OECD and Modern Slavery: How much aid money is spent to tackle the issue?

Martina Ucnikova

Abstract

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) donor countries spend millions of dollars each year on programmes to end modern slavery across the globe. Exactly how much is spent, however, has previously been unclear. The Walk Free Foundation has conducted research to estimate how much these countries are spending.

This article examines international spending on modern slavery programmes by twelve OECD countries, explores how countries report on modern slavery funding and, ultimately, hopes to serve as a building block for broader discussions about donor spending on anti-slavery initiatives.

A major finding of the article is that between 2003 and 2012, donor countries contributed a combined average of USD 124 million annually, predominantly funding projects in Southeast Asia, Eastern Europe and Sub-Saharan Africa.

Key words: modern slavery; international development assistance; foreign aid; OECD; DAC; donor governments; human trafficking; IATI

Introduction

How much money exactly—or even roughly—is spent on anti-trafficking initiatives? While there have been many calls[1] for increased spending to assist the estimated 29.8 million people living in modern slavery and vulnerable populations,[2] there is very little research examining how much governments are actually already spending, both domestically and internationally, through aid contributions.

In 2014, the Walk Free Foundation undertook research to examine some of these questions. How much money is spent internationally on modern slavery projects and programmes annually? Who are the major donors? Is expenditure proportionate to the size of the problem or the complexity of the response required?

This article focuses on research undertaken on one specific sub-issue: development spending on modern-slavery-related projects over the past decade by major Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) donor countries.[3] It resulted in several key findings. First, as a result of this research, it is estimated the leading OECD donor countries together spend an annual average of USD 124 million on international development projects combating modern slavery, which takes into account both human trafficking and other slavery-like practices. Second, the sector is disproportionately funded by three countries—the United States (US), Norway and Japan—which together account for almost 75% of international development assistance on modern slavery. Third, for countries included in the study, spending on modern slavery is only a tiny proportion of their total development assistance: with the largest spender (as a proportion of Overseas Development Assistance contributions) being Norway (0.36%), followed by the US (0.27%) and Australia (0.26%).

This article begins by explaining the methodology used to gather the data reported. It then proceeds to examine the key findings and offers an analysis of the findings and recommendations.

Methodology

Countries were selected for inclusion in this study based on the size of their 2012 Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) contributions.[4] The countries included in the final estimates are: Australia, Austria, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom (UK) and the US.

This research has used the terminology of 'modern slavery' as the basis of its analysis. As used by the Walk Free Foundation, 'modern slavery includes slavery, slavery-like practices (such as debt bondage, forced marriage and sale or exploitation of children), human trafficking and forced labour'.[5] As such, programmes focused on slavery, forced labour and human trafficking were clearly within the scope of this research. Programmes relating to irregular migration,

---

[1] A number of recent statements by government agencies and anti-slavery organisations called for increased funding, most notably reviewed and evaluated (M&E). See: Save the Children, Amnesty
The Global Slavery Index 2013, mentioned 2 February 2014,
http://www.globalslaveryindex.org/findings/#overview

[3] Australia, Austria, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States. The OECD countries spend further funds combating slavery domestically and some through regional channels such as the European Commission; however, this has been not included in this research.

[4] The final countries were selected based on the size of their 2012 ODA financial contributions. See: OECD, 'Aid Statistics', n.d., retrieved 3 June 2013, http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/

[5] The Global Slavery Index, 'What is Modern Slavery?', 2013, retrieved 2 February 2014,
http://www.globalslaveryindex.org/about/#modernslavery

border strengthening and similar issues were included but only if they were predominantly focused on combating one or more modern-slavery-related issues.

In order to answer the question of how much money OECD donor governments are spending on modern slavery, research drew on data from several sources. Initially, it involved an analysis of primary and secondary source material, both qualitative and quantitative, a content review of reports published by individual governments and non-governmental organisations (NGOs). Individual governments' reports were sourced from departments of Foreign Affairs, Labour, Justice, Home Affairs and development agencies. Additional reports were sourced from various NGOs and United Nations (UN) agencies, including the Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (GRETA), International Labour Organization, International Organization for Migration, the UN Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking (UN.GIFT) and the UN Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons. These reports included departments' annual reports, website information, archives and National Action Plans.

