

The author conducted primary research on inter-organizational relationships and networks in India, hoping to uncover the specific challenges involved in building counter-force networks and find methods to strengthen these networks to ultimately help combat trafficking more effectively.

As part of a collaborative multiple case study framework, the author applied semi-structured interviews with individuals and focus groups in the USA, UK, and India in the period January-March 2013. The organizational levels of management, field staff, and survivors, connected to various “types” of organizations, were included in the interviews to try and capture a wider picture of the situation. Some interviews were conducted in Bengali/Hindi through a translator.

#### **Types of Organizations**

Institutional donors:

INGOs:

Destination Area Organizations:

Destination/Transit Area  
Organization:

#### **Participating Organizations**

European Commission (India)

Tearfund (*Ireland*), Tearfund (*UK*),  
Oasis Global (*UK*), Geneva Global  
(*USA*), Groupe Developement (India,  
former director)

International Justice Mission (IJM)  
(*Kolkata, India*), Rescue Foundation  
(*Mumbai, India*), Oasis (*Mumbai,  
India*)

Sanlaap (*Kolkata, India*)

Source Area Organizations:

Goranbose Gram Bikash Kendra  
(GGBK) (*South 24 Parganas, West  
Bengal, India*)  
Barasat Unnayan Prostuti (BUP)  
(*North 24 Parganas,  
West Bengal, India*)

The semi-structured interviews revolved around the Feyerherm Framework<sup>10</sup>, which can be broken down into the following themes for the research: perceptions of rehabilitation and freedom, how “success” is defined and evaluated, the purpose and process of inter-organizational relationships, roles of actors in the network, challenges and opportunities of coordinated/cooperative relationships towards more effective interventions, and power relations.

### **Limitations of the Research**

Limitations of the qualitative data included the dependence on the interviewee’s situational factors, subjectivity, honesty, and the ability to be self-critical. In qualitative research, there is often the desire of the interviewee to “tell the interviewer what they think they want to hear.” However, triangulation methods were employed to ensure rigor in the data collected. For example, a transit/destination area organization claimed to work well with other organizations. Other actors who worked with this organization, however, did not agree. This demonstrated that certain responses should be received with skepticism, due to actors being subjective rather than objective.

---

<sup>10</sup> The Feyerherm Framework argues that a strong inter-organizational relationship needs to have clarity and agreement around these elements: “purpose, process, characterization, interests, positions, stakes, and judgment criteria.” Feyerherm, A. (1994) *Multiple paths for inter-organizational journeys*, paper prepared for the Workshop on Multi-organizational Partnerships: Working Together across Organizational Boundaries, European Institute for Advanced Studies in Management, Brussels, September 19-20.

## Research Results

<b>Challenges to building an effective counter-force</b>	<b>Negatively impacted elements of cooperative/coordinated relationships</b>
<p>1. A complex and limiting institutional and political landscapes, which results in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Structure and agency complexities that hinder cross-cultural or cross-class communication</li> <li>b. Difficulty aligning macro, meso, or micro level interventions hindering the ability to define common purposes for cooperation</li> <li>c. Contested meanings of various values and approaches to anti-trafficking efforts leading to misunderstandings and breakdowns of trust</li> </ul>	<p>1. This challenge creates a coercive environment that fails to minimize duplication.</p>
<p>2. A lack of funding and vision dedicated to fostering cooperative and coordinated inter-organizational relationships, especially between urban-based destination area organizations and rural-based source area organizations.</p>	<p>2. This challenge undermines the ability to clearly organize into cooperative/coordinated inter-organizational relationships based on trust, mutual benefit, and a common purpose.</p>
<p>3. A lack of capacity or adequate expertise in realms like psychology/counseling, fundraising, leadership, or monitoring/evaluation</p>	<p>3. This challenge hinders the building of complementary capacities or strengths, and creates a feedback loop that intensifies the limiting institutional landscape.</p>



## **Challenges to Building an Effective Counter Force Network**

### **1. Institutional and political landscapes**

In the historical institutional landscape of anti-trafficking work in India; organizations based in destination, transit, and source areas of trafficking have functioned independently.<sup>11</sup> These weak inter-organizational relationships contribute to fragmented rescue and case management rehabilitation systems that do not adequately prevent trafficking or prepare survivors of sexual exploitation to face trauma, economic, and social challenges.<sup>12</sup> “The linkages between source, transit and destination organizations need to be much more strengthened, with a focus on regularizing communication among them. Coordinated linkages between source and destination organizations would allow case management to be scaled up as an integrated approach, covering case sourcing to reunification and rehabilitation.”<sup>13</sup> However, there are many structural challenges between destination and source area organizations that hinder the ability to work together.

