



Funding of anti-modern slavery interventions

Iffat Idris

University of Birmingham

23.03.2017

Question

What data and analysis is available on: funding of anti-modern slavery interventions by donor governments and by private sector and philanthropic organizations; and the estimated funding gap between current spending on such interventions and global need? Focus on support to low and middle income countries (especially Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, China, Indonesia, Philippines, Russia, Vietnam, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Sudan, DRC).

Contents

1. Overview
2. Funding by donor governments
3. Funding by private sector and philanthropic organisations
4. Gap between current funding and global need
5. References

The K4D helpdesk service provides brief summaries of current research, evidence, and lessons learned. Helpdesk reports are not rigorous or systematic reviews; they are intended to provide an introduction to the most important evidence related to a research question. They draw on a rapid desk-based review of published literature and consultation with subject specialists.

Helpdesk reports are commissioned by the UK Department for International Development and other Government departments, but the views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, the UK Government, K4D or any other contributing organisation. For further information, please contact helpdesk@k4d.info.

1. Overview

This review looks at the availability of funds to tackle modern slavery¹ and human trafficking², and the availability of data in this regard. It seeks to move beyond the findings of Martina Ucnikova's 2014 paper, *OECD and Modern Slavery: How much aid money is spent to tackle the issue?*, and identify updated (post-2013) data on funding by governments as well as private sector and philanthropic organisations. The review found a very limited peer-reviewed academic literature in this regard and drew largely on reports by development organisations and think tanks (though these too were limited). The query called for a specific focus on LMICs, in particular 12 identified countries. However, most anti-modern slavery funding is directed globally and/or data is not disaggregated by country. This and time constraints meant it was not possible to address this aspect of the query.

Key findings are as follows:

- **Lack of comprehensive database on government anti-modern slavery funding:** The OECD-DAC provides the most detailed information on international development spending, but is not structured to give data on anti-modern slavery spending.³ The Global Slavery Index (GSI) (Walk Free Foundation, 2016) and the US Department of State's annual *Trafficking in Persons* reports (US Dept. of State, 2016) rank countries on the estimated prevalence of slavery (GSI only) and on government steps to tackle the issue. Neither give figures for country-wise anti-modern slavery funding.
- **Challenges in calculating individual donor country spending on anti-modern slavery interventions:** This would entail looking at diverse development programmes targeting different countries, regions and sectors, and individual departmental budgets. Spending to tackle modern slavery would have to be identified and aggregated from these. The review found nothing to suggest that Ucnikova's findings (2014) on the challenges in this (e.g. difficulty of disaggregating anti-modern slavery spending from wider development spending) are no longer valid.
- **Similar challenges in calculating anti-modern slavery funding in individual recipient countries:** Target countries receive support from diverse sources – donor governments and agencies, their own government spending, private sector and philanthropic organisations – and this would all need to be identified and aggregated to give a figure for overall spending on anti-modern slavery interventions.
- **Diverse UN Funds provide small-scale funding:** The UN has a number of funding instruments, notably the UN Slavery Fund and UN Human Trafficking Fund. Contributions to these funds have been limited (USD 2.28 million in the case of the Human Trafficking Fund over five years) (UNODC, 2016: 3-4); scarcity of resources is

¹ 'Modern slavery' is a term that encompasses a variety of situations in which one person is forcibly controlled by one or more others for the purpose of exploitation, including human trafficking and forced labour. It takes many forms: debt bondage, forced labour, descent based slavery, domestic slavery, sexual slavery and forced marriage, and illegal exploitation of children, including during conflict and through prostitution (Cockayne, 2015: 11).

² Modern slavery and human trafficking are generally referred to together in the literature: available data does not distinguish between these. Hence the terms are used collectively in this review.

³ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-data/>

made worse by duplication of effort and lack of coordination between the different funds (Cockayne, 2015: 45). Eradication of modern slavery is also a target under Sustainable Development Goal 8, but monitoring for this does not look at funding commitments (Boll, 2017).