Individual government departments responsible for addressing modern slavery issues in all twelve countries were contacted and invited to comment on the findings generated from desk research. Eight out of the twelve governments responded to our request for feedback: Austria, Australia, Finland, France, Germany, Sweden, the UK and the US. For the four countries that did not respond, publicly available data was used to estimate their spending on modern slavery.

The data-set we compiled on expenditure is available in full at the Global Slavery Index website.[6] Over 2,000 individual projects on modern slavery, dated between 2003 and 2012 were included in the final estimates.[7] It is this data-set that forms the basis of all analysis in this article.

To standardise currency and financing periods, conversion to US dollars and adjustment to calendar year intervals were necessary. For projects with multi-year durations, it was not possible to identify a yearly spend, so an estimated yearly average was used. Projects with a multi-year duration, starting prior to 2003 or finishing after 2012 were included in the total, based on the annual average spend per year within the research time frame.[8]

The research findings are limited both by data availability and the scope of the research itself. In terms of data availability, there has been very little research on funding, so there was fairly limited existing research to draw on. As discussed later on, while data on expenditures were sourced directly wherever possible from governments, it can be very difficult to disaggregate funding on modern slavery from other expenditures. As with other areas of international development, international spending on modern slavery is often managed by a range of government departments, making spending difficult to trace, calculate and aggregate. Spending on modern slavery is also rarely disaggregated from broader

---

[6] The Global Slavery Index, 'OECD Spending Barometer', 2014, retrieved 7 July 2014, http://d3mj66ag90b5fy.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/OECD-Spending-Barometer.xlsx See also additional data and wider project details at: The Global Slavery Index, 'International Spending', 2014, retrieved 12 June 2014, http://www.globalslaveryindex.org/update/#international-spending

[7] The timeframe reflects the reporting cycle of most governments, where reports become available up to six months after the end of a financial or calendar year.

[8] Calculations for individual countries vary. For the US, a cumulative total of 1,959 projects with funding allocation between 2002 and 2012 was used to determine the final estimate. All numbers were rounded to the nearest tenth. Data came from a variety of sources, all listed in the 'OECD Spending Barometer', op. cit. Significant data sources for instance, are United States Department of State, 'Archives', retrieved 7 July 2014, http://2001-2009.state.gov/g/tip/rls/rpt/index.htm ; Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 'Japan's Actions to Combat Trafficking in Persons', Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo, n.d., retrieved 7 July 2014, http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/i_crime/people/pamphlet.pdf

development spending, and the OECD does not separately code types of modern slavery spending.

In terms of limitations of the scope of this research, while other countries contribute towards eradicating modern slavery, this research was focused on a dozen of the world's leading donors to provide the first estimate of what is likely the majority of OECD development assistance spending on modern slavery. It does not account for any internal country spending on modern slavery or programmes addressing issues like education and health that contribute towards reducing vulnerability to enslavement.

Findings

USD 124 million spent annually

Based on our analysis, cumulative spending by OECD donors on modern slavery over ten years amounts to USD 1.2 billion.[9] To reach an estimate of an annual spend, this amount was divided by the number of years in the study (ten). The result is an estimated USD 124 million spent each year on programmes on modern slavery.

US government tops the list of donors

In the ten-year period examined, the country making the largest annual contribution is the US, spending an average of USD 68.7 million per annum, followed by Norway (USD 12.7 million), Japan (USD 10.3 million), Australia (USD 7.7 million), the Netherlands (USD 6.5 million), the UK (USD 5 million), Sweden (USD 4.3 million), Canada (USD 4.1 million), France (USD 1.8 million), Germany (USD 1.2 million), Austria (USD 1.1million) and Finland (USD 200,000).[10]

Proportion of overall aid spending on modern slavery is less than 1%

The twelve countries included in the scope of this research make cumulative annual ODA contributions of USD 78 billion.[11] Of this, less than 1% is directed towards combating modern slavery. Norway's contribution as a proportion of its total ODA was the highest at 0.36%, while Germany's was the lowest at 0.01%.[12]

Three countries account for over three-quarters of all spending

Over the period 2003—2012, three countries accounted for almost 75% of all modern slavery aid assistance. Together, the US, Norway and Japan provided USD 91.7 million annually, out of a total USD 124 million annually.