#### **(a) Institutional landscapes – structure and agency complexities**

Both the dynamics of external social structures and individual conviction are involved in the behaviour of a given situation.<sup>14</sup> The limitations and opportunities of urban and rural contexts are examples of structures that impact inter-organizational relationships by reinforcing cultural norms and prejudices. Urban areas contain larger amounts of money and influence, while rural areas lack infrastructure. In addition, source area organizations from rural areas are simply not represented at conferences, workshops, or trainings.<sup>15</sup> “Potentially, destination area organizations have more influence because the rescue work they do is more dramatic,” said a program director from Tearfund Ireland. “Source area organizations probably have more technical expertise in terms of preventing trafficking and providing re-integration support, yet their voice may not be as loud.”<sup>16</sup> One source area NGO manager stated, “No one wants to fund source

---

<sup>11</sup> Sen, S & Nair, P. (2003) *A Report on Trafficking in Women and Children in India 2002-2003*, Institute of Social Sciences, New Delhi, pp. 375.

<sup>12</sup> Banerjee, P (2010) *Where have all the flowers gone? An evidence-based research into the sex trafficking of girls, Andhra Pradesh and West Bengal*, Sanjog, Kolkata.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 71.

<sup>14</sup> Giddens, A. (1997) *Sociology*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Cambridge, Polity Press.

<sup>15</sup> Interview, Roop Sen, Sanjog, Kolkata, India, 16 February 2013.

<sup>16</sup> Interview, Markus Koker, Tearfund, Ireland, India, 6 February 2013.

area organizations, because in destination areas they have hundreds of girls in one place. It is easier for the donor to feel they are getting results.”<sup>17</sup> Even if urban and rural areas desire to cooperate, these cultural, class, caste, and geographical divides are not easy to cross.

### **(b) Institutional landscapes – macro/meso/micro tensions**

On the macro level, a weak public sector creates a vacuum that is best filled by a strong NGO sector. Instead of improving, the public sector can tend to depend more on the NGO sector. The US Department of State’s annual report on trafficking in persons has observed that, “the Government of India does not fully comply with the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking.”<sup>18</sup> It is clear in many cases that the NGO or civil society sector is taking on state responsibilities, including facilitating rescue and rehabilitation, with little to no exit strategy. This creates tensions when NGOs are focused on state responsibilities at the micro level, while others operate at a more macro level seeking state structural transformation or public and civil society cooperation.

### **(c) Institutional landscapes – contested meanings**

Each interrelated facet of anti-trafficking theory and practice contains debates regarding the nature of prostitution, trafficking, social work, criminal justice, migration, poverty reduction, and development. Actors build meaning within these contexts and debates, and therefore see things differently. This contributes to misunderstandings and contradictions that “signify both a potential basis for change and a potential barrier preventing planned interventions.”<sup>19</sup>

When organizations attach too much meaning to one particular approach as the “best way”, it limits honest dialogue and learning necessary for stronger inter-organizational relationships.<sup>20</sup> For example, destination area organizations argue that their legal support for rescued survivors helps bring structural change

---

<sup>17</sup> Interview, Source Area Organization, Kolkata, India, 3 February 2013.

<sup>18</sup> US State Department (2012) ‘India’, *Trafficking in Persons Report*, [online] <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/tiprpt/2012/index.htm> (Accessed 12 December 2012).

<sup>19</sup> Engberg-Pedersen, L. (1997) *Institutional contradictions in rural development*, European Journal of Development Research, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 198.

<sup>20</sup> Robinson, D., Hewitt, T & Harriss, T. ‘Conclusions to Part 3 & 4: Key Concepts and Principles of Co-ordination and Co-operation’, pp.272.

towards a decrease in crime.<sup>21</sup> Even if this is accurate, this system alone does not address the more powerful factors like gender discrimination and poverty that affect the agency of rescued survivors in India.