- **There is no single database of private sector and philanthropic organisations funding of anti-modern slavery interventions:** End Slavery Now has an Antislavery Directory⁴ which gives country-by-country lists of organisations working to tackle slavery in each, but this is not comprehensive and does not give funding figures.
- **Private sector/philanthropic contributions can be greater than government spending:** Humanity United, the Freedom Fund, the Global Fund to End Slavery and Google are among the key donors in the sector (Moses, 2016). Private sector and philanthropic contributions are often on a larger scale than government funding. The Freedom Fund, for example, has already mobilised USD 50 million (as of 2014) out of its target USD 100 million (Cockayne, 2015: 46).
- **Total spending to tackle modern slavery still falls far short of needs:** The literature does not provide figures for the gap between current funding of anti-modern slavery interventions and global needs, but makes clear that the former falls far short of requirements (Moses, 2016). The estimated number of people in modern slavery globally is 45.8 million (Walk Free Foundation, 2016: 4); the forced labour sector is worth an estimated USD 150 billion (Moses, 2016).
- **The most effective approach to tackling modern slavery is through government-private/philanthropic sector partnerships:** The literature highlights the fact that modern slavery and human trafficking can best be tackled through public-private partnerships (Cockayne, 2015; Abramowitz, 2015).

2. Funding by donor governments

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) DAC

The OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) has a framework for collating and reporting on international development aid, both by sector and country (donors and recipients).⁵ However, its reporting codes are broad, e.g. social infrastructure, economic infrastructure, humanitarian aid, debt relief, multi-sector. As noted by Ucnikova (2014: 144), only three codes in the DAC framework cover modern slavery, and those focus on child labour and child soldiers, as well as the very broad 'victims of trafficking'. The OECD-DAC is therefore not structured to report on donor spending or recipient funding of anti-modern slavery interventions.

Global Slavery Index

The Global Slavery Index provides country by country information on the estimated prevalence of modern slavery and the steps taken by each government to respond to the issue. There are 98

⁴ <http://www.endslaverynow.org/connect>

⁵ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-data/>

indicators for the latter, looking at factors such as whether the country has the necessary laws in place, provides support to victims and ensures the application of labour standards to vulnerable populations.⁶ One of the indicators for government response is whether national action plans to tackle slavery are fully funded: this is marked as '0' or '1'. However, the Index does not give actual figures for funding of anti-slavery interventions.

The Global Slavery Index 2016 covered 161 countries – Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Syria and Yemen were excluded because of ongoing conflict. It found that the governments with the strongest response to modern slavery were The Netherlands, United States, United Kingdom, Sweden, Australia, Portugal, Croatia, Spain, Belgium and Norway (Walk Free Foundation, 2016: 5). 'Response' here is not confined to funding anti-slavery interventions, but it is one factor taken into consideration in deciding a country's ranking. The Global Slavery Index also correlates government response to slavery against GDP (PPP). On that basis it identified a number of wealthy, stable countries that had taken little action in combating modern slavery, including Qatar, Singapore, Kuwait, Brunei, Hong Kong, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Oman, Japan and South Korea (Walk Free Foundation, 2016: 5). The finding with regard to Japan is refuted by other studies which show the country is the third biggest funder of anti-slavery interventions after the United States and Norway (Ucnikova, 2014: 138). This suggests the need to refine the methodology used for deciding the Global Slavery Index rankings.

US Trafficking in Persons reports

The US Department of State produces an annual *Trafficking in Persons* (TIP) report. Its website describes this as 'the world's most comprehensive resource of governmental anti-human trafficking efforts....It represents an updated, global look at the nature and scoping of trafficking in persons and the broad range of government actions to confront and eliminate it'.⁷ The TIP reports do not give a country by country ranking, but rather place countries into one of three tiers based on the extent of their government's efforts to comply with the 'minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking' found in Section 108 of the US Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) 2000.⁸ A Tier 1 ranking is the highest: it does not mean that a country has no human trafficking problem but rather that its government is compliant with the TVPA's minimum standards (US Dept. of State, 2016: 36). The focus of the TIP reports is on actions in relation to tackling trafficking, specifically prosecution, protection and prevention. Funding does not feature significantly in the country analyses. Indeed, the only specific mention of funding is in the context of government funding and partnership with NGOs to provide victims access to primary health care, counselling and shelter (US Dept. of State, 2016: 36).

⁶ <http://www.globalslaveryindex.org/methodology/>

⁷ <https://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/tiprpt/index.htm>

⁸ <https://www.state.gov/j/tip/laws/index.htm>

United Nations

The UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) lists the main UN agencies, programmes, NGOs and foundations working on contemporary slavery.⁹ Key UN agencies include OHCHR, UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), International Labour Organisation (ILO), International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF). The UN has a range of funding instruments to support anti-modern slavery interventions, described below. These work on very similar issues but operate completely separately, raising concerns about duplication of work and transaction costs, and competition for scarce resources (Cockayne, 2015: 45). In the case of the UN Slavery Fund and UN Human Trafficking Fund, despite the huge similarities in objectives and approach, 'there has been no systematic effort to coordinate their work, share costs, or otherwise coordinate strategies' (ibid).

Sustainable Development Goals

A number of Sustainable Development Goal targets are relevant to slavery and trafficking. Most pertinent is Target 7 of SDG 8, under which states commit to: 'Take immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human trafficking and secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour, including recruitment and use of child soldiers, and by 2025 end child labour in all its forms' (Cockayne, 2015: 22). The indicator to measure achievement of Target 8.7 is the 'Proportion and number of children aged 5-17 years engaged in child labour, by sex and age' (Boll, 2017: slide 4). The SDG monitoring framework does not have provision to assess spending by governments to tackle slavery and trafficking.

UN Voluntary Trust Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery

Commonly referred to as the UN Slavery Fund this was set up by the General Assembly in 1991 and is administered by OHCHR. Through small grants it supports projects offering humanitarian, medical, psychological, legal and financial assistance to victims of modern slavery. As of 2015 it had supported over 400 organisations in 95 countries.¹⁰ However – compared to the scale of the problem – funding is very small-scale. The Fund's own estimate of required annual contributions is USD 2 million: actual contributions have fluctuated between 2002 and 2015 between USD 208,827 and USD 886,482, and it is currently dependent on a handful of donors, notably Germany (Cockayne, 2015: 42). Contributions received/pledged between 1 January and 30 November 2016 totalled USD 716,076, from ten countries and the Holy See; the biggest contributions were from Germany, Australia and the United Kingdom.¹¹

In 2015 the Fund was supporting 44 projects in 35 countries, and was expecting to reach 29,014 victims through these – roughly 0.1 percent of suspected global victims of slavery (Cockayne, 2015: 43). A further point to note is that, since the Fund deals with small-scale projects, administration costs are high: only around 70 percent of contributions are actually disbursed to victims, the remainder covers Fund costs (ibid). A recent report concluded that, 'after 20 years of

⁹ <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Slavery/UNVTFCFS/Pages/SlaveryList.aspx>

¹⁰ <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Slavery/UNVTFCFS/Pages/WhattheFundis.aspx>

¹¹ <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Slavery/UNVTFCFS/ListOfDonors.pdf>

operation, the Slavery Fund is not close to covering its management costs, relying on OHCHR regular budgetary support and cross-subsidization by the Torture Fund' (ibid).

UN Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking

The other name for this is the UN Human Trafficking Fund. It was set up in 2010 as a parallel trust fund to the Slavery Fund, focused on victims of trafficking. It is managed by UNODC rather than OHCHR. Contributions from member states have been of a similar scale to those to the Slavery Fund: rising from USD 79,109 in its first half year to USD 794,197 in 2013 from a total of 13 member states, but then dropping down to USD 155,893 in 2015 (UNODC, 2015: 3). However, unlike the Slavery Fund, the Human Trafficking Fund has also received private sector donations. These accounted for almost one third of its total USD 2.28 million income as of 2015 (UNODC, 2016: 3-4). The five largest donors as of 2015 were Qatar, Australia, Orascom Telecom Holding, France and the United Arab Emirates (Cockayne, 2015: 45).

The UN Human Trafficking Fund supports about 2,000 victims per year through the award of grants to fund projects by civil society organizations specialising in victim assistance. As of December 2015 it had supported 30 NGO projects in 26 countries around the world, with grants worth USD 1.26 million (UNODC, 2015: 3). Its impact – given the scale of the problem - will therefore clearly be very limited (Cockayne, 2015). As with the Slavery Fund, there are also issues with meeting its operational costs and ensuring a large proportion of funds go to supporting victims (Cockayne, 2015: 45).

International Criminal Court (ICC) Trust Fund for Victims

The ICC provides assistance to victims (as defined in Rule 85 of the ICC Rules of Procedure and Evidence) and their families who have suffered physical, psychological and/or material harm as a result of crimes under the Rome Statute – even if those crimes have not been charged or proven in the ICC. This can be both monetary support and physical and psychological rehabilitation services. The Trust Fund has a particular focus on sexual and gender-based violence. As of 2015, it had helped over 100,000 victims. Its resources as of July 2014 were USD 10 million (Cockayne, 2015: 45). [Note that not all of these funds and victims helped would be in relation to modern slavery, but such victims would be covered under the ICC Trust Fund's remit.]

Individual countries

Contributions by individual donor countries to anti-modern slavery efforts are difficult to calculate for the reasons outlined by Ucnikova (2014): spending on modern slavery is often managed by a range of government departments making it difficult to trace, calculate and aggregate, and it can be hard to disaggregate spending on modern slavery from broader development spending. Programmes can target different countries/regions and different sectors; moreover, they can run over several years – all of which makes it hard to disaggregate and collate spending specifically to tackle modern slavery. This review found nothing to suggest that Ucnikova's conclusions are no longer valid.

The same challenges apply when trying to assess funding of anti-modern slavery interventions in individual recipient countries. Since there can be diverse funding sources – national and local governments (in the country), donor governments and agencies, private sector and philanthropic organisations – spending by all of these would have to be identified and aggregated to give a

total figure. While this was beyond the scope of this review, it would in any case be a difficult and time-consuming task.

3. Funding by private sector and philanthropic organisations

Humanity United

Humanity United is a philanthropic foundation, launched in 2008 by The Omidyar Group. It is 'dedicated to bringing new approaches to global problems that have long been considered intractable'.¹² Ending slavery and human trafficking is a top priority for the foundation. Its Advancing Freedom grant-making programme supports groups working on anti-slavery advocacy, private sector engagement and those pushing for increased government action on the issue (Moses, 2016). Between 2011 and 2014, Humanity United had contributed USD 17.5 million towards projects tackling modern slavery (Ucnikova, 2014: 148). In 2015 it was reported that its founders, Pierre and Pam Omidyar had committed a further USD 50 million to fight human trafficking and modern slavery (Abramowitz, 2015).

In 2012 Humanity United and the US government (Departments of State, Justice, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, and Labour) launched Partnership for Freedom. This is a public-private partnership 'designed to bring private investment in innovation together with government experience to develop solutions to fight modern slavery' (Abramowitz, 2015). Partnership for Freedom has undertaken a series of innovation challenges (competitions) to inspire, reward, pilot and potentially scale constructive solutions to end trafficking and support survivors. Under the first challenge a total of USD 1.77 million was awarded to 12 projects (Humanity United, 2015: 8). The current third challenge (launched in 2016) is focused on changing attitudes, policies and processes to ensure that trafficking survivors are treated with dignity. Successful groups are awarded grants to implement their projects. All funding for prizes comes from private donors. Additional partners have come on board for the third challenge: the NoVo Foundation, Steven Spielberg's Righteous Persons Foundation, the Goldman Sachs 10,000 Women Initiative, and the Ray and Dagmar Dolby Family Fund.¹³

Humanity United has also launched two separate organisations to advance its anti-modern slavery and human trafficking strategy. The first is the Alliance to End Slavery and Trafficking (ATEST). Set up in 2007, this is a US-based coalition that advocates for solutions to prevent and end all forms of human trafficking and modern slavery around the world. The second is the Freedom Fund, described below. Humanity United's *Performance Report 2014* gives some details of funding awarded by Humanity United to various initiatives to counter modern slavery (Humanity United, 2015).

¹² <https://humanityunited.org/about/>

¹³ <https://www.partnershipforfreedom.org/what-is-pff/#our-partners>

Freedom Fund

The Freedom Fund was set up in 2013 by Humanity United, the Legatum Foundation and the Minderoo Foundation. The Legatum Foundation is the development arm of the Legatum Group. Human trafficking is one of its core sectors; over the past decade Legatum has funded over 125 projects aimed at empowering, educating and rescuing victims of trafficking and slavery.¹⁴ The Minderoo Foundation was set up in 2001 and originally called the Australian Children's Trust. It supports a range of causes including ending indigenous disadvantage and ensuring opportunities for children. The Minderoo Foundation's Walk Free Foundation is a global organisation focused on fighting modern slavery.

The Freedom Fund claims to be the first private philanthropic initiative set up with the sole purpose of combating slavery. Founded with contributions of USD 30 million by Humanity United, Legatum and Mindaroo Foundations, it aims to mobilise a further USD 70 million and put this all to use by 2020. As of January 2014 it had already mobilized a total of USD 50 million, from its founders as well as additional investors: Children's Investment Fund Foundation, the Stardust Fund and C&A Foundation (Cockayne, 2015: 46).

The Freedom Fund uses these resources to invest in 'best of class' anti-slavery interventions. It maps interventions around the world, and invests in those geographic regions with a very high prevalence of slavery ('hotspots') and in those industry and thematic sectors ('clusters') where it will have the greatest impact. It also aims to encourage greater collaboration between actors and partners in the anti-slavery sector through knowledge development and dissemination. As of June 2016, the Freedom Fund was supporting over 95 partner organisations around the world, including community-based NGOs, national and international organizations. A full list of organisations and funds awarded to each is given on Freedom Fund's website.¹⁵ Hotspot project sites are in Brazil, Central Nepal, Ethiopia, Myanmar, Northern India, South-Eastern Nepal, Southern India and Thailand (ibid).

Global Fund to End Slavery

The Global Fund to End Slavery is a recently established Washington-based public-private partnership to dismantle the systems of slavery. It seeks to address the major, structural gaps that require a coordinated, international response. Thus it focuses on engaging with governments, businesses, civil society and international organisations to drive country-wide transformations. Its aim is to reduce slavery in target countries by 50 percent by 2022 (Cockayne, 2015: 46). Launched with start-up funding of USD 5 million,¹⁶ it seeks to secure Congressional grants of up to USD 250 million over eight years, conditional upon it securing USD 500 million from other governments and USD 750 million from private sector donors – a total of USD 1.5 billion (Cockayne, 2015: 46).

¹⁴ <http://www.legatum.org/trafficking>

¹⁵ <http://www.legatum.org/external?http://www.freedomfund.org>

¹⁶ <http://dubrof.com/our-clients/featured-engagements/global-fund-to-end-slavery-chief-measurement-impact-evaluation-officer/>

The Global Fund will work with each country to develop its own Costed National Plan (CNP) to end slavery. Each CNP will include prioritisation of proven strategies, assignment of responsibilities, costs, and timelines for implementation. National Councils of local leaders will drive efforts to conclude CNPs. The Fund will provide incentive payments for implementing projects outlined in the agreed CNPs. A prerequisite for funding will be agreement to robust monitoring and impact evaluation. A key focus of the Fund is on programming for sustainability. This refers to anticipating the economic, political and social dislocation associated with eradication of slavery, and working to ensure the local economy has the capacity to absorb those coming out of slavery – thereby ensuring progress is sustainable.¹⁷ As yet, the Global Fund is in the very early stages of being established.

End Slavery Now

End Slavery Now was set up in 2009 to highlight the many ways in which ordinary people can get involved in the fight to end slavery. Its Antislavery Directory¹⁸ gives country by country lists of organisations working there to tackle modern slavery. The directory includes website links for each organisation, the type of slavery it focuses on (e.g. child labour, sex trafficking, domestic servitude) and the state/province it works in. The directory does not give any information on resources and sources of funding for the organizations it lists. The countries covered in the directory include Bangladesh, China, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines and Russia.

Google

Google has been providing large-scale funding for interventions tackling slavery for many years now. In 2011 it gave USD 11.5 million to combat slavery: USD 8 million went to the International Justice Mission in India to support anti-slavery coalitions, direct intervention projects and government-led rescue operations (Moses, 2016). Nearly USD 2 million went to the US Anti-Trafficking Resource Centre hotline. This was followed by US\$ 1 million to the UK Home Office to launch a similar helpline for victims of slavery in the UK. Google's Global Impact Awards support non-profits using technology and innovation to tackle tough human challenges. Under these it has provided USD 3 million in grants to the Polaris Project (which describes itself as a 'leader in the global fight to eradicate modern slavery'), and anti-slavery groups La Strada International and Liberty Asia (Moses, 2016).

4. Gap between current funding and global need

The Global Slavery Index 2016 estimates that 45.8 million people globally are in modern slavery (Walk Free Foundation, 2016: 4). Just five countries account for 58 percent of these: India, China, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Uzbekistan (ibid). Clearly it is a massive problem. This review did not come across any updated figures for anti-modern slavery funding needs to those calculated by Kevin Bales and cited in Ucnikova's 2014 paper. He estimated that USD 13.5

¹⁷ <http://www.fundtoendslavery.org/pathwaytoendingslavery/programming/>

¹⁸ <http://www.endslaverynow.org/connect>

billion was required to eradicate slavery worldwide (Ucnikova, 2014: 147). Later reports also cite Kevin Bales' figures (Cockayne, 2015: 24).

But while the literature does not give precise figures for the funding-needs gap, it consistently refers to the inadequacy of current funding for anti-modern slavery interventions (Cockayne, 2015; Moses, 2016). The ILO's estimate of USD 150 billion for the value of the forced labour business is contrasted with Ucnikova's calculation of USD 124 million annual spending by OECD countries to tackle slavery and trafficking (ibid). Even the large private sector funds, such as the USD 50 million (as of 2014) Freedom Fund and the planned USD 1.5 billion Global Fund to End Slavery (currently at USD 5 million), are dwarfed by the scale of the problem they are confronting. Moses concludes that 'overall, there's not a lot of anti-slavery money flowing in these days, with the vast majority of funders avoiding this very dark corner of grant-making. In comparison to other global health, development and humanitarian challenges, modern slavery rarely makes the top of the priority list' (Moses, 2016).

Cockayne highlights the fact that the costs of ending slavery will be substantial. 'They are not only the costs of intervention programmes themselves, but also potentially the costs of compensation for those who lose out in the short-term from the transformation (i.e. the vested interests), the costs of rehabilitation and reintegration of survivors, and the costs of structural adjustment (such as capital reallocation and changes in labour and capital productivity)' (Cockayne, 2015: 24). Given these huge costs, he calls for anti-slavery to be taken as a large-scale development project, involving public and private donors, multilateral development banks and development finance agencies. Abramowitz of Humanity United echoes this call for public-private partnerships to tackle slavery: 'The business of human trafficking is too large to allow fragmentation of efforts, which is why bringing government, business and civil society together is key' (Abramowitz, 2015).

5. References

- Abramowitz, D. (2015). Testimony to US Senate Foreign Relations Committee. 4 February 2015. Retrieved from: <https://humanityunited.org/ending-modern-slavery-what-is-the-best-way-forward/>
- Boll, S. (2017). 'Monitoring and Reporting in the Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative Against Trafficking (COMMIT Process)'. Presentation at UN-ACT Regional Workshop, 3 February 2017. Retrieved from: <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic-social/meetings/2017/bangkok--international-migration-data/Session%209/Session%209%20UNAct.pdf>
- Cockayne, J. (2015). *Unshackling Development: Why we need a global partnership to end modern slavery*. United Nations University and Freedom Fund. Retrieved from: <http://freedomfund.org/wp-content/uploads/Unshackling-Development-FINAL-FOR-EMAIL.pdf>
- Humanity United (2015). *Performance Report 2014*. Retrieved from: https://humanityunited.org/performance-report-2014/assets/media/HU%202014-Performance-Report_June2015.pdf
- Morris, S. et al (2015). *The Freedom Ecosystem: How the power of partnership can help stop modern slavery*. Deloitte University Press. Retrieved from: <https://dupress.deloitte.com/dup-us-en/topics/social-impact/freedom-ecosystem-stop-modern-slavery.html>

Moses, S. (2016). 'The New Abolitionism: Who's giving who to end modern day slavery?' *Inside Philanthropy*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/2016/3/3/funding-the-new-abolitionism-whos-giving-to-end-modern-day-s.html>

Suhr, B. (2016). *Funding the Fight Against Modern Slavery: Mapping Private Funds in the Anti-Slavery and Anti-Trafficking Sector: 2012-2014*. Freedom Fund and Humanity United. Retrieved from: <http://freedomfund.org/wp-content/uploads/Donor-Mapping-Report-for-web-FINAL-30March16-1.pdf>

Ucnikova, M. (2014). 'OECD and Modern Slavery: How much aid money is spent to tackle the issue?' *Anti-Trafficking Review*, Issue 3, 2014; 133-150. http://www.antitraffickingreview.org/index.php/atrjournal/article/view/68/66%23_ftn9

UNODC (2016). *UN Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking: Annual Report 2015*. Retrieved from: http://www.unodc.org/documents/human-trafficking/Human-Trafficking-Fund/AnnualReport_UNVTF_2015.pdf

US Dept. of State. (2016). *Trafficking in Persons Report June 2016*. Retrieved from: <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/258876.pdf>

Walk Free Foundation (2016). *Global Slavery Index 2016*. Retrieved from: <http://assets.globallslaveryindex.org/downloads/GSI-2016-Full-Report.pdf>

Key websites

- Freedom Fund: www.freedomfund.org
- Global Safety Index: www.globallslaveryindex.org/
- UN Office of High Commissioner on Human Rights (OHCHR): <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Slavery/UNVTF/CFSPages/SlaveryList.aspx>

Acknowledgements

We thank the following experts who voluntarily provided suggestions for relevant literature or other advice to the author to support the preparation of this report. The content of the report is the sole responsibility of the author and does not necessarily reflect the opinions of any of the experts consulted.

- Freedom Fund Team
- Tom Keatinge, Royal United Services Institute (RUSI)

Suggested citation

Idris, I. (2017). *Funding of Anti-Modern Slavery Interventions*. K4D Helpdesk Report. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.

About this report

This report is based on five days of desk-based research. The K4D research helpdesk provides rapid syntheses of a selection of recent relevant literature and international expert thinking in response to specific questions relating to international development. For any enquiries, contact helpdesk@k4d.info.

K4D services are provided by a consortium of leading organisations working in international development, led by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), with Education Development Trust, Itad,

University of Leeds Nuffield Centre for International Health and Development, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM), University of Birmingham International Development Department (IDD) and the University of Manchester Humanitarian and Conflict Response Institute (HCRI).

This report was prepared for the UK Government's Department for International Development (DFID) and its partners in support of pro-poor programmes. It is licensed for non-commercial purposes only. K4D cannot be held responsible for errors or any consequences arising from the use of information contained in this report. Any views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, K4D or any other contributing organisation. © DFID - Crown copyright 2017.