Projects funded vary in scope and focus

Not surprisingly, the scope, focus area, duration, form and time of disbursements for individual anti-slavery projects vary considerably. The funding starts from as little as USD 700 to cover research and travel costs for a journalist from Georgia, to USD 20 million multi-year contributions for an anti-trafficking project in the Mekong region.[13] An average amount disbursed per project is not possible to derive

---

[9] For per project and country breakdown, see: The Global Slavery Index, 'OECD Spending Barometer', 2014.

[10] The actual annual spending of USD 123.6 million was rounded up to the closest one—USD 124 million.

[11] Based on 2012 ODA figures. See: OECD, *Aid Statistics*, OECD, n.d., retrieved 03 June 2013, http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/

[12] Global Slavery Index, *International Spending*, 2014.

[13] See: P Bazeley and M Dottridge, 'Asia Regional Trafficking in Persons (ARTIP) Project Independent Completion Report', Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2011, p. 1, retrieved 9 April 2014, http://www.ausaid.gov.au/countries/eastasia/regional/Documents/asia-regional-trafficking-in-persons-report.pdf; The US Department of State, *United States Government Funds Obligated in FY 2005 for Anti-*

from the data gathered, as some countries only report on their cumulative annual totals, rather than individual projects.

While multiple US government agencies work on modern slavery issues around the world and contribute a total averaging USD 69 million each year, the US State Department's Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (J/TIP) leads global diplomatic engagement and spending with an average annual spend of USD 20 million.[14] However, it receives on average 270 applications for funding annually with organisations requesting over USD 230 million.[15] Individual projects can last for multiple years, making it difficult to determine how much funding is disbursed each year.

Multiple definitions of modern slavery

There is variation in nomenclature used by countries to record spending on combating modern slavery. In a majority of OECD countries, including France, Germany and Japan, the term 'human trafficking' or 'trafficking in persons' is used, as agreed in the 2000 Palermo Protocol to Prevent, Supress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children.[16] The US government uses the terms 'human trafficking', 'contemporary slavery' and 'modern slavery'.[17] The UK government is shifting towards using the umbrella term 'modern slavery', highlighted by the introduction of the Modern Slavery Bill.[18] This difference in terminology makes it challenging to gather comparable figures across states.

Disaggregation of data

Due to limited Development Assistance Committee codes,[19] it was not possible to disaggregate spending on the various forms of modern slavery. Even existing codes do not have data available for every year or country. As identified through engagement with several governments, this was due in some cases to no funding being made available that year, but in some instances it was due to lack of reporting on the issue.

More comprehensive data is also needed to clarify the direction of anti-slavery spending flows. The most detailed and consistent data on the location of funded projects was provided by Austria, Canada, Sweden, the UK and the US pertaining to programmes in Southeast Asia, Eastern Europe and Sub-Saharan Africa. Australia and Japan focus almost universally on South and Southeast Asia with only a handful of projects funded in other regions. Austria, Canada, Sweden and the US spread their efforts more broadly and fund projects in Eastern and Southern Europe, Western and Southern Africa, as well as Southeast Asia. The remaining countries, Finland, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Norway, only included data on

---

Trafficking in Persons Projects, 2006, p. 8, retrieved 9 April 2014, http://2001-2009.state.gov/documents/organization/78573.pdf

[14] Based on 2009–2012 spending, see: 'International Programs to Combat Trafficking in Persons', Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, 2012, p.2, retrieved 10 March 2014, http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/194938.pdf

[15] Ibid.

[16] United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, n.d. retrieved 15 April 2014, http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/ProtocolTraffickingInPersons.aspx

[17] The US Department of State, *The "3P" Paradigm: Prevention, Protection and Prosecution*, 2010, retrieved 14 April 2014, http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/fs/2010/143248.htm

[18] UK Home Office, *Draft Modern Slavery Bill*, 2013, retrieved 15 April 2014, https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/draft-modern-slavery-bill

[19] The Development Assistance Committee is an OECD development forum that monitors and valuates international development funding. The DAC and Corporate Social Responsibility code lists are used by donor countries to report on their aid allocation and flows. See: OECD, *Development Co-operation Directorate (DCD_DAC)*, retrieved 12 June 2014, http://www.oecd.org/dac/

cumulative totals for anti-slavery projects, excluding a further breakdown by region or country. As previously noted, a wide range of projects, from one-off contributions to multi-year commitments, was identified. While it was possible to identify some funding patterns, a clear analysis of all projects included was beyond the current scope of this research.