Another example of contested meanings is when organizations view “rehabilitation” differently. Destination area organizations tend to view rehabilitation as survivors not running away from their shelter homes, returning to their native place one day, and then never returning to the destination point.<sup>22</sup> This is linked to the funding responsibilities and value system of their particular approach, and does not take into consideration the large economic, social, and psychological challenges that face survivors. Source area organizations, on the other hand, tend to view rehabilitation as effective re-integration in their home community. One source area social worker said, “rehabilitation is a survivor being accepted and taken care of by her family and community.”<sup>23</sup> For survivors’ point of view, trafficking is often seen as just one unfortunate incident among many others.<sup>24</sup> Source area organizations identified that the “rehabilitation” and “vocational training” received from destination area organizations does not adequately prepare survivors for the economic challenges and social stigma of village life. Source area organizations and destination area organizations also struggle to find comprehensive ways to equip survivors to deal with trauma long term.<sup>25</sup>

Both of these views of rehabilitation have limitations and contradict one another, limiting scope for inter-organizational relationships. To make things more difficult, to try and change or improve these views would be difficult because it is altering “meaning” for those actors.

## 2. Funding and Vision

Not only does the institutional landscape limit inter-organizational relationships, but individual vision can be limiting as well. “Everyone is for

---

<sup>21</sup> Jones, A. Schlangen, R. & Bucoy, R. (2010) *An Evaluation of the International Justice Mission’s Project Lantern: Assessment of Five-Year Impact and Change in the Public Justice System*, International Justice Mission [online] <http://www.ijm.org/sites/default/files/resources/120610-Project-Lantern-Impact-Assessment-AJ.pdf> (Accessed 4 April 2013).

<sup>22</sup> Sanjog (2012) *Sanyukt: A regional case management program with survivors of trafficking, a summary report of the project context, design, and learnings*, in partnership with the European Commission and Acting for Life, Kolkata.

<sup>23</sup> Interview, Social Worker, Kolkata, India, 13 February 2013.

<sup>24</sup> Banerjee (2010), pp. 36.

<sup>25</sup> Interview, Source Area Organization, Kolkata, India, 3 February 2013.

coordination but no one wants to be coordinated.”<sup>26</sup> In other words, though organizations will attend conferences and say how important cooperation/coordination is, they mostly care only about their own initiatives and survival. It takes a particular vision of what could be accomplished with a unified network to motivate inter-organizational relationships. But vision is not enough, dedicated funding is a necessity.

The results of the research suggested that INGOs, in compliance with institutional donors, are in the best “macro level” position to foster cooperation by coordinating a network of destination, transit, and source area organizations through dedicated funding and capacity building. The inclusion of source area organizations is essential to building a stronger counter-force because of the crucial role they play in addressing factors like prevention, rehabilitation, and re-integration. Geneva Global as an INGO coordinated their network of destination and source area organizations in this way, and confirmed the ability of this model to help foster cooperation and prevent and/or improve coercive inter-organizational environments.<sup>27</sup> Organizations from destination and source areas are willing to engage in a network and be coordinated if there is funding dedicated to it.

An alternative perspective argues that an urban-based destination area organization is in better position than an INGO to fund and provide capacity building to source area organizations, since they are closer to the culture and context. However, it was clear from this research that no destination or transit area organization wanted the responsibility of coordinating source area organizations. Funding/monitoring from INGOs or other donors was the means that provided the avenue for coordination and the provisions of necessary capacity building initiatives to make coordination and cooperation effective.

### **3. Capacity building**

Capacity building is necessary to mitigate the challenges of inter-organizational relationships, but not every funder or consortium leader is in a position to implement capacity building effectively, especially with rural, “grassroots”, or source area organizations.<sup>28</sup> Without capacity building, each organization relies more on their own intuitions and good intentions. This leads to contested meanings, breakdowns in communication, and poor programming. The research suggested that source/transit/destination area organizations

---

<sup>26</sup> Robinson, D., Hewitt, T & Harriss, T. ‘Conclusions to Part 3 & 4: Key Concepts and Principles of Co-ordination and Co-operation’, pp.218.

