

## **Conclusions Panel 1**

**by Ms. Eva Biaudet, OSCE Special Representative and Co-ordinator CTHB**

Dear Colleagues,

We heard yesterday a number of representatives from national rapporteurs/equivalent mechanisms (NR/EM) who shared with us their experiences in the implementation of the national monitoring and reporting mechanisms.

The various ways in which implementation of such mechanisms is being carried out in the Member States (MS) is in fact, a reflection of the national resources, national structures, the country's stage in addressing THB, etc.

However, it is important to highlight that such variety is not particular to trafficking, but is a natural process in the way EU MS carry out their work and develop their own structures and mechanisms.

Results from the discussion show a number of areas in which there is dissent regarding the function/role or mandate of a national mechanism. In particular, the issue of:

Independency, Autonomy, and Independent Structure;

Separation of the co-ordination/implementation function from monitoring and reporting

However, based on the responses from the questionnaire and statements made during the panel, the majority of representatives concurred on the value of establishing or strengthening the NR/EM at national level. Moreover, based on the presentations, it is possible to identify at first glance a number of common elements (despite differences in approach) when we look at how this function is being implemented.

Perhaps we could agree that on-going practices (given the results produced so far by a number of national mechanisms) could help us to develop a list of minimum standards/items that should be in place in order to have an effective mechanism. I am convinced that we need a more in-depth understanding of each system, followed by an analysis of common features. For now, let me give you a brief overview of what common elements emerged from yesterday's discussion:

1. A certain degree of independency can be said to exist in all the examples given → all the way through to complete independent status;
2. In terms of the Added Value of the NR/EM, it was cited as:
  - being the capacity to provide an overview of national efforts to policymakers and practitioners;
  - a tool towards more effective policy and awareness raising;

- having the potential to assist in the development of a comparable information system (use of similar indicators, etc);
  - an instrument with the potential to strengthen regional co-operation;
  - having the capacity to provide evidence-based information to policymakers and practitioners;
3. All speakers highlighted the involvement of civil society in their work, as well as access to those responsible for the development and implement of policy;
  4. Greater importance is attached to evidence, which is then translated into the need for comprehensive data collection, analysis, the need to have qualitative research, etc.;
  5. Having the legal basis, which defines the role/function/mandate, as well as appointment procedures, which gives this function the basis to carry out its work, was also emphasized;
  6. The need to have access to data and information covering all areas of THB from specific issues to general information was also emphasized;
  7. An independent/autonomous budget was mentioned several times;
  8. Many NR/EMs also serve as a “focal points” for the dissemination and exchange of information, and have de facto become the ones responsible for answering questionnaires addressed to MS, as well as for providing ready-made responses on behalf of respective government;
  9. The importance of having dedicated staff to fulfil this function appropriately was also stressed;
  10. In terms of the Monitoring Function, examples given showed that NR/EM carry out reviews of the implementation of policy/legislation/action/programme, identification of trends and responses, identification of good practice, as well as being able to provide a picture on the evolution of trends and implementation of policies, etc. ...
  11. It is clear that such a function plays an advisory role, which is reflected for instances in the elaboration of recommendations to Government (e.g., policy and legislative review), as well as recommendations to stakeholders (e.g., identification of needs and practical solutions to be implemented);
  12. Another concrete example given by all was the reporting function through an annual report, or otherwise, which is public, and how this tool has contributed to transparency and promotion of public and policy debate (e.g.,Parliament).

Overall, the examples presented show clearly that models vary and that we need to know more in terms of how this function operates, the results it generates, and what

lessons we can learn from each other. However, we all know that results can only be achieved when the goal we pursue is worthwhile. Structures/functions may need adapting, but we know that we cannot achieve effectiveness and sustainability in our practices without knowledge, especially since we all agreed how rapid this phenomenon evolves.

Perhaps the need to gather, analyse, exchange information, and monitor the situation with a view to address these problems is, in a way, our common thread, guiding us to excel in our work. As such, we need to continue to work together no matter how different we may look at first glance. After all, the project of the European Union is in a way a reminder to us all that differences are not our weakness, but rather our strength! Thank you.