Countries do not report internationally on their funding to combat modern slavery

The absence of a comprehensive international donor reporting framework means reporting on modern slavery funding at an international level does not occur. The US Department of State's annual *Trafficking in Persons Report* provides the most comprehensive information on domestic and international spending on modern slavery by country, but it is still not complete. Funding is only a small part of the overall country narrative on prevention, protection and prosecution. Occasionally government reports provide fragmented insights into how much has been spent within these specific areas.[20] However, project descriptions tend to be too broad to determine the exact category of modern slavery.

With the recent shift towards online reporting platforms, a number of countries are publishing data online via the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) organisational standard framework that allows for aid data to be compared.[21] IATI is aiming to support a more transparent aid sector by working with donor countries, recipient countries, civil society organisations and other stakeholders. The IATI Data Registry is a centralised database of government and NGO funding linked to all donor countries' internal databases, and provides access to information on aid allocation, volume, and conditions. Nine countries included in this research (Australia, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, the UK and the US) have joined the initiative already. Despite this, information on modern slavery funded projects was not available, and gaps remain in how spending is reported.

Lack of a Universal Reporting System

The IATI Standard is a promising attempt to bring together donor governments, NGOs and implementing countries to co-operate on aid reporting. As identified previously, nine countries are already using the IATI platform for their reporting. Sweden and the UK appear to be leading efforts to report modern slavery spending. OpenAid.se, operated by the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), is a web-based platform providing detailed information on how the Swedish government distributes aid funding around the world. The search tool allows a user to see exactly where aid funding is going. Each funding commitment is given a unique SIDA reference number and provides information about the region, partnering organisation, duration of the contribution, paid totals, as well as individual amounts distributed on a per-annum basis. This system provides a simple and instant overview of how the money is spent, as well as additional government and partner organisation documents, allowing for further transparency and accountability. Total disbursements per sector can also be accessed and compared with other sectors.[22]

---

[20] For a detailed report on Canada, see: Public Safety Canada, *Public Safety Canada Quarterly Financial Report for the quarter ended December 31, 2011*, 2012, retrieved 15 April 2014, http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrcs/pblctns/qrtrl-fnncl-rprt-20111231/index-eng.aspx. For detailed reporting on Japan, see: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Japan's Actions to Combat Trafficking in Persons*, n.d. p.10, retrieved 15 April 2014, http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/i_crime/people/pamphlet.pdf
[21] For more detail, see: IATI, *IATI Standard,* n.d., retrieved 15 April 2014, http://iatistandard.org/
[22] For more detail, see: Open Aid, n.d., retrieved 15 April 2014, http://www.openaid.se/en/organizations/multilateral-organisation

Similarly, the UK provides DevTracker, a resource for detailed data on aid expenditure, funded by the UK government.[23] However, unlike Sweden, which has funding data available for the past decade, the UK data only dates back to 2008. With the availability of additional data for all countries, it would have been possible to conduct further research into funding patterns, regional allocation of resources and a breakdown by individual types of slavery.

Lack of Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Codes

As with individual country governments, the OECD-DAC framework does not presently account for a range of emerging issues and, as the DAC has acknowledged, does not reflect the current needs of the global development agenda.[24] Only three codes used within the DAC framework cover modern slavery: child soldiers—prevention and demobilisation (15261), combating child labour (16020.07) and victims of trafficking (15150/15150.07/15130.06).[25] This narrow focus on one aspect of modern slavery (children) and the broad category of 'victims of trafficking' draws an inaccurate picture of modern slavery spending by states from DAC reporting.