<sup>27</sup> Interview, Gene White, Geneva Global, Mechanicsburg, PA, 1 March 2013.

<sup>28</sup> Interviews, INGO and Destination Area Organization, Kolkata, 19 & 20 February 2013.

interviewed would benefit from further training on psycho-social therapies, counseling, fundraising, leadership, practice based on rigorous research and evidence, and equipping survivors for the informal sector through entrepreneurship training and vocation or employment programs. This kind of capacity building helps to build shared meanings necessary for organizations to improve their programs, communicate about important issues, and work together to benefit the survivors long term.

Often, capacity building is seen as linked to funding, which can structurally inhibit learning and agency.<sup>29</sup> One way around this is for an INGO to fund and coordinate a local technical resource or capacity building organization that can accurately assess the strengths and weaknesses of all the partners in the network, provide a long term relationship and support, and empower continual improvement.

### **Cooperation in the Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) Sector**

The argument for institutional donors or INGOs to specify parts of their funding towards cooperation costs and initiatives is not new, yet the three interrelated challenges hinder cooperation in anti-trafficking networks. In cases like this, it is sometimes helpful to compare with other sectors like WASH. This sector was chosen as an example due to the author's current connection with some of the key foundations in providing WASH in developing contexts, and the example of the WASH sector defining clearer outcomes to unify partners.

The USAID Water and Development Strategy 2013-2018 promotes "increasing partnerships" and "building USAID comparative advantage on capacity building and governance by emphasizing policy reform, strengthened enabling environments and institutions, participatory governance, and innovative financing."<sup>30</sup> The WASH Senior Manager at World Vision USA commented to the author that, "institutional donors are requiring inter-organizational relationships more and more. The Hilton Foundation, among others, started requiring cooperative relationships with universities and other WASH organizations around 25 years ago. The common purpose was to create a multi-disciplinary team and create an environment for learning with an evaluation every three years."<sup>31</sup> With the funding provisions of the Hilton Foundation of around 2-3% of the overall budget towards stakeholder workshops and 2-3% towards evaluations, World Vision was able to foster connection and trust even

---

<sup>29</sup> Taylor, J. and Soal, S. (2003) *Measurement in developmental practice: from the mundane to the transformational*, Paper presented, March, Community Development Resource Association.

<sup>30</sup> USAID (2013) *Water and Development Strategy 2013-2018*, Washington D.C., pp. 2.

<sup>31</sup> Interview, Randy Strash World Vision USA, Grand Rapids, MI, 29 October 2013.

between faith-based and secular institutions, the Desert Research Institute, and the Messiah College Collaboratory.<sup>32</sup>

Institutional donors are also beginning to cooperate in the WASH sector. Braimah Apambire, a Director at the Desert Research Institute, indicates, “The Hilton Foundation, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Rockefeller Advocacy, and the Buffet Foundation have cooperated to form a platform<sup>33</sup> of funding to minimise duplication and foster more effective networks to provide clean and safe WASH facilities.”<sup>34</sup> They practically achieve strengths-based cooperation by providing a small percentage of the overall budget to setting up coordinating agencies, like the West Africa Water Initiative, responsible for holding stakeholder meetings, providing monitoring and evaluation, and providing a shared identity and voice of the partnership to the public sector. “There are always challenges,” Dr. Apambire continues, “but more has been accomplished through coordination and cooperation.”

The clarity and unity of vision around WASH as expressed in Target 7.C in the Millennium Development Goals could be a factor in the ability for the WASH sector to better fund and foster cooperation.<sup>35</sup> Yet, if the WASH sector is benefiting from international donors and INGOs setting up funding that fosters cooperation, then the same can be accomplished in the anti-trafficking sector if the specific challenges that hinder cooperation can be addressed. The Google funded consortium led by IJM is an example of a step in this direction. Though IJM could be classified as a destination area organization due to the nature of their strategy and interventions, their global presence and operations in multiple Indian urban centers also classify them as an INGO with capacity for coordination. According to a briefing from IJM, the Google-funded effort “trained six other organizations in India from 2012-2014 [and] rescued more than 2,000 people in slavery.”<sup>36</sup> Another encouraging step is the institutional donors Humanity United, Walk Free Foundation, and Legatum Foundation banding together as the Freedom Fund to cooperate towards anti-trafficking interventions and research. “Efforts to combat modern day slavery have

---

<sup>32</sup> Interview, Dr. Ray Norman, Messiah College, Mechanicsburg, PA, 28 October 2013. With funding from the Hilton Foundation, Messiah College partnered with World Vision to provide resources, training, and design research and development for people with disabilities in relation to WASH in a project called The Africa WASH and Disabilities Study. This is an example of a strengths-based inter-organizational relationship fueled by funding, vision, and capacity building.

<sup>33</sup> [washfunders.org](http://washfunders.org)

<sup>34</sup> Interview, Braimah Apambire, Desert Research Institute, Mechanicsburg, PA [phone], 11 November 2013.

<sup>35</sup> <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/environ.shtml>

<sup>36</sup> International Justice Mission, *The Justice Briefing Spring 2014*, IJM, 2014, p.4, [online] <http://www.ijmuk.org/sites/default/files/documents/Final%20Justice%20Briefing%20Spring%202014%20Web.pdf> (retrieved 4 April 2014).

traditionally been driven by individual actors and organizations with limited funding, relative to the scale of this significant problem,” said CEO of Humanity United. “[The] goal with the Freedom Fund is to unite those working in isolation in order to create scalable, lasting change for the estimated 21 million people living under this oppression of modern slavery.”<sup>37</sup>

### **Recommendations to Develop Counter-Force Networks that Fight Trafficking**

The following recommendations are based on one case study of Sanyukt. Sanyukt was “a project to build a coordinated system between NGOs in source and destination points of trafficking towards rescue and rehabilitation efforts.”<sup>38</sup> In 2009, the European Commission (EC) & Groupe Developpement (GD) funded Sanyukt a €1.7 million maximum budget, with EC covering 80%. GD was the extension of a French organization that later changed its name to Acting for Life, and eventually closed its India operations in 2012. GD was the lead implementer in Sanyukt.

The budget breakdown was:

€ 0.45 million	Setting up systems to help with coordination: workshops, research, and evaluation (34% of total)
€ 0.89 million	Funding the 16 partner organizations (66% of total, 4% average per organization):
€ 0.74	Salaries
€ 0.15	Workshop travel expenses

Total: € 1.34 million<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> PR Newswire (2013) ‘\$100 million Freedom Fund to Combat Modern Slavery,’ [online] <http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/100-million-freedom-fund-to-combat-modern-day-slavery-225397722.html> (Accessed 20 November 2013).

<sup>38</sup> Europe Aid (2007) *Migration and Asylum Programme: Thematic Programme on Cooperation with Third World Countries in the Areas of Migration and Asylum*, [online] [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/migration-asylum/documents/migration\\_and\\_asylum\\_2007-2008.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/migration-asylum/documents/migration_and_asylum_2007-2008.pdf), pp. 55 (Accessed 1 October 2013).

<sup>39</sup> Interview, former GD coordinator Anustoop Bhattacharya, 27 November 2013. This funding was dedicated to specific activities to foster cooperative inter-organizational relationships: “10/11 monitoring visits to 16 organizations, 8/9 exchange visits, three regional consultations on case management, 9/10 care givers workshop for improving care standards and methods, and several coordination meetings between partners.”

In 2013, almost a year after funding had ended, the author conducted semi-structured interviews with the following network actors: the former director of GD South Asia, an official of the European Commission based in India, one destination area organization, and two source area organizations. The results of the research indicated that the inter-organizational relationships and the case management rehabilitation system developed through GD coordination continued even though the funding had ended almost a year prior, indicating that the funding and capacity building provided was successful in fueling sustainable cooperation.

In this case, coordination was not based on control, but was done in a way that builds capacity and allows for what Robinson, Hewitt, and Harris have called “building some shared meaning and constituencies for certain forms of action”, such as evidence-based practice or stronger cooperation with other organizations.<sup>40</sup> INGOs like GD function at the macro level, and are therefore able to provide different actors the funding and capacity building necessary to participate in a cooperative/coordination network, establishing best practice principles and standardized processes to link organizations, while also allowing for flexibility.<sup>41</sup> “For the [multi-agency partnership] to function effectively, trust must be established between the different stakeholders, emphasizing transparency while avoiding bureaucracy.”<sup>42</sup> Though not without weaknesses, Sanyukt’s capacity building strengthened these cooperative relationships by building shared meanings, organizing macro/meso/micro level strategies that also cooperated with the public sector, and increasing the ability of organizations to overcome cultural/structural limitations.