A globally coordinated strategy is missing

Funding on modern slavery is usually directed towards a single country, despite the often transnational nature of the issue. Some regional and multi-country efforts were identified, such as the UN Action for Cooperation against Trafficking in Persons (UNACT, formerly known as UNIAP), the Department for International Development funded Work in Freedom programme, and the Australia-Asia Program to Combat Trafficking in Persons (AAPTIP). However, country-specific projects are far more common.

While there are international treaties that provide some basis for coordinated global action, these are not matched by a central coordinating mechanism or entity with a focus on funding. The guardian of the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, and the UN Trafficking in Persons Protocol, is the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). While the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime contains a soft obligation to 'enhance' cooperation on this issue through funding and financial and material support, the reality is that this is not backed up by a strong coordination mechanism. According to the *2012 Global Report on Trafficking in Persons,* published by the UNODC, the number one challenge to comprehensive responses to human trafficking is the limited capacity to allocate sufficient resources on projects tackling the issue.[26] Upon reporting in 2012, UNODC had allocated approximately USD 3 million to their anti-trafficking activities for the financial period 2012—2015, while at the same time, they

---

[23] For more detail, see: Department for International Development, *What is the Development Tracker?*, Department for International Development, n.d. retrieved 15 April 2014, http://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/about/

[24] OECD, *Modernising the DAC Development Finance Statistics*, DAC Senior Level Meeting 2—4 March 2014, Paris, pp.4—5, retrieved 16 April 2014, http://www.oecd.org/dac/externalfinancingfordevelopment/documentupload/SLM%20Dev%20Fin%20DAC(2014)9.pdf

[25] Individual disbursements are only available for child soldiers—prevention and demobilisation (15261), which amounts to USD 94.9 million (2003—2012). Other codes do not offer a breakdown by sub-sector and are often too broad in scope. See: OECD, 'Aid statistics', retrieved 03 June 2014, http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats. OECD aid activities can take many forms. Often there is no specific information offered on the individual activities or what is covered other than a broad sector classification (human rights), purpose code (victims of trafficking), recipient country, policy objectives and a short project description. Classification does not cover the individual aspects of the programme, such as the type of goods or services provided.
See: OECD, *Development Aid at Glance,* OECD, p. 8, retrieved 03 July 2014, http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/development-aid-at-a-glance-2008_dev_glance-2008-en

[26] UNODC, *Partnership Opportunities*, UNODC, 2010, p. 88, retrieved 25 June 2014, http://www.unodc.org/documents/human-trafficking/UNODC_Partnership_Opportunities.pdf

estimated USD 20 million was needed to fund their thematic programmes.[27] The UN administers two funds focused on combating modern slavery and helping human trafficking victims: the UN Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking (managed by UNODC)[28] and the UN Voluntary Trust Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery (managed by the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights).[29] However, their limited funding deprives them of the institutional gravity to play a greater role on a global scale.

As other commentators have noted,[30] while donor countries may communicate and coordinate their funding with contractors and implementing countries on a project basis, there is often a lack of cooperation both locally and between donor countries internationally. For example, there are currently only a handful of examples of projects where country 'X' is addressing modern slavery and its pre-conditions, for example in a context of migrant workers, in a source country, while country 'Y' addresses issues in the areas receiving these workers. The majority of funding is often disbursed through a country's development agency and department of foreign affairs, but for several countries, police, immigration and interior departments are also funding modern slavery projects overseas—again adding to the complexity of coordination both locally and at a global level.

Analysis and Recommendations

The need for a global strategy and coordination

A comprehensive global strategy to combat modern slavery is needed. Many recipient countries have national action plans to address modern slavery,[31] complementing national and international legal frameworks. The treaty obligations provide an important level of coherence to funding and projects that is then reflected in national action plans. However, this in itself seems insufficient given the often transnational nature of the issue and modest funding relative to the scale of the problem. More frequent dialogue and communication are needed along with collaborative coordination between donor countries, implementing governments, NGOs, international organisations (IOs) and experts.

In addition, strong leadership is needed to coordinate the global response. Presently, insufficient budgets prevent existing IOs and specialised UN funds from taking a lead on the issue, and countries' spending shows that modern slavery is a peripheral issue for most of them.[32] An impending opportunity to change this

---

[27] Note that one budget item includes and does not disaggregate counter-smuggling activities. UNODC, *Fundraising Strategy 2012—15*, UNODC, 2012, p. 41, 44 retrieved 25 June 2014, https://www.unodc.org/documents/donors/Fundraising.Strategyv._final_print_version.5_Sep.2012.pdf

[28] For the financial year 2011, the UN Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons received contributions in total of USD 463,408. See: United Nations, *Annual Report*, United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, 2011, p. 33, retrieved 15 April 2014, http://www.unodc.org/documents/human-trafficking/Fund/UNVTF_2011_Report_eBook.pdf

[29] Based on contributions and pledges received from 11 July 2012 to 12 July 2013, the second of these funds received USD 457,012 in total. See: United Nations, *United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery Report to the Secretary-General*, United Nations, 2013, p. 4, retrieved 15 May 2014, http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/DOC/UNDOC/GEN/N13/420/96/PDF/N1232096.pdf?OpenElement

[30] See: A Gallagher and P Holmes, 'Developing an Effective Criminal Justice Response to Human Trafficking: Lessons from the Front Line,' *International Criminal Justice Review*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 318—43.

[31] United Nations, *UN.GIFT.HUB Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking*, United Nations, 2014, retrieved 12 May 2014, http://www.ungift.org/knowledgehub/en/governments.html

[32] The United Nations Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons is a first step towards a cohesive approach to combatting modern slavery. However, the plan has not been fully implemented by all governments and has failed to address the need for increased funding. See: United Nations, General Assembly resolution 64/293, *United Nations Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons 2010*, A/RES/64/293 (12 August 2014) http://www.unodc.org/documents/human-trafficking/United_Nations_Global_Plan_of_Action_to_Combat_Trafficking_in_Persons.pdf

pattern and focus on modern slavery is coming in 2015 when the international community endorses a new set of development goals.

The need for increased funding

The analysis of OECD donor spending on modern slavery validates what many in the sector have long suspected: donor spending is not proportionate to the scale of the problem.

Very few estimates have been undertaken of the actual cost of fully responding to all forms of modern slavery. In a global context, Kevin Bales, Professor of Contemporary Slavery at the Wilberforce Institute for the Study of Slavery and Emancipation, UK, estimates at least USD 13.5 billion is required to eradicate slavery worldwide.[33] In terms of what is needed, the cost of protection, liberation and re-integration of modern slavery victims varies by country; however, it costs approximately USD 500—600 per person, in countries like Ghana.[34] At current spending rates, it will take over 100 years to achieve that target.

While it is essential to increase international attention, resources and funding on modern slavery, there also needs to be a broader funding base. Three countries provide over three-quarters of the overall funding on international assistance projects focused on modern slavery. With such a small number of donors providing the bulk of support, there is a risk of large cuts to an already significantly under-resourced sector if just a single donor re-orients their funding priorities.

Private-sector funding is likely significant

While it was beyond the scope of this research to examine private sector spending on modern slavery, the relatively modest scale of government spending suggests private sector spending on modern slavery may be a considerable proportion of total funding on modern slavery. In recent years there have been several large private contributions by corporations and foundations. Humanity United has contributed USD 17.5 million towards modern slavery projects since 2011 and the Legatum Foundation has invested nearly USD 12.8 million across three modern slavery projects.[35] The Google Innovation Award also provided USD 11.5 million on countering trafficking in 2011, and in 2013 Google provided a further USD 3 million on a joint project with NGOs, the Polaris Project, Liberty Asia and La Strada International.[36] The Freedom Fund—a private donor fund—was established in 2013, with USD 30 million in initial contributions from the Walk Free Foundation,

---

[33] K Bales, *Ending Slavery: How We Free Today's Slaves,* University of California Press, September 2007, p. 55.

[34] *Ibid.*

[35] Humanity United has contributed over USD 15 million to modern slavery projects since 2011. Spending from 2011 can be found at: Humanity United, *Humanity United 2011 Performance Report*, retrieved 22 July 2014, http://www.humanityunited.org/performancereport2011/ Investment funding from 2012: Humanity United, *Humanity United 2012 Performance Report*, retrieved 22 July 2014, http://www.humanityunited.org/performancereport2012/investments.php For 2013 spending: Humanity United, *Humanity United 2013 Performance Report*, retrieved 22 July 2014, http://www.humanityunited.org/performancereport2013/investments.html. Legatum Foundation has invested more than USD 12 million across three modern slavery projects. See: The Freedom Fund, '$100Million Freedom Fund to Combat Modern-Day Slavery', retrieved 22 July 2014, http://www.freedomfund.org/2013/09/100-million-freedom-fund-combat-modern-day-slavery/. Legatum, 'Ghana Child Labour', retrieved 22 July 2014, http://www.legatum.org/initiative/Ghana-Child-Labour. Legatum, 'North India Human Liberty', retrieved 22 July 2014, http://www.legatum.org/initiative/North-India-Human-Liberty; and The Freedom Fund, '$100 Million Freedom Fund to Combat Modern-Day Slavery'

[36] Funding over a multi-year period. See: D Molko, 'Google joins fight against slavery with 11.5 million grant', CNN, 14 December 2011, retrieved 15 May 2014, http://www.edition.cnn.com/2011/12/14/us/google-anti-slavery-grant. 'Data Collaboration to Disrupt Human Trafficking,' Google, 2013, retrieved 7 July 2014, http://www.google.org/global-impact-awards/polaris-project/

Humanity United and the Legatum Foundation. The Fund managers aim to secure donations totalling USD 100 million and put this to use by 2020.

Adoption of best practice for reporting systems
While the data available on modern slavery has improved in recent years, there are still substantial quantitative and qualitative gaps. In terms of modern slavery funding, data on internal and international spending should ideally be disaggregated by target group and forms of modern slavery, region and project duration. This will help to avoid a situation where, for example, all resources are directed at female children, but none at male adults or boys as victims of this crime. At the same time, published data should capture how much funding has been committed at the start of the project, actual financial disbursement per annum and a total spent upon completion of a project. Reporting systems used by countries like Sweden and the UK should be used as a benchmark.

If all countries used consistent reporting methods, data would be comparable and possible gaps in funding easier to identify. The OECD DAC Committee could potentially play an important role in changing the status quo. As noted previously, the OECD DAC Committee Framework captures only a very limited proportion of anti-slavery spending. There is an urgent need for modernisation and implementation of dedicated codes related to all modern slavery issues.

Conclusion

This research is a first attempt to estimate the spending of OECD donors on modern slavery as part of their aid programmes. It hopes to serve as a building block for broader discussions about donor spending on anti-slavery initiatives. Now that we know how much is being spent, is it enough? At the most basic level, if implementation of human trafficking, forced labour and slavery laws is required in all countries where modern slavery is most prevalent and resources are scarce, the cost of achieving even this element of the response is likely to far exceed USD 124 million per year. However, for governments to make the 29.8 million people living in modern slavery a priority, it will likely also require global leadership to develop and coordinate a strategy that will address this transnational problem. At present, this role is currently filled by the US, the world's largest single-government funder of projects and programmes globally to end modern slavery. Its leadership could be elevated still further. The 2013 report of the US President's Advisory Council on Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships had as its top recommendation that: 'the Obama Administration lead the effort to elevate and bring to scale the fight against modern-day slavery at home and abroad'.[37] It also noted: 'We can imagine the creation of a Global Fund to Eradicate Modern-day Slavery inspired by the success of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.'[38]

This research has revealed that simple changes to the existing reporting systems are crucial to improving understanding of the modern slavery response at a global level, including its impact. The study also identified several areas requiring further research—the scale of private sector spending, where current spending is targeted, to which forms of modern slavery it is targeted and how effective it has been.

---

[37] President's Advisory Council on Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, *Building Partnerships to Eradicate Modern-day Slavery,* President's Advisory Council on Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, 2013, p. 16, retrieved 15 May 2014, www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ofbnp-council-final-report.pdf
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 18. The Walk Free Foundation has also proposed the establishment of a Global Fund to End Slavery.

Martina Ucnikova is a Fund Analyst with the Walk Free Foundation. She is responsible for the development of the Global Fund to End Slavery. She also teaches politics and international relations at the University of Notre Dame in Australia. Email: martina.ucnikova@walkfree.org