### **Funding Seven Capacity Building Elements to Fuel Cooperation**

The research suggested that INGO funding/monitoring of a network should include seven capacity building elements to fuel combinations of cooperative/coordinated relationships at different macro, meso, and micro levels:

- 1) Leadership/staff/systems development
- 2) Shared identity and platforms for partners to build trust

---

<sup>40</sup> Robinson, Hewitt, & Harriss, ‘Conclusions to Part 3 & 4: Key Concepts and Principles of Co-ordination and Co-operation’, pp. 218.

<sup>41</sup> Stahl, C. Svensson, T. & Ekberg, K. (2011) *From Cooperation to Conflict? Swedish Rehabilitation Professionals’ Experiences of Inter-Organizational Cooperation*, Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation, Sep. 2011, Vol. 21, Issue 3, pp. 441.

<sup>42</sup> UNGIFT (2008) *The Vienna Forum report: a way forward to combat human trafficking*, United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Trafficking, New York.



- 3) Research/learning processes towards evidence based practice
- 4) Formative evaluation structure for learning
- 5) Development of project cycles that build up public sector capacity
- 6) Financial security and sustainability training to prevent unhealthy competition
- 7) Accountability through an evaluators appointed by donors

### **1) Leadership development**

Leadership development can help build the trustworthiness of character and competency necessary for building trust within organizations and beyond.<sup>43</sup>

### **2) Shared identity and platforms for partners to build trust**

The Feyerherm Framework is a useful tool to manage expectations of cooperation/coordination. The dedicated funding for platforms like workshop travel and collective governance fosters an identity of “shared power and meanings” where different strengths, faiths, cultures, and perspectives are increasingly appreciated and unified through building “mutual respect”, understanding, “positive relationships”, and “a collective commitment to the common good.”<sup>44</sup> Important in this process is the suspending of one’s preexisting organizational entity to work toward a new, shared identity, which is the first step in maximizing functioning and productivity in a new organizational union.<sup>45</sup> GD demonstrated this by encouraging all partners, including funders, to develop the shared identity of “Sanyukt” based around cooperative and strategic principles.

### **3) Research/learning processes**

Each of the Sanyukt partners had experienced positive results from the capacity building they received, and it helped foster cooperation by helping to build “shared meanings” and evidence-based practice. For capacity building and platform to continue improving, fostering “participation” is essential to increase “ownership”, mutuality, and understanding of best practices and local knowledge/contexts. “Effective participation requires giving people access to information on which to base deliberation or to mobilize to assert their rights and

---

<sup>43</sup> Covey, S. (1990) *Principle-Centered Leadership*, Free Press, New York, pp. 60.

<sup>44</sup> Patel, E. (2013) *Toward a Field of Interfaith Studies*, Liberal Education, Fall 2013, Vol. 99, No. 4.

<sup>45</sup> Clayton, P. H., Bringle, R.G., Hatcher, J.A. (2013) *Research of service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment*, Volume 2B: Communities, institutions, and partnerships, Virginia, Stylus Publishing LLC, pp. 585-586.

demand accountability. To do so requires active engagement in nurturing voice, [and] building critical consciousness.”<sup>46</sup>

#### **4) Formative evaluation for learning**

The formative evaluation structure celebrates double loop learning whether it is positive or negative. Double loop learning seeks not only learn from the ability to meet or not meet a goal, but also learn to question or modify that goal in light of the experience. This helps foster reflective or self-learning for each actor, especially those in situations of power. “Measurement must promote consciousness, openness, honesty and depth... [and] must build confidence through facing failure, celebrating success and learning from both.”<sup>47</sup> Research and formative evaluation addresses the organizational assessment need for improved learning systems, and promotes learning and knowledge sharing important for healthy inter-organizational relationships.<sup>48</sup>

#### **5) Public sector cooperation and development.**

Developing strategies to cooperate with and equip the public sector is important to provide macro level structural transformation towards sustainable change. Often, it begins with the network starting as an “adversary”, and moving towards becoming a “collaborator, then a mentor.”<sup>49</sup>

#### **6) Financial security and sustainability training to prevent unhealthy competition**

In addition, financial security and sustainability training was requested by all southern partners in the research case study. It is important to them because it would help prepare them to transition from dependence on the INGO to a mutually learning and beneficial relationship. Often, southern NGOs partner with more than one funding INGO, so managing these networks is also an important skill. The Keystone Performance Survey of over 1000 southern NGOs summarizes, “[Southern] respondents want northern NGOs’ help to become

---

<sup>46</sup> Cornwall, A. (2002) *Making spaces, changing places: Situating participation in development*, IDS Working Paper 170, Brighton, IDS, October, pp. 1-6, 10-17, 26-29.

<sup>47</sup> Taylor, J. and Soal, S., *Measurement in developmental practice: from the mundane to the transformational*.

<sup>48</sup> Dutta, D. (2012) *Inter-Organizational Relationships and Firm Performance: Impact on Complementary Knowledge and Relative Absorptive Capacity*, Journal of Management Policy and Practice, Vol. 13 Issue 2, p46-55.

<sup>49</sup> Interview, Sanjog, Kolkata, India, 16 February 2013.

strong, independent and influential organizations. They contrast this with being contracted to implement northern NGOs' projects and priorities."<sup>50</sup>

## 7) Accountability

Tearfund stated in their interview, "we have found it helpful to have an accountability organization that independently interviews us and our partners in order to get an objective viewpoint of the health of our inter-organizational relationships." However, in their view, "external evaluations were effective only when the accountability partner understands the network well."<sup>51</sup>

## Conclusion

The funding and capacity building elements of leadership development, shared identity, research, formative evaluation, and public sector development were coordinated by GD. The partners still continuing relationships and case management rehabilitation systems without additional funding demonstrate the design's effectiveness. According to the interviews, adding the capacity building elements of financial security/sustainability and accountability would have further strengthened the network. Funding a separate technical resource organization to support each capacity building element and/or provide accountability is also recommended, because it allows the technical resource organization to understand and support the entire network.

Though not without challenges, GD was able to foster cooperation because it anticipated the three interrelated challenges to anti-trafficking network building in India; complex institutional and political landscapes, a lack of vision and funding for inter-organizational relationships, and a lack of expertise in specific disciplines. At the same time, GD was also able to include the requirements for cooperation and coordination: clear organization into cooperative/coordinated relationships based on trust, mutual benefit, complementary capacities or strengths, minimizing duplication, a clear and common purpose, and funding.

Any actor can follow these frameworks for cooperation and coordination to help improve their inter-organizational relationships. Successful examples of funding and capacity building, such as WASH, encourage movements in this direction. While institutional donors and INGOs set the agenda for cooperation

---

<sup>50</sup> Keystone Accountability (2011) *NGO Partner Performance Survey 2010 Public Report*, in association with BOND, NIDOS, InterAction [online] [http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/sites/default/files/Keystone%20partner%20survey%20Jan2011\\_0.pdf](http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/sites/default/files/Keystone%20partner%20survey%20Jan2011_0.pdf) (Accessed 18 March 2013).

<sup>51</sup> Interview, Tearfund, UK, 3 February 2013.

through funding, organizations in destination and source areas also have the power to collectively influence vision, funding, and capacity building agendas.<sup>52</sup> “The skills of leading a network are going to become as important as those of leading an organization.”<sup>53</sup>

With the appreciation of institutional landscapes and the provision of vision, funding, and capacity building, INGOs and other donors can nurture cooperation by coordinating a newly designed network of destination, transit, and source area organizations. Such a counter-force network has the potential to improve prevention, awareness, advocacy, arrest and prosecution of traffickers, and the empowering of survivors facing mental health, economic challenges, and social vulnerabilities.

---

<sup>52</sup> Interview, Randy Strash World Vision, Grand Rapids, MI, 29 October 2013.

<sup>53</sup> Middleton, J. (2007) *Beyond Authority: Leadership in a Changing World*, Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire.