child protection committee

glasgow

CHILD TRAFFICKING IN GLASGOW

THE JOURNEY SO FAR

Paul Rigby, Sheila Murie, Margaret Ball

January 2012

Many thanks to Glasgow's child trafficking sub-group who have overseen the preparation and writing of this report.

The views expressed in the report are those of the authors based on the findings of the audit and do not necessarily reflect the views of all members of Glasgow Child Protection Committee, the child trafficking sub group, or partner agencies.

Acronyms and abbreviations

AFRUCA	Africans Unite Against Child Abuse
ATMG	Anti-Trafficking Monitoring Group
CEOP	Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre
CPC	Child Protection Committee
ECPAT	End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and the Trafficking of Children
EHRC	Equalities and Human Rights Commission
GRETA	Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
London SCB	London Safeguarding Children Board
NRM	National Referral Mechanism
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe
SOCA	Serious Organised Crime Agency
SCCYP	Scotland's Commissioner for Children and Young People
TARA	Trafficking Awareness Raising Alliance
UASC	Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children
UKBA	United Kingdom Border Agency
UKHTC	United Kingdom Human Trafficking Centre
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

SUMMARY

Two years after the publication of the Glasgow Child Protection Committee practice guidance for child trafficking, an audit of all cases known to the social work child protection team was undertaken. Since the commencement of a research and development programme in 2008, until September 2011, the child protection team have received referrals and enquiries regarding one hundred children for whom there were concerns about trafficking. During this period, it has also become apparent that the needs of trafficked children have to be assessed and addressed amongst a greater understanding of the vulnerabilities of children on the move who arrive in Glasgow.

Following analysis of social work case records pertaining to the children an audit team identified 68 individuals who had evidence of exploitation and movement, plus many with other additional indicators. In the opinion of the audit team, these children met the definition of trafficking adopted for the study – the movement of children for the purposes of exploitation and abuse. Further analysis of the 30 children referred to the National Referral Mechanism (NRM) enabled detailed comment about countries of origin, background circumstances, journeys to the UK, recruitment into the trafficking process and exploitative experiences. No UK citizens have been identified as being trafficked and referred to the NRM from Glasgow.

While the available data is limited, relating to details known to social work services, and predominantly relying on the accounts of children, Glasgow has commenced the task of developing a more detailed picture of children in the city who have been trafficked, and the responses they receive from child protection services. It is apparent that the 'official' figures of children referred to the NRM underestimate the numbers of individuals who have been trafficked.

Children have been identified from twenty-five different countries, some recounting experiences of journeys, abuse and exploitation lasting over two years, before arriving in Glasgow. Children's background circumstances, family histories and other cultural experiences, differ markedly, to the extent there are few common characteristics that could easily inform identification and service provision. 'Profiling' trafficked children in Glasgow remains difficult and contentious.

The identification of children who may have been trafficked, and subsequent referral to the NRM, is problematic as it is clear that workers are struggling to undertake comprehensive assessments that take account of children's lives pre and post arrival in Glasgow. Addressing the issue of trafficking as one of child protection, and providing children with the same level of assessment and service provision as UK citizens is still not fully realised as immigration concerns often predominate. It is apparent that some children who present with exploitation and movement are not assessed in line with the local trafficking procedures and subsequently may not receive sufficient safeguarding supports. Similarly, where children have been identified and referred via the NRM, the decisions of the Competent Authorities are contentious in some cases, especially as referral decisions in Glasgow are made

following a multi-agency child protection case meeting. While local guidance is clear that a negative decision from the Competent Authority does not overrule safeguarding decisions, there are indications that a negative decision has implications for future service provision and monitoring of risks around possible trafficking.

The developing response to the recognition of child trafficking in Glasgow has been characterised by close multi-agency working and the provision of numerous services to address welfare issues including education, housing, health, legal and immigration needs. While this is positive, there are indications that the potential traumas, risks and needs associated specifically with the exploitative experiences are being minimised.

For many children and young people uncertainty about longer term legal and immigration status is a constant factor in their lives. Despite this uncertainty and the possibility of future forced return to their home countries, there are indications that many children who arrive in Glasgow, who are identified as trafficking victims, and access services, settle in the city and manage to create new lives for themselves, apparently free of continuing exploitation. However, there is also evidence that a substantial minority remain in contact with traffickers and exploitation continues, as they move in and out of abusive situations.

It is unclear which of the support agencies have contributed to the more positive outcomes as there is little clarity about the actual services provided, as specific interventions are rarely documented. Similarly, it is unclear what particular resilience factors, and interventions, permit some children to apparently overcome their harrowing experiences, while others remain in contact with traffickers.

Two years after the introduction of the NRM in Glasgow and robust research, policy and practice developments, challenges remain for the effective safeguarding of children in the city who have been trafficked. A continually evolving situation requires a dynamic response, and while there have been positive developments and good practice there can be no complacency, or belief, that all children are being identified and protected. The reality is that we may never know the full extent of trafficking, and without an increased knowledge base about service provision and understanding of the longer-term needs of trafficked children, we will struggle to provide effective safeguarding responses for the children who are identified.

1. INTRODUCTION

Glasgow Child Protection Committee (CPC) has adopted an evidence-based approach to the development of policy and practice in relation to child trafficking. The formation of a local multi-agency child trafficking subgroup preceded the introduction of the National Referral Mechanism (NRM), and the development of an ongoing research programme has informed local guidance for policy makers and practitioners. The development of a centralised database held by the social work chid protection team to record all referrals of child trafficking has commenced the process of monitoring known or suspected cases. This report is the initial stage of a developing monitoring framework for child trafficking in the city.

In early 2011 a confidential statistical report was prepared for the CPC detailing the first 12 months of the National Referral Mechanism in Glasgow. The present report builds on the initial data and provides an overview of what is known in Glasgow in relation to suspected victims of child trafficking and the challenges facing practitioners, placed in the context of global practice and emerging knowledge. In establishing a monitoring framework and strategic multi-agency approach both positive practice, and factors that have hindered progress, have been identified.

The focus and comment of this report is on trafficking into and within the UK of non-UK nationals. No UK citizens have been referred to the NRM to date from Glasgow. It should be read in the context of all children on the move - for most children who arrive in the city exploitation and abuse are not features of their lives, although many may have additional welfare and support needs.

The main findings focus on details of journeys, exploitative experiences, recruitment, information about traffickers and initial responses and service provision, for those children referred to the NRM. The report does not provide a definitive version of children's experiences and 'what works', it is an indicative account of what we know to date and should be considered a baseline for continued monitoring and service development. The final section of the report focuses on identifying the possible constituents of future care provision, informed by the developing knowledge base around the issues of rehabilitation and re/integration in the UK. The findings reflect those of other reports looking at the situation in England and Wales (Pearce et al 2009; Wirtz 2009), and while particularly relevant to Glasgow, and an example of a small scale focussed study (Tyldum 2009), they may provide additional evidence relevant to other jurisdictions.

Terminology is constantly changing in the area of trafficking and while the use of the term 'victim' in this report should not imply a judgement on status, or resilience, it is used to describe children's experiences and their victimisation in the legal sense (Busch-Armendariz et al 2010; Gozdziak et al 2006). The term 'children on the move' is increasingly utilised to describe all children who are moving from their usual places of residence to new destinations (see appendix 1).

2. HUMAN TRAFFICKING

International responses to human trafficking remain primarily focussed around the Palermo Protocol (United Nations 2000) to which 142 countries are presently signed up. Despite concerns about its transnational and organised crime focus (Scarpa 2005), the protocol provides a comprehensive definition of trafficking adopted around the world:

> *The recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to obtain the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation shall include, at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labour or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs* (article 3a)

The Council of Europe convention against trafficking details the European response to the protocol and highlights respect for victim's rights, protection of victims and combating trafficking (Council of Europe 2005). Recently international attention has centred on the 3P paradigm of prevention, protection and prosecution (European Commission 2010; Human Trafficking 2011; US Dept of State 2011). Within the 3P paradigm there is perhaps a less pronounced focus on a reintegration and rehabilitation discourse (Schloenhardt and Loong 2011), although international efforts to provide guidance and direction to this aspect of intervention are becoming more prominent (Surtees 2010; ILO 2006; IOM 2007)

Global and local estimates about the extent of trafficking still vary widely, with reports of up to 27 million worldwide (Mattar & Van Slyke 2010; Farrel et al 2010), as different organisations apply varying definitions and understanding of trafficking, depending on their roles (Kelly 2005; UNODC 2006). Despite the growth of prevalence studies and acknowledgement of trafficking as a growing problem there remains a lack of robust and reliable data, without which it is unlikely that agencies will be able to understand and respond to human trafficking (Gozdziak 2008; ECPAT 2010). Efforts to combat trafficking in 2012, arguably, suffer from the same lack of a clear understanding of factors that contribute to and facilitate the trade, or services that may aid rehabilitation of the victims, which have been evident for a number of years (Gozdziak 2008; Omelaniuk 2005; Rafferty 2007). This may be especially so in the UK, where the focus for children and adults has been on identification once arrived (Hynes 2010).[1]

---

[1] Previous Glasgow Child Protection Committee reports (Rigby 2009; 2010) provide a fuller background and overview of trafficking

Human Trafficking in the UK

The Council of Europe convention underpins the UK wide policy responses to trafficking. The UK action plan (Home Office 2007) has now been supplemented by Human Trafficking: The Government's Strategy (Home Office 2011), detailing the plans of the UK government to prevent, prosecute and protect in relation to trafficking. Specific guidance has been published in England and Wales and Scotland for working with and safeguarding children who have been trafficked (Scottish Government 2009; LONDON SCB 2011).

Europe wide the Group of Experts on Action Against Trafficking in Human Beings (GRETA) are responsible for monitoring implementation and adherence to the convention and are tasked with publishing regular reports detailing this.[2] The Anti-Trafficking Monitoring Group (ATMG) is an umbrella organisation of non-governmental organisations who monitor trafficking across the UK; they have been collecting and analysing data on the implementation of the European Convention in the UK. Numerous support agencies have also been established to offer help and advice to victims and potential victims of trafficking, the most notable being the Poppy Project, ECPAT, Migrant Helpline and Trafficking Awareness Raising Alliance (TARA), all members of the ATMG.

The issue of human trafficking is one that continues to attract media[3] and political[4] attention in the UK, but despite this increased attention, and a developing academic and research discourse, the extent and prevalence of the trade remains largely unknown. The Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (CEOP) provide regular updates of child trafficking data to identify trends, patterns of exploitation, and victim experiences (CEOP 2011). The Serious Organised Crime Agency (SOCA) provides regular statistical bulletins regarding referrals to the National Referral Mechanism. Despite the efforts of various agencies, a recent parliamentary report indicated that:

> *"No systematic collection of data on victims or perpetrators exists, and therefore it is impossible to ascertain a clear understanding of whether trends in trafficking for exploitation are increasing or decreasing."* (Almandras 2011:4)

---

[2] http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/trafficking/Docs/Monitoring/GRETA_en.asp#TopOfPage

[3] www.mirror.co.uk/celebs/tv/2011/03/21/ross-kemp-on-the-scandal-of-human-trafficking-115875-23004569/

www.guardian.co.uk/media/2010/aug/05/bbc1-drama-taken

www.dailyrecord.co.uk/news/scottish-news/2010/09/14/no-evidence-human-trafficking-rates-will-increase-at-2014-commonwealth-games-says-top-scots-cop-86908-22560736   [all accessed 7/9/11]

[4] www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmhaff/23/2302.htm

www.allpartygrouphumantrafficking.org

www.scottish.parliament.uk/s3/committees/equal/reports-10/eor10-05-00.htm

Trafficking in Scotland

Attempts have been made to quantify the problem of human trafficking in Scotland. TARA, an organisation providing support to female adult victims of trafficking for sexual exploitation in Glasgow, received 47 referrals from April 2009 to March 2010 (TARA 2010). The Migrant Helpline in its submission to the parliamentary inquiry on migration and trafficking suggested 60 adults have been referred to their service as potential victims of trafficking, mainly for forced labour from the Slovak Republic (Migrant Helpline 2010). Lebov (2009) identified 79 individual adults across Scotland thought to have been the victims of trafficking. It is likely that some of these figures contain instances of duplicate counting. Despite government initiatives, exploratory research projects and the work of specialist agencies like TARA and the Migrant Helpline, whether these figures are the tip of an iceberg or the extent of the problem is unknown.

Accompanying attempts to quantify the problem, human trafficking is receiving increased political attention in Scotland, evidenced by the Scottish Parliament migration and trafficking enquiry (Scottish Parliament 2010) and the Equalities and Human Rights Commission enquiry (EHRC 2011). Increased media attention specific to Scotland (Booth 2009; Leask 2011) has served to further focus political and public attention on the issue. This increased activity does not necessarily result in any clearer understanding and improved response. There remains a relatively limited empirical knowledge base for Scotland and absence of a conceptual framework to understand the antecedents and consequences of trafficking (Omelaniuk 2005; Gozdziak 2008), from which effective services can be developed.

Without an empirical and theoretical knowledge base developments in Scotland will remain open to criticism that policies are developing in an information vacuum, with trafficking being sensationalized, misrepresented and politicised (Koser 2000; Brennan 2005). Media reports, including one that Glasgow and Dundee are the fourth and fifth largest destination cities in terms of numbers of children trafficked in the UK (Booth 2009), are difficult to confirm. There remains little indication of the full extent of trafficking in Scotland, nor of possible responses to it - *"It is difficult to identify the true nature, scale and extent of human trafficking as it affects Scotland"* (Scottish Parliament 2010). Such gaps in the evidence and knowledge base underpin scepticism about the issue (see Herald Scotland 2011).

National Referral Mechanism

The Council of Europe Convention on Action Against Trafficking in Human Beings (Council of Europe 2007) ensures that each signatory country has mechanisms in place – The National Referral Mechanism (NRM) – for identifying and recording cases of child trafficking. The convention was ratified by the UK government in December 2008 and the formal procedure for assessing and recording all trafficking cases, including children, became operational on 1 April 2009. From this date, arrangements came into force to allow all cases of human trafficking to be referred by frontline agencies for assessment by designated Competent Authorities. In the UK

the Competent Authorities are a central UK Human Trafficking Centre (UKHTC) and a linked authority within the UK Border Agency (UKBA) for cases also involving immigration and asylum claims.

The NRM as delivered in the UK differs from that envisaged by the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE 2004) in that the Competent Authority relating to child victims is not made up of a multi-agency grouping with specific child protection responsibilities. The OSCE (2009) criticised the NRM in the UK for its reliance on one central authority to make the final decision in respect of whether an individual had been trafficked, marginalising the opinions of front line services which did not appear *"to count for much"* (p88). The Anti Trafficking Monitoring Group (ATMG) also criticised the process in a number of areas, including its focus on immigration issues over victim support and its inability to provide additional protection for victims (ATMG 2010).

UKHTC figures relating to referrals to the NRM indicate that 1481 individuals (adults and children) were referred to the Competent Authority up until 31 March 2011. These included individuals from 88 different countries, with Nigeria, China, Vietnam and Romania constituting the greatest number of referrals (SOCA 2011). A referral to the NRM does not require a criminal level of 'evidence' as a reasonable grounds decision by the competent authority can be made where there are suspicions to believe that a child has been trafficked, but it cannot be proven. A conclusive decision is made when on the 'balance of probabilities' it is more likely than not that a person has been trafficked.

While difficulties have been identified with the NRM, and the 'official' figures recorded by the UKHTC are considered to be an underestimation of the numbers trafficked during that period (ATMG 2010; SCCYP 2011), at the moment they are the only national figures available that are based on documented cases, rather than estimates and best guesses. Some commentators have suggested that cases identified represent less than 5% of all probable cases (UNODC 2006a), although this figure seems to be based on the differences between documented cases and estimates, a method of estimation that is in itself problematic.

Children in the NRM

390 of the NRM referrals are for children of 47 nationalities. Vietnam, Nigeria, China, UK and Romania are the most numerous nationalities referred, accounting for 67% of all child referrals (SOCA 2011). In recognition of the particular characteristics of children and the risks and organisational issues involved in child trafficking, all referrals regarding children to the NRM in Scotland should come from the child's lead professional or their equivalent in local authority social work departments (Scottish Government 2009b). These guidelines are an acknowledgement that child trafficking is child abuse and social work is the primary agency for addressing the child protection concerns related to trafficking (Kelly 2009; ILPA 2009).

Under international conventions, the three elements of trafficking - movement, exploitation and recruitment / control do not have to be met for children. Children can be considered to have been trafficked if there is evidence of movement and exploitation (or intent to exploit). The working definition for this report in terms of child trafficking is:

> *"The trafficking of children shall simply mean the movement of children for the purpose of exploitation and abuse."* (AFRUCA 2007:6)

Since its inception, and from a child protection focus specifically, the NRM has been subject to a substantial amount of criticism because:

> *"….The British authorities decided to bypass the existing system and not task local authority children's services with the identification of trafficked children, despite their expertise in child protection and their statutory duty to safeguard children* (ATMG 2011a: 1).

Services for children

While the NRM is regarded as the central mechanism for identifying and responding to trafficking concerns for both adults and children, it has been identified as a bureaucratic, immigration focussed process, and not child friendly (London SCB 2011c; ATMG 2010). In practice, social work child protection teams should be the primary agency for assessing and providing services for trafficked children. In reality, there remains varying levels of understanding of the concept of trafficking, and differential application of a child centred, child protection focus in work with trafficked children (Bovarnick 2010; Hynes 2010; Pearce 2011). Bovarnick (2010) suggests that whether practitioners are 'child focussed' or 'immigration focussed' plays a substantial role on the quality of services received by children.

Much of the work to date in the UK has been focussed on the identification of trafficked children (Hynes 2010). While necessary as an initial step, this has perhaps deflected from providing and evidencing effective rehabilitation and reintegration services. However, there are a number of agencies providing support services and advice specifically for trafficked children and professionals across the UK, including peer support and drama based interventions [5], although the authors are not aware of any evaluations of these. The Guardianship project in Glasgow, a collaboration between Aberlour and the Scottish Refugee Council, to provide advocacy and support for separated children, will be publishing its evaluation in the near future.[6]

The London Safeguarding Children Board guidance (London SCB 2011a) and toolkit (London SCB 2011b) is used by many local authority areas as a blueprint for identifying and working with victims. The monitoring of the original guidance (London SCB 2011c) indicated that pilot authorities found it useful and helped to

---

[5] http://www.afruca.org/our-work/our-work-in-the-uk/62-theatre-for-development-project.html
http://www.ecpat.org.uk/content/working-with-young-people
[6] http://www.aberlour.org.uk/scottishguardianshipservice.aspx

focus professionals on the issue of trafficking. However, it also found that practitioners required more guidance on how to work with trafficked children. While there is still a need to train workers on the identification and initial safeguarding responses to trafficked children, it is also increasingly clear that practitioners are requiring guidance on how to work with children to meet their mid and longer term needs.

Child Trafficking in Scotland

The Scottish Government is clear that child trafficking is child abuse and that it is the responsibility of child protection services to make provisions for supporting trafficked children. In recognition of the importance of the existing child protection system, it is recommended that all referrals to the Competent Authority come from the child's lead professional in local authority social work departments (Scottish Government 2009b).

Enquiries in Scotland have tended to focus on adult human trafficking, and often the concept of trafficking is associated with that of commercial sexual exploitation (SCCYP 2011). However, child trafficking should not be viewed as a sub category of human trafficking; it requires its own child centred approach (Wallace and Wylie 2011). The Children's Commissioner investigation to scope the extent and nature of child trafficking in Scotland was the first to attempt to gather information across the country. From a questionnaire circulated to a multi-agency sample of professionals it was estimated that between 2009-2011 concerns had been expressed about 249 children across the country, a figure adjusted to 83 to take account of duplicate counting (SCCYP 2011). It is not clear what the actual concerns were for many of the respondents, although being in the country illegally was considered a prime indicator for trafficking by many.

While it is difficult to ascertain what proportion of the 390 child referrals to UKHTC are from Scotland, the SCCYP reported 14 referrals received by UKBA up until the end of 2010. However, the accuracy of this figure is debateable as Glasgow alone made 22 referrals during the period, although UKHTC refused to accept some as referrals because the children had left the country, or they considered the issues to be one of child protection, but not trafficking.

Unfortunately, the numbers of referrals and reasonable and conclusive grounds decisions made by the Competent Authorities is often viewed as the 'official' estimates of the problem. This is considered a particularly narrow view of the extent of trafficking; not least because of the restrictive definitions sometimes employed by UKBA, especially in relation to the interpretation of the European convention and time periods for inclusion in the figures (ATMG 2010).

The absence of any clear estimates about the numbers of trafficking victims in Scotland, either adults or children, reflects the international difficulty in estimating the prevalence of a largely hidden crime. It is likely the true number will never be

known (EHRC 2010), and as indicated earlier the absence of definitive prevalence data can lead to scepticism about the extent of the trade in Scotland.

Glasgow Child Protection Committee Response to Child Trafficking

A multi-agency child trafficking / exploitation meeting was held in January 2007 after concerns were raised by the Child Protection Committee about separated children arriving in the city. Following the meeting, a CPC child trafficking sub group for vulnerable young people was established and the city council child protection team was commissioned to undertake work investigating child trafficking in the city.

The first two reports identified a number of trafficking victims in the city amongst the unaccompanied asylum seeking children population and documented the experiences of a cross section of multi-agency professionals working on the front line, who confirmed that trafficking was a developing issue in Glasgow (Rigby 2009; 2010). These reports reflect similar concerns to those identified in England and Wales (Pearce et al 2009; Hynes 2010; Pearce 2011; Wirtz 2009).

Following the CPC reports, and ongoing concerns about trafficking in the city, Glasgow CPC published guidance for practitioners working with potentially trafficked children (Glasgow CPC 2009), to accompany the nationwide roll out of the National Referral Mechanism. Glasgow became a pilot area for monitoring the 2009 London Safeguarding Children Board guidance for practitioners, including an assessment framework and toolkit. During the monitoring period Glasgow contributed to national meetings in London and to a final monitoring report (London SCB 2011c).

Glasgow CPC has also developed and delivered a series of multi-agency child trafficking awareness raising sessions and a half day training programme for front line practitioners. These sessions have now been delivered to over 500 professionals across the city, and most schools in Glasgow have received input on child trafficking. In 2010 the CPC, in conjunction with the Scottish Government, also organised a national child trafficking conference to further raise awareness.

Child Trafficking Database

Following concerns about the absence of systematic referring and recording of suspected child trafficking cases (Rafferty 2008; IOM 2009), the findings of the case file analysis (Rigby 2009), and Glasgow's involvement in the pilot monitoring, the social work child protection team developed a database for recording information about trafficking concerns involving children. The database was designed in line with guidelines published by the International Organisation for Migration (IOM 2009) detailing the minimum data requirements for building a comprehensive picture of human trafficking. It was established to complement data gathered for a NRM referral, including information that could be used to inform future provision of services across the city.

The database is a working tool containing information relating to NRM referrals, NRM pending cases, suspected cases not referred, and mothers or pregnant women where there are concerns about potential risks to their children.[7] Historical cases are also recorded that are disbarred from referral to the NRM (including those cases identified in the original CPC case file audit). Essentially, the database now contains trafficking related information in relation to all suspected cases where the child protection team have been contacted. What is not known is how many suspected cases are not referred to the child protection team or to the police anti-trafficking unit - concerns about non referral have been previously raised (Cameron 2010; SCCYP 2011), and have become more apparent during the preparation of this report.

The database is maintained and updated by the child protection team and details are shared with the police vice and anti-trafficking unit when appropriate and in line with data protection guidelines for trafficking (IOM 2007). While efforts are made to regularly review the database the majority of the information is that provided by children and young people during their period of social work care and support - the usual source of information for separated children (Keen 2006; Mitchell 2003). Consequently, for much of the information relating to background circumstances and journeys there is little independent corroboration.

The present report is the third from Glasgow Child Protection Committee that attempts to document the development of responses to child trafficking in the city to inform local practice and contribute to the developing evidence base. It is only a snapshot on what is presently known (more sensitive details remain confidential) and indicative of present practice, rather than a detailed analysis of what works. There is recognition, that despite positive developments, and the introduction of practice guidelines informed by a local evidence base, there remains much to be learned and understood about trafficking in Glasgow, and the appropriate responses required to meet the needs of particularly vulnerable children.

---

[7] This is not about risks to children from their mothers, but concerns where young women may still be part of a trafficking network and in touch with traffickers.

3. AUDIT OF CASE RECORDS - METHODS

As a continuing response to child trafficking in Glasgow, and reflecting recommendations from the 2010 CPC report and the London SCB monitoring report (London SCB 2011c), a proposal to prepare a comprehensive report as a baseline for the longer term monitoring and evaluation of trafficking in the city was presented to the Glasgow Child Protection Committee. As the NRM process constitutes a clearly identifiable population of suspected trafficked children, where information is routinely collected as part of Glasgow's operational responses to child trafficking, the already established database maintained by the social work child protection team provided the framework of the report. The first two years of the NRM in Glasgow was considered a reasonable timeframe from which to provide additional comment on progress in the city. While the report tentatively comments on outcomes for children, it does not constitute an empirical evaluation of service delivery.

The aim of the case records audit was to:

- Report on the impact of the NRM in Glasgow both in terms of numbers of children referred and change in practice
- Report on characteristics and backgrounds of children referred
- Develop a better understanding of children's journeys to Glasgow
- Begin to develop greater understanding of the profile and role of traffickers
- Present a broader picture of suspected child trafficking cases in the city
- Provide comment on progress and potential outcomes for children

Data collection methods adopted for the audit included:

- Reading of case records and document analysis
- Analysis of existing databases
- Previous Glasgow CPC research projects
- Observations of the audit team
- Comment from the child trafficking steering group

Three workers from the child protection team and the asylum team, with experience of working in the field of child trafficking, analysed all the entries on the child trafficking database and corresponding electronic case records and documents. Following reading of case records, NRM referrals and the database a separate Excel datasheet was designed specifically for the audit, to facilitate reporting descriptive statistics of the relevant information for the NRM cases. It is worth reiterating that the reported numbers and circumstances of children reflects what has been disclosed by children and reported to the child protection team – as part of the audit there is no way to independently corroborate children's accounts of their circumstances.

In addition to the more substantial information available for NRM referrals a similar method of investigating Carefirst records was employed for all those cases known to the child protection team - the suspected cases not referred to the NRM, and referrals regarding mothers and pregnant women where concerns had also resulted in contact with the child protection team. While the available information was not as detailed for these groups, it was sufficient to enable some comment to be made on suspected trafficking cases beyond those referred to the Competent Authority. To facilitate observation on those cases identified in the original 2009 case file analysis Carefirst records were also accessed for this group to enable the audit team to identify progress and developments over the last thirty months and make tentative comment on outcomes.

Four comprehensive case studies were also prepared by the audit team to contextualise the issues and concerns identified during the audit, although these have not been included in this report. The case studies were presented in a restricted summary report to the Child Protection Committee, which also included a more detailed breakdown of countries of origin and other potentially identifiable information.

Overall, the methods employed allow for observations to be made about the development of responses to child trafficking in Glasgow over the last four years. The observations and comment will be indicative of practice, not a definitive statement of success or failure in the identification of children and the delivery of services.

Ethical issues and limitations

The ongoing requirement for research to directly inform policy developments necessitates short time lines (Kelly 2005), and the limitations of this methodological approach are recognised. Similar to operational responses, empirical research on trafficking related issues is complicated, and limitations and biases are inherent in the process (Tyldum 2009). The working definition adopted for the work – the movement of children for the purposes of exploitation and abuse - and the absence of any corroborative sources of information for children's accounts may raise methodological concerns. However, the practice adopted has been to accept the accounts provided to workers by children who are accorded the benefit of doubt in all aspects of their stories – except where it is apparent the story is one in which the child has been coached by traffickers and repeated by other children. As with much research investigating child trafficking there were also many ethical issues to be considered and the reader must make a decision as to the veracity and robustness of the adopted approaches.

The CPC child trafficking subgroup provided initial consent for the research to commence and had an overview of the research and initial draft of the report. The proposal met the social work department ethical approval process for audit and research employing the use of administrative data – all the databases and

information accessed are those used by operational and / or strategic teams to inform ongoing policy and practice.

Not all children and young people were aware of the operational professional activity around the concerns about trafficking, and therefore children may be being identified as trafficking victims who do not want a trafficking label (Tyldum 2009). Following the CPC child trafficking guidelines, decisions are made in some cases not to inform children, or accompanying adults, of the trafficking investigation because of safeguarding concerns. In such cases seeking individual consent for audit purposes would have undermined child protection practice decisions.

The use of administrative data for audit / research purposes without explicit consent is controversial, although widespread (Jonson-Reid & Drake 2008). While the monitoring work undertaken in Glasgow is to inform policy and practice developments and improve responses and service provision for potential victims of trafficking, a more participatory approach may be preferable, which could involve interviews with children and young people (Hugman et al 2011; Tyldum 2009). These debates are ongoing as part of the monitoring framework.

Potentially identifiable information has been excluded from this report and the steering group acted as an additional gatekeeper to ensure it contained no identifying details. While countries of origin have been reported elsewhere, a decision was taken to only report here on 'areas of origin' to maintain confidentiality. Restricting information from the final report may reduce its impact in certain areas as a guide for practitioners, especially in relation to naming the countries of origin. However, until the numbers of children identified in Glasgow reaches a figure where the possibility of identification is negligible, this policy is likely to remain.

While the report aims to provide an overview of the present situation in Glasgow regarding children who are suspected of being trafficked, there remain limitations, especially its ability to provide definitive comment on child trafficking in the city. The major concern is that there are cases of suspected child trafficking that are not being referred to the NRM, and decisions being made in localities not to refer to the child protection team and the police vice and anti-trafficking unit as cases of suspected trafficking (Cameron 2010; SCYYP 2011).[8] Clearly, a methodology and report concentrating on cases known to the child protection team cannot comment on other potential trafficking victims. Even with known cases, a report drawing information from social work case records and NRM referrals alone is likely to miss information available in other agency records, and perhaps most importantly the direct testimonies of children themselves. An effective monitoring framework has to elicit information from all agencies to facilitate a comprehensive policy and practice response.

---

[8] Following the data collection phase and nearing completion of this report, additional cases came to the attention of the audit team that had not been previously reported.

Future work monitoring the progress of children through the various systems in Glasgow should attempt to seek the views of children if a better understanding of what works in aiding rehabilitation and supporting children is to be gained. However, the recognition of secondary trauma and the issue of further and ongoing interviews for children remain as major ethical and methodological barriers (Brennan 2005). Talking to children as the best informants of their experiences remains a sensitive topic, especially if the researchers are employees of the agencies providing support. Direct engagement with children who have been trafficked may be best achieved by collaborating with researchers from independent organisations – to date this has not been attempted in Glasgow. Until this is achieved, first hand accounts and stories of children exploited through trafficking in the city and their views about services provided remains largely unexplored.

The methodological and ethical issues around monitoring work with suspected victims of trafficking are substantial (Surtees 2010; Pearce et al 2010; Tyldum 2009) and preparation for this report has been no less problematic in this respect. While the overview of the Child Protection Committee via a child trafficking steering group is invaluable in addressing some of the issues, methodological and ethical considerations remain challenging.

4. WHAT DO WE KNOW?

The findings presented here report, as far as possible within the still developing knowledge base and response to child trafficking, the present situation in the Glasgow city area, predominantly in relation to referrals to the NRM. As indicated, it is not possible to make definitive claims at the present time from the limited information available and the focus on cases known to the child protection team and the police vice and anti-trafficking unit. By the nature of child trafficking, and the associated gathering and recording of information, there are numerous gaps in the data, and efforts are being made to constantly update systems to increase knowledge and understanding and support children in their recovery and reintegration.

The findings are based on aggregated information extracted from the complex and ever changing record of the stories of individuals. Little of the data can be independently corroborated or verified; the majority of the information coming from children themselves and recorded by social work staff.

CHILDREN REFERRED TO THE NATIONAL REFERRAL MECHANISM

From 1 September 2010 (the introduction of the NRM in Glasgow) to 31 August 2011, the child protection team recorded 30 referrals to the National Referral Mechanism from the Glasgow CPC area. In line with the CPC guidelines (Glasgow CPC 2009), the majority of these referrals followed a multi-agency strategy meeting where the decision was to refer a child to the Competent Authority. This multi-agency engagement at the point of referral to the Competent Authority is recognised nationally as a good practice model (London SCB 2011c).

The first responder (referrer to the NRM) is recorded as social work in the majority of cases, in line with the CPC guidelines, although in practice the completion of the NRM referral form is a joint police / social work endeavour. There were a small number of cases where a third sector organisation, or UKBA, made referrals when social work did not recognise concerns as trafficking.

In line with CPC guidelines all referrals to the Competent Authority should be centrally collated by the child protection team and police vice and anti-trafficking unit. This central monitoring of all suspected trafficking cases and referrals, with an overview by a child trafficking subgroup, reflects, at a local authority level, internationally recommended guidelines for an anti-trafficking framework (IOM 2009; OSCE 2004). Such a system facilitates and informs strategic decision making regarding provision of services, enables monitoring of provision and supports evaluation of processes and outcomes. It also promotes a unified, multi-agency response, key to protecting children (OSCE 2004). This strategic approach by the CPC has been instrumental in developing an evidence based response to child trafficking in Glasgow and contributing to national developments.

Region of origin

Region	Nos
Africa	16
Asia	2
East Asia	4
Eastern Europe	6
Western Europe	2

Table1 – nos of children referred to NRM by geographical region

To date there have been no referrals from Glasgow to the Competent Authority relating to UK citizens. This is despite UK children constituting the fourth largest number of referrals through the NRM and the largest number of positive conclusive grounds decisions (SOCA 2011).

Africa constitutes the largest concentration of victims, in terms of area of origin, for children identified in Glasgow. Children from Eastern Europe have now started to be identified in the city - one country accounting for all but one of the NRM referrals and the majority of enquiries to the child protection team about trafficking concerns from that area. During the data collection it became evident that the identification of Eastern European children as victims of trafficking has been particularly challenging for professionals. Most of the Eastern European children referred to the NRM had been known to services for considerable periods before there was acknowledgement of their situation as one of trafficking.

To the end of September 2011 none of the children referred to the NRM had been returned to countries of origin by immigration authorities - of those subject to immigration controls, the majority have received discretionary leave to remain. The two children from West Europe moved back to their home country. As most of the children identified are subject to immigration controls the possibility of returns by UKBA cannot be discounted in the future.

Gender

79% (23) of the referrals to the NRM from Glasgow were girls and 21% (7) boys. This weighting towards girls is replicated nationally, although less pronounced across the UK (59% ATMG 2011a). It is not clear why there are more girls being identified in Glasgow, one reason may be the dominant discourse on trafficking being one of sexual exploitation, which serves to overlook other forms of exploitation and abuse (Hynes 2010). Care must be taken to ensure that the exploitation of boys and young men is not overlooked.

Ages

Age	Nos
<10	12
11-13	0
14	2
15	3
16	5
17	8

Table 2 – referral to NRM by age

While the ages of children referred appears broad, this wide age range is not reflected in positive reasonable grounds decisions, which are usually made for those aged 14 plus years. Most children under the age of 10 accepted on reasonable grounds were those whose referral was made jointly with adults. The problem with the indicator matrix being of limited use for younger children has been previously highlighted (London SCB 2011c). Nationally UKHTC figures indicate 24 children under 10 were referred, with 3 (5%) granted conclusive grounds decisions, compared to 38% of over 10 years olds (SOCA 2011). Concerns about younger children being missed under the present system do not appear unfounded, unless of course younger children are not trafficked to the same extent. Further work is required to investigate these age anomalies as the younger age group constitute over a third of all referrals from Glasgow, and may be at increased risk if the assessment and decision making is problematic.

Indicators of trafficking – exploitation and movement

For children, the definition of trafficking is met if there is evidence (or suspicion) of movement and exploitation (United Nations 2000). To date all children referred from Glasgow have not been UK citizens and the movement aspect of identification has been implicit in their journeys to the UK.

The indicator matrix is the most widely available 'tool' that assists professionals in making a judgement if they believe a child has been trafficked. The majority of the matrix indicators relate to those that exist in the UK (Hynes 2010), they take little, or no, account of circumstances in home and transit countries, and cannot estimate the 'risk' of being trafficked. The matrix is often referred to as a 'risk assessment matrix', although in reality there is little empirical understanding of how the indicators should be incorporated into an assessment process, nor how they combine with background and social circumstances to aid assessments, predict future risk and help in determining which services may best meet children's needs (Rigby 2011). It has also been suggested that the matrix is often used as a proxy assessment, in the place of a full trafficking or integrated assessment (London SCB 2011c). Additionally some professionals have also pointed out that, excluding those of exploitation, many of the indicators can relate to most separated children (Rigby 2010).

Such issues underline the complexities for professionals in attempting to identify trafficked children among the greater number of children on the move and making the distinction between trafficked and smuggled children. The latest London Safeguarding Children Board guidance and toolkit on child trafficking is clear that the presence of indicators are not, alone, evidence of trafficking, and only point to the need for a comprehensive assessment of children's needs (London SCB 2011a&b).

EXPLOITATION INDICATORS	NOS
• Claims to have been exploited through sexual exploitation, criminality, labour exploitation, domestic servitude, forced marriage, illegal adoption, and drug dealing by another person.	21
• Physical symptoms of exploitative abuse (sexual, physical etc)	10
• Underage marriage	4
• Physical indications of working (overly tired in school, indications of manual labour – condition of hands/skin, backaches etc)	1
• Sexually transmitted infection or unwanted pregnancy	5
• Required to earn a minimum amount of money every day	6
• Involved in criminality highlighting involvement of adults (e.g. recovered from cannabis farm / factory, street crime, petty theft, pick pocketing, begging etc)	9
• Performs excessive housework chores and rarely leaves the residence	7
• Reports from reliable sources suggest likelihood of sexual exploitation, including being seen in places known to be used for sexual exploitation	5
• Limited freedom of movement	5
• Located / recovered from a place of exploitation (brothel, cannabis farm, involved in criminality etc)	4
• Deprived of earnings by another person	8
• Claims to be in debt bondage or "owes" money to other persons (e.g. for travel costs, before having control over own earnings)	5

Table 3 - exploitation indicators identified for those children referred to the NRM.

MOVEMENT INDICATORS	NOS
• Gone missing from local authority care	4
• Unable to confirm name or address of person meeting them on arrival	6
• Accompanying adult previously made multiple visa applications for other children / acted as the guarantor for other children's visa applications	6
• Accompanying adult known to have acted as guarantor on visa applications for other visitors who have not returned to their countries of origin on visa expiry	3
• History with missing links or unexplained moves	6
• Pattern of street homelessness	1
• Persistently missing, staying out overnight or returning late with no plausible explanation	1
• No passport or other means of identity	16
• Unable or reluctant to give accommodation or other personal details	6
• False documentation or genuine documentation that has been altered or fraudulently obtained; or the child claims that their details (name, DOB) on the documentation are incorrect	8
• Entered country illegally	19
• Journey or visa arranged by someone other than themselves or their family	19
• Registered at multiple addresses	7
• Going missing and being found in areas where they have no known links	1

Table 4 - movement indicators identified for those children referred to the NRM.

As indicated above, in Glasgow it has been relatively straightforward to identify movement indicators amongst children referred to date, as none are UK citizens. However, during the analysis of case records and preparation of this report it became clear of the limitations of the matrix in highlighting 'movement' indicators in relation to European children who have rights of entry to the UK, and for UK children. Children with broad rights of entry and outwith the asylum legislation may not 'hit' many of the movement indicators as they have a reduced number that may apply – another reason to view the matrix as a useful indicator, not a definitive assessment guide for trafficking.

Additional indicators

The use of the indicator matrix for aiding a trafficking assessment is complex. As suggested most indicators do not necessarily imply exploitation and abuse, applying to many separated children, and it is not known how the different factors may interact to increase or decrease future risk, given the complex nature of the trafficking process (Rafferty 2007; Rigby 2010; 2011).

However, with this caveat, the additional indicators in table 5 were present in at least a third of all cases referred to the NRM, with social isolation and psychological trauma present for over half children where positive conclusive grounds decisions were made. These findings suggest that particular attention should perhaps be given to children where these indicators are present, even in the absence of clear evidence of movement and exploitation. The presence of these indicators should at least guide professionals towards the completion of a more comprehensive assessment, with some thought given to the possibility of trafficking, while remembering, alone, they are not indicators of trafficking.

ADDITIONAL INDICATORS	NOS
• Socially isolated – lack of positive, meaningful relationships in child's life	15
• Psychological – indications of trauma or numbing	10
• Not registered with or attended a GP practice	13
• Not enrolled in school	11
• Cared for by adult/s who are not their parents and quality of relationship is not good	12
• Appropriate adult is not an immediate family member (parent / sibling)	10

Table 5 – additional indicators of children referred to NRM

Indicators relating to who the adults may be are particular pertinent, as it was clear from the analysis of case records that workers, in the absence of documentary or other evidence, generally accept that 'parents' and 'aunties / uncles' are related to children, or have a 'legal' responsibility to care for children. There appear to be *"assumptions that children in the UK are here legally and that 'somebody else' has checked that they are being adequately looked after and safeguarded"* (London SCB 2011c:17). Concerns about 'private fostering' and / or 'kinship care' arrangements in relation to trafficking are documented (Care Commission 2008; ECPAT 2011; Scottish Government 2008a), although there is no clear evidence of the extent of this. At a

minimum, all such cases should be assessed in line with the relevant legislation relating to the circumstances of individuals and to the suitability of people to care for a child. Assessment in these situations is problematic, as determining whether an adult is the appropriate and legal caregiver is difficult, especially if documentation is not available (Derluyn and Broekaert 2008).

Exploitation and abuse

Exploitation	Nos
Sexual	6
Commercial sexual[9]	6
Domestic servitude	6
Forced / under age marriage	3
Physical abuse	5
Criminality	1
Benefit fraud	2
Female genital mutilation	3

Table 6 – types of exploitation of children referred to the NRM

For nearly half of the children there was evidence of multiple exploitative situations, with disclosures from children particularly noting sexual and physical abuse and domestic servitude. It is not always clear, but the physical abuse probably constitutes a means of control of the child, as opposed to being moved for the purposes of physical abuse. Verbal threats of physical harm or death, or reporting to authorities are reported as the most common means of control, although incidences of ritual oaths have been noted.

Nearly a third of the children had been abused in their home countries, before ongoing exploitation en route to and in the UK. The European Convention does not differentiate between geographical locations in respect of exploitation and abuse, a child exploited prior to movement to the UK and identified before abuse in this country can still be identified as trafficked.

There was evidence in the case records that nearly a fifth of the children had reported being subjected to exploitation and abuse for at least a year, with three disclosing abuse for over two years. Children who had experienced abuse of at least one year had also been subject to multiple types of exploitation in home, transit and destination countries. While the numbers are small, unsurprisingly, this indicates that children who have been involved in the trafficking process for the longest time period have also been subject to more types of exploitation and in more geographical locations.

---

[9] Commercial sexual exploitation was recorded where it was evident or suspected that children had been prostituted or sold for sex.

Education prior to movement

Nearly half the children reported they had received at least some education in primary school, and seven indicated they had also been educated at secondary level, with an even split between boys and girls receiving secondary education. The ages of completing education varied and it is not known what the statutory secondary school education ages are in most countries. However, these findings begin to question the assumption that a lack of education is always a risk factor for trafficking (Taylor 2005).

Entry into the trafficking process and profile of traffickers

Information in respect of a child's entry into the trafficking process and the identities and profile of potential traffickers is particularly limited.[10] It is possible children are reluctant to talk about this aspect of their exploitation because of misguided loyalties or fear of traffickers. Additionally, in reading case records it was apparent many professionals are reluctant to probe further into certain aspects of children's experiences. Whether practitioners do not believe children, or do not feel confident enough to address the issues (Pearce 2011), is not known. This requires further investigation in the Glasgow context as the audit team suspected a 'fear' or 'panic' on the part of some workers when faced with a potentially complex trafficking scenario.

The process of recruitment included children being sold by parents or other relatives to agents, some apparently in the knowledge that the children would be exploited, others not. 'Domestic servitude' in home countries is apparent, before children were promised greater financial rewards, or educational opportunities abroad.[11] The deaths of parents was evident in nearly a quarter cases, after which children reported being looked after by other adults before being moved into the trafficking process.

Offers of help by 'friends' in the community in home countries was noted and a quarter of children reported 'aunties' and 'uncles' being clearly involved in recruitment, movement and actual abuse (see Hynes 2010). There appears to be a church connection in a quarter of the cases, all bar one of these with African children. This connection includes church members and leaders looking after children before passing them onto traffickers and in some instances travelling with children and / or abusing them.

The involvement of women in the trafficking process, as agents, accompanying children on journeys, or meeting children on arrival in the UK, is noted in a third of the cases. There is only one instance of a named organised criminal network being

---

[10] Additional intelligence information (eg names etc) have been withheld from this report.

[11] There is much debate about defining exploitation, when often in countries of origin local traditional culture differs from UK culture and law. For example some African cultural and traditional practices may be harmful, including using children as domestic servants; child marriages; extreme physical punishment (AFRUCA 2009;ECPAT 2011)

involved, although the details surrounding the circumstances of children exploited commercially for sex suggests additional organised criminal activity.

Movement and journey

The movement and journeys are an integral part of understanding a child's experiences and, as with information about entry into the trafficking process, it is limited and at times confusing. Many children experienced substantial movement within their home countries, before being transported to transit countries, and onwards to the UK, although a small number flew direct to the UK. There was also substantial movement before any exploitation in some cases, highlighting that children could be smuggled one day, trafficked the next (Bhabha & Zard 2006; Gallagher 2002).

The time period for actual journeys to the UK varied from one to two days for those who flew direct to the UK and onwards to Glasgow, to over six months for those children travelling overland on foot, lorry, car and boat. If time in transit countries is taken into account there are at least three children reporting time from leaving their home countries to arriving in the UK and Glasgow at over two years.

It is worth noting the concerns of Hynes (2010), who cautions against the terms transit and destination countries, as an apparent destination can become a transit point if the traffickers decide to move children on. There is evidence that children referred to the NRM have subsequently moved on from Glasgow, with at least two children taken back to their home countries and one child going missing, whereabouts unknown. Three other children have had regular episodes of going missing for short periods of time. Nationally 12% of child referrals to the NRM have subsequently gone missing (ATMG 2011a). Strathclyde police have recently introduced a process whereby all children where trafficking is suspected, and who go missing for periods, are interviewed on return.

From the available descriptions of journeys it appears that the majority of children arrive in Glasgow from other parts of the UK, usually by road. Direct entry at a Glasgow port remains rare, although in effect the Glasgow city council area has no external ports of entry within its boundaries – airports and ports are in neighbouring local authority areas. While descriptions of journeys are varied there is a recurring theme of, girls especially, being 'rescued' from brothels in other areas of the UK by kindly 'clients' and put on a bus to Glasgow.

Over twenty countries have been identified as transit points for children before arriving in Glasgow with, as identified above, abuses often occurring during the periods in transit countries. The countries identified include England, Northern Ireland, Ireland, Italy, Turkey, India, Poland, Czech Republic, Spain, Kenya, Russia, Germany, Uganda, Somalia, South Africa, Nigeria, Sweden, Netherlands, Burma and Egypt. Other cities in the UK that children recount periods in, where they also describe being abused, include London, Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, Derby, Wolverhampton, Coventry, Bristol, Rugby, Plymouth, Aberdeen and Dundee. While

identifying countries and cities as part of a journey and / or exploitative experiences is problematic, often relying on the recall of children who may not know where they are, it is increasingly apparent that Glasgow is only one part of an international network of destinations and transit points for children.

Reasonable grounds decision

The Competent Authority (UKHTC or UKBA) indicate that a reasonable grounds decision can be made when there are suspicions, that cannot necessarily be proven, that a child has been trafficked. To date in Glasgow there have been:

- 16 positive reasonable grounds decisions
- 6 negative reasonable grounds decisions
- 2 children were not accepted as a referral as they had already left the UK
- 1 child was not accepted as a referral because it was child protection, not trafficking
- 1 had a decision on hold as the child is missing
- 4 children awaiting decisions

Analysis of case records and NRM referrals indicates that three of the negative grounds decisions were made for children where no evidence was presented in respect of exploitation. In retrospect it is unlikely that these cases would now be referred as during the audit it became clear there was no evidence of exploitation / abuse, although numbers of other indicators were present that raised concerns for staff.

Such cases highlight the need for child protection professionals to be clear of what factors may indicate trafficking, and which may indicate welfare concerns. SCCYP (2011) found that the most common indicator that workers applied to trafficking was the child appearing to be in Scotland illegally – this alone is not an indicator of trafficking - most unaccompanied children arriving in Glasgow (489 since 2005), and most other children arriving in Glasgow do not present with concerns of exploitation and abuse. This is not to say they may not be vulnerable and in need of care and support.

Conclusive grounds decision

Conclusive grounds decisions are made when on the balance of probabilities the Competent Authority decide that a child has been trafficked. This is not a criminal level of proof.

To date in Glasgow there have been:

- 7 positive conclusive decisions
- 2 negative conclusive decisions

Nationally, there have been concerns about the numbers of negative decisions made when the Competent Authority acknowledges that the child has met the criteria for trafficking but they do not meet the definition of 'victim' for the purposes of the convention. This is because the elements of human trafficking do not continue to apply at the time of the assessment and / or too much time has elapsed since the child was trafficked (ATMG 2011).

Such decisions have been made in Glasgow, with children not considered as a 'victim for the purposes of the convention' because the trafficking was not apparently ongoing. This overlooks the fact that young people are in the care of Glasgow social services; the reason for the referral is that young people come to the attention of the authorities, who are then able to make a referral. If children are being effectively safeguarded, elements of human trafficking are less likely to apply at the time of assessment. Such decisions may also fail to take into account that for some children disclosures of exploitation may not be made until they have been safe for considerable periods.

The Council of Europe Convention does not indicate that trafficking has to have occurred within a certain timeframe or be ongoing, it only refers to the fact that a person is a victim, or potential victim, of trafficking, not when (or where) the trafficking occurred. The ATMG (2011b) suggest that if the Competent Authority interprets the Convention otherwise, for example, by narrowing the definition of victimhood by imposing an arbitrary time limit, this might be an unlawful exercise of discretion in a legal process.

None of the substantive decisions made by the Competent Authorities in respect of children have been challenged to date in Glasgow. There is no right of appeal associated with the NRM, a judicial review being the only legal avenue open to challenge decisions. In Glasgow, UKBA have indicated a willingness to look again at their decisions if additional, or different, information is available. Regular meetings between UKBA, police and the social work child protection team are now being held to discuss issues. UKBA have also indicated that the wording on future letters is to be amended to clarify decision making for children.

Once a decision is made by the Competent Authority this is generally accepted by child protection agencies as the definitive comment on whether a child is trafficked or not, and a focus on trafficking related issues often dissipates. This is despite concerns that the Competent Authorities are not child protection trained, that information provided by child protection agencies is not always provided due consideration, and decisions are often made through a bureaucratic, immigration focussed framework (ATMG 2010; London SCB 2011c). The fact that trafficking is not a single movement, that disclosures can take months and that practitioners have concerns about children being apparently 'safe' for a number of months, before traffickers come 'knocking at the door' (Hynes 2010; Rigby 2010), is also problematic if initial decisions are accepted and never revisited.

Information and assessment

Case records provide varied, and usually limited, background information for most of the children making it difficult to discern country of origin circumstances, journeys and exploitative experiences of children. The sparcity of the information recorded and reported is likely to reflect the lack of information provided by children, either through a reluctance to disclose, or not being able to recall many experiences. However, it is also likely to be a reflection of professionals not asking the questions; it is clear from case records that exploration of some issues has been piecemeal and limited. There was little evidence that, beyond the Red Cross family tracing service and police enquiries via Interpol and the Force Investigation Bureau, that child protection professionals had made any systematic attempt to contact agencies for information about children's circumstances in their home and / or transit countries.

The new shortened trafficking assessment form (see appendix) may help to focus workers when undertaking an assessment where trafficking may be an issue. However, it is also important that assessments focus on all aspects of children's lives, not just the possibility of trafficking, or not; the new forms are designed to complement full children's assessments, not replace them.

Article 10.4 of the Council of Europe Convention states that immediately after an unaccompanied child is identified as a trafficking victim every effort should be made to locate his / her family if it is in the best interest of the child. However, it should also be noted that for many of the children the family has been complicit in the entry into the trafficking process and *"Simplistic and nostalgic notions of 'home' need critical examination when considering the best interest of a child or young person"* (Hynes 2010: 108). Such decisions are not easy, although at the moment there is little evidence that attempts to uncover background circumstances are sufficiently robust in Glasgow.

While children may be reluctant to talk about their past experiences, it is incumbent on professionals that as much background information as possible is gathered to permit the completion of an integrated, comprehensive assessment. Education, health, home and social circumstances form a crucial part of the triangle of assessment (Scottish Government 2008b; 2011) – without this information how effective can an integrated assessment be? Without a holistic, comprehensive assessment, focussing on all aspects of children's experiences (Hynes 2010; Kane 2006; Rafferty 2007; Parmentier 2010), progression beyond initial identification and safeguarding practice will be restricted. Gozdziak et al (2006) suggest little or no background information makes initial engagement and intervention difficult, and the ability to meet the medium and longer term needs of children may be compromised

The lack of information regarding children on the move and details about home countries may severely hamper the effort of agencies to provide appropriate support and interventions. Irrespective of whether abuse has occurred, children on the move may be vulnerable, especially those who are unaccompanied. While it is recognised that children may be initially reluctant to discuss issues, the case file evidence

appears to indicate that workers rarely attempt to discuss these aspects of a child's experience once a child is settled and 'safe', concentrating instead on education, housing, health etc. While this approach may be understandable in not wanting to keep re-traumatising children by re-visiting past experiences, psychological and physical trauma as a result of trafficking is well recognised (Rafferty 2007) and in this respect requires addressing if children are in agreement and willing to engage. Hynes (2010) has noted the resilience of many children who have been trafficked, and not all children present with symptoms of severe trauma and many may not want to discuss past experiences. Listening to what children want in these circumstance is key to effective and supportive intervention, although professionals avoiding the subject altogether is unlikely to be a positive approach.

Service provision

Responses to child trafficking should be multi-agency (Asquith and Turner 2008; ILO 2006), and address various and changing needs (Macy and Johns 2011). It is clear from case records that children have been provided with numerous agency supports that attempt to meet this wide range of needs. A large number of service providers, and policy-makers, are working to address trafficking issues in Glasgow, although specific intervention details are rarely documented, and it is often not clear what is being undertaken (Macy and Johns 2011). Overall, despite numerous agencies involvement, there is little clarity about the actual services provided, making it difficult to plan strategically for future provision and understand clearly what works for trafficked children to facilitate positive outcomes.

Children referred to the NRM have received educational, health, legal and housing support. The majority of separated children under the age of 16 are accommodated in local authority residential accommodation under s25 of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995, although over 16 year olds continue to be accommodated in placements that may not be ideal and increase the risk of ongoing exploitation (ATMG 2010). By September 2011 nearly a quarter of the children remained in college or university placements, which perhaps reflects their determination for a positive education (Kohli 2002). A number of organisations are noted as providing educational and accommodation support and the Young Survivors Step to the Future Group, a partnership project between social work children's rights, Aberlour and Scottish Refugee Council, provides group support to UASCs – not specific to trafficked children. The child trafficking sub-group is presently mapping services across the city, to identify which may be in a position to provide appropriate interventions to children who are suspected of being trafficked.

A third of the children are identified in social work records as suffering from mental health problems, with specific reference to post traumatic stress disorder in half of these. The majority have evidence of therapeutic services recorded in case files, although it is unclear if the provision relates to the psychological trauma associated specifically with trafficking experiences. Counselling provision has been provided for a quarter of the children, usually by the NHS Compass project, which provides

therapeutic services for asylum seeking children, although there continues to be capacity pressures on such services.

The majority of the children who are subject to immigration status have ongoing contact with UKBA, with support from legal agencies. A number have been granted five year refugee status, while most remain on discretionary leave to remain until aged 17 ½ . None of the children and young people referred to the NRM have been removed from the country to date by immigration authorities. This uncertainty about refugee status often dominates the lives of separated children, undermining confidence about their future (Kohli 2002). Surtees (2010) suggests that clarity about legal status should be one of the main outcomes for trafficked children. It remains to be seen for children and young people in Glasgow the effect that not knowing their legal immigration status has on longer term outcomes.

Additional support in Glasgow since mid 2010 has been the appointment of a 'guardian' to support all unaccompanied children on arrival in the city, to help them through the complicated asylum process. Although not specifically for working with trafficked children, the guardian project should provide an additional support and advocacy service. It is too early to comment on its efficacy.[12]

While there are indications of a wide variety of agencies involved with children, it is not particularly clear how a child's social work plan and the involvement of different services have contributed to the children's progress. It is apparent that discussion of trafficking related issues has not been to the forefront of continued contact, or at least it has not been evident from case recording. It appears children's experiences of exploitation and abuse, once identified, quickly move off the agenda, although discussion of these issues may take place elsewhere and are not recorded in social work records – for example ongoing police investigations. As discussed earlier it must also be remembered that children may also choose not to accept support or engage in discussion of their experiences, especially when some exhibit strong resilience (Surtees 2007; Hynes 2010).

ADDITIONAL (NON NRM) CASES

While the predominant focus of this audit has been referrals to the NRM, where most information is available, the development of a database has allowed additional monitoring of referrals to the child protection team. While not fully developed at present this part of the database allows for information to be recorded where there are concerns, but with no referral to the NRM, and highlights that referrals to the NRM do not represent all suspected child trafficking cases (see ATMG 2010; SCCYP 2011).

Details included in this area of the database include children where there are 'suspicions' about trafficking, children identified pre NRM introduction (they could

---

[12] The guardianship project, a collaboration between the Scottish Refugee Council and Aberlour, is being evaluated.

not be referred retrospectively); pregnant women presenting to maternity services where there were concerns about subsequent children, and children identified in the original 2009 case file analysis.

2009 Case Analysis

The suspected child trafficking cases that were identified in the 2009 case file analysis were followed up via electronic Carefirst records. The twenty-one children identified in the original sample as possible trafficking victims were aged between 18 and 21 at the beginning of August 2011.[13] It should be noted that the retrospective nature of the original case file analysis means that services were not necessarily delivered in a response to trafficking concerns at the time and that any positive outcomes from the 2007 sample may be a result of generic multi-agency inputs, rather than a focus on protection and recovery from trafficking.

Of the twenty-one children identified in 2007, thirteen (62%) appeared to have reasonably positive outcomes, although whether they meet the criteria for successful re/integration (Surtees 2010) is debateable without further intensive investigation. For eleven of the young people, either no ongoing concerns were noted on records and they remained in contact with support services, or cases were closed following positive engagement and progress. Two young people were also progressing well and settling into the local community in Glasgow but still receiving counselling support to address the psychological trauma experienced during trafficking. Eight (38%) young people are progressing well at college or university and clearly making the most of educational opportunities originally identified. One young man had been forcibly returned to his home country (this is not considered a positive outcome).

Despite the generally positive outcomes, there was evidence of ongoing trafficking concerns for a quarter of the young people. Four young people had gone missing for considerable periods and for two their present whereabouts is unknown. One person eventually turned up working in a cannabis factory, and another re-presented to social work services following a number of missing episodes and disclosing sexual exploitation during the missing period.

One young person experienced ongoing criminal justice contact and one case was closed at 16 when the young person obtained their own tenancy and no further information is available.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to ascertain which services or interventions contributed to these positive outcomes, or what factors and circumstances of the children perhaps made them more resilient and able to overcome their abusive experiences. It appears that some of the children who experienced particularly harrowing experiences of torture and abuse were coping four or five years later and

---

[13] Approximately 25% of new UASC arrivals in 2010 were subsequently referred to the NRM, supporting the findings of the 2009 case file analysis regarding the numbers of UASC who are potential victims of trafficking.

adjusting to life in the local community. To begin answering the wider questions of what works for children on the move, including suspected victims of trafficking, improved, and ongoing, assessments are required that take into account children's lives and experiences before entering the UK (Hynes 2010). Additionally, more needs to be documented about the interventions and ongoing needs once in the UK, and a clear multi-agency monitoring framework is required that includes data from all agency files.

Similarly, it is not possible to identify those circumstances or factors that contributed to the suspected ongoing exploitation of children where trafficking continued, or seemed to have ceased, but recommenced after periods of time. For these children and young people what is apparent from case records is that workers were often not attuned to, or aware of, the risk factors indicating the possibility of continued trafficking. Ongoing monitoring of present NRM referrals is required to ensure that practitioners, following increased awareness raising and training, are now aware of factors that may maintain risk of further trafficking.

Interestingly, when children go missing there is a tendency to record 'absconding' in the case files, implying that the children and young people have made a choice to disappear. While there may be no explicit evidence they have been trafficked, a recording of 'missing' may be a more neutral term, leaving open the possibilities of why they are missing.

Monitoring of children and young people - both those who have exited trafficking networks and those who remain exploited - through the support systems in the UK is vital to begin evidencing outcomes and understanding the process of rehabilitation. Central to this will be discussion with children to ask what they consider to be helpful. The relatively simple process of checking case records a number of years later has provided some indication that two thirds of children have experienced reasonably positive outcomes, even when trafficking was not originally considered an issue by support services. Contributors to positive outcomes - personal attributes, background circumstances, extent of exploitation, professional interventions - remains unclear and should be the focus of continued monitoring and evaluation in Glasgow now that potential victims of trafficking are being identified. What is apparent is that many children appear to have the capacity to overcome extremely harrowing experiences, even in the absence of targeted interventions, although longer term monitoring is required to make any definitive statements.

Pregnant women

Since the CPC focus on child trafficking in Glasgow over the last four years the child protection team have also received a number of enquiries about young women presenting to maternity services, with stories that raise concern about the possibility of trafficking and potential risk for their children. There is no clear evidence that mothers' having been trafficked is a particular risk factor for child protection, although there is some concern that the children of survivors may present with

health and mental health challenges and that there may be high risk of victimisation of children of adult survivors (Busch-Armendariz et al 2011).

Fifteen future/mothers have been referred to the child protection team where there are trafficking concerns, and a number of children have subsequently been placed on the child protection register because of known risks when suspected traffickers appear to be in the vicinity. It is known that at least five of the presenting mothers were themselves first trafficked to the UK as children. In the absence of any clear knowledge and understanding about specific risks, concerns may exist about the risk from traffickers who may still be in a relationship with mothers, or may re-appear later. More work is required to establish an evidence and knowledge base for working with this particularly vulnerable group of women survivors and their children for whom the importance of developing services to meet their specific needs is paramount (Busch-Armendariz et al 2011). As discussed earlier, the limitations of the indicator matrix for younger children have been identified - at present the issue of pregnant, suspected trafficked mothers and their children, is also a particular challenge for assessment and planning, especially as there is no clear understanding of the risk factors.

ALL REFERRALS TO THE CHILD PROTECTION TEAM

Over the last four years, up until September 2011, the social work child protection team have received referrals or enquiries about 100 individual children where there were concerns about trafficking.[14] These include NRM referrals and pre-NRM cases, pre-birth referrals and the 2009 file analysis cases. When siblings and children with no specific individualised evidence of exploitation / movement, and the pre-birth cases, are excluded 68 individual children have been identified who, if the NRM had been operational for the period, would have been referred in the opinion of the audit team. The audit team also identified 15 children who should have been referred to the NRM, but were not, for reasons which are unclear.

While there is particularly limited information recorded for many of these 68 cases, it has been possible to extract data relating to types of exploitation and country (region) of origin.

---

[14] By the conclusion of the data gathering phase and final writing of this report another nine children had been referred to the child protection team.

Exploitation	Nos	Africa	Asia	East Asia	East Europe	West Europe
Sexual	27	18	1	2	6	-
Commercial sexual[15]	7	7	-	-	-	-
Domestic servitude	9	7	-	1	-	-
Labour exploitation	9	1	1	3	4	
Forced / under age marriage	3	3	-	-	-	-
Physical abuse	9	8	1	-	-	-
Criminality (inc cannabis cultivation)	5	1	-	2	2	-
Begging	2	-	-	-	2	-
False asylum claims[16]	3	3	-	-	-	-
Benefit fraud	12	5	-	-	5	2
Female genital mutilation	4	4	-	-	-	-

Table 7. 'Suspected' cases referred to the child protection team for advice since 2007 where there was evidence of exploitation and movement (n=68). Includes the 30 children referred to the NRM

Seventeen children had experienced multiple (2 or more) types of exploitation, half of these involving sexual exploitation. While only indicative of exploitation prior to and in Glasgow there are indications that where children have been subject to sexual abuse it is likely other forms of exploitation will also have been experienced.

It was increasingly apparent from discussions and contact with other agencies there were child trafficking cases that had not been referred to the child protection team, or the police anti-trafficking unit. This raises further concerns about the number of children who may be identified as possible victims, but are not provided with adequate safeguarding provision via child protection processes, referral to the NRM and the benefits of multi-agency decision making as indicated in local CPC guidelines.

WHAT DOES A TRAFFICKED CHILD IN GLASGOW LOOK LIKE?

As practitioners, or policy makers, the temptation can be to seek common denominators or characteristics that aid identification of potential victims and inform appropriate interventions. While one of the aims of the audit was to inform the process of identifying profiles and circumstances of children, in the hope of aiding workers with assessments, it must be concluded that there are few common characteristics across all children who have been trafficked.

In Glasgow the numbers of children identified as potential victims of trafficking remains relatively few, which is in itself problematic when drawing conclusions. The information collated confirms that children from many different backgrounds can be victimised, that the causes of trafficking may vary between countries to such an extent that antecedents and risk factors may not apply universally, and that making

---

[15] Commercial sexual exploitation was recorded where it was evident or suspected that children had been prostituted or sold for sex.
[16] Traffickers / exploiters used these children to make false asylum claims for accompanying adults

simple comparisons between children and profiling 'victims' is problematic (Brennan 2005; UNODC 2006; Wirtz 2009).

This conclusion coupled with the limited knowledge base and understanding can impede identification of victims (Gozdziak et al 2006), and may not aid practitioners in identifying appropriate service provision. Unfortunately, with the still relatively limited comprehension of the issues and absence of an overarching conceptual framework of understanding, the reality is that until such a time that robust empirical and practice evidence emerges, profiling trafficked children in Glasgow is not possible.

5. FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION

Recovery from the trafficking experience and protection from future risk is unlikely to be successful without multi-agency input and ongoing investigation of all safeguarding possibilities for longer terms needs. The multi-agency approach to service provision in Glasgow, while welcomed as a wide support package and a positive aspect of local responses, may disguise the fact that understanding about the process of rehabilitation, and exactly what support children need and require, is less well understood.

As identified nationally (London SCB 2011c), it appears that professionals could benefit from more guidance on how to support children in recovering from the experiences of trafficking, as there is little research on the longer term needs of trafficking victims, specifically on the topic of long-term needs and reunification (Busch-Armendaiz et al 2011). Guidance should include the necessity of liaison with agencies in source and transit countries to assess any risks if children, or young adults, are returned.

The topic of reintegration is one that rarely surfaced in case records. While it is recognised a comprehensive assessment is required, including information from countries of origin, to inform discussion, there should not be an assumption that all trafficking victims wish to remain in the UK (or indeed will be permitted to remain), or that children are necessarily better off in home countries (Hynes 2010). Whatever informs such decisions it should be child centred and based on the best interests of the child, not based on immigration and migration concerns.

Much of the work that has been evaluated in respect of reintegration and rehabilitation has tended to focus on the services provided in source countries (see Asquith and Turner 2008). While this may be a successful outcome for re/integration for many children, the majority of individuals identified in Glasgow remain in the city. To date, despite the committed efforts of front line professionals and policy makers to provide effective services, service provision has not been guided by a clear evidence base for UK based interventions.

> *"Service providers and policymakers sometimes operate under an assumption that clients will quickly access mainstream services, and that those mainstream services will be adequate. However, clients' needs and the structure of both mainstream services and services for victims of human trafficking are not always in harmony. For example, time-limited services are not able to accommodate trauma-related needs that may not be evident during the first six or seven months of services."*
> (Busch-Armendariz et al 2011)

As identified above, while there appears to be positive outcomes for the majority of children identified in the 2009 case file analysis, it is far from clear which aspects of service provision contributed to this. And, most crucially, children and young people themselves have not been asked in Glasgow.

There are some useful indicators of the specific services that may be required, although these are not necessarily focussed on children subjected to multiple exploitation. It is suggested that a continuum of aftercare services are required to attend to changing and developing needs, addressing immediate crisis, ongoing, and longer terms needs in the areas of:

- basic necessities
- secure, safe shelter, and housing
- physical health care
- mental health care
- legal and immigration advocacy
- job and life skills training
- substance abuse services (Macy and Johns 2011)

Surtees (2010) has published a useful document that has detailed possible 'outcomes' for trafficked children where a 'successful re/integration' is defined as recovery and economic and social inclusion following trafficking. The definition is included in full here as it provides a useful blueprint for planning future responses in Glasgow. Successful reintegration includes:

"Settlement in a stable and safe environment, access to a reasonable standard of living, mental and physical well-being, opportunities for personal, social and economic development and access to social and emotional support. It may involve returning to one's family and/or community of origin; it may also involve integration in a new community and even in a new country." (Surtees 2010: 154)

In the US the Trafficking Victims Reintegration Programme criteria for determining successful re/integrated are:

- safe and affordable accommodation
- legal status
- professional/employment opportunities
- education and training opportunities
- security and safety
- healthy social environment (including anti-discrimination and anti-marginalisation)
- social well-being and positive interpersonal relations
- economic well-being/viability
- physical well-being
- mental well-being
- access to services and opportunities
- motivation and commitment to re/integration process
- legal issues and court proceedings
- well-being of secondary beneficiaries (Surtees 2010)

Successful re/integration is likely to differ depending on the circumstances of individual children. A one-size fits all approach is unlikely to work, and comprehensive individualised assessments will be required, while acknowledging the limited information often available to workers (Surtees 2010). However, the above suggestions may be areas that require further investigation in the Glasgow context to ensure that children are receiving appropriate support and to form the basis of an ongoing monitoring framework focussing on outcomes.

Finally, it is becoming increasingly apparent that distinctions between children on the move in terms of their risks, characteristics, agency and responses is problematic, and potentially unhelpful if dividing children into certain categories - trafficked children, migrating children etc (Dottridge 2011). The fact that children may be at risk because of movement, but not (yet) exploited, is a nuance that is often overlooked in assessments as professionals look for 'evidence' of exploitation, rather than assessing overall needs and risks.

It is in these situations that there may be dissonance between the asylum and child protection systems - decisions made by the Competent Authorities regarding trafficking are made on evidence of exploitation; child protection decisions are often made on assessed or perceived 'risk', informed by an underpinning theoretical framework. However, it should be noted that international definitions of trafficking include the 'intent' to exploit and not necessarily require the intended aim to be completed (Gallagher 2010; Council of Europe 2005).

Reasonable grounds decisions in Glasgow have not been made on children who are 'at risk', it appears children have to be actually exploited to be granted a positive decision. It is in this area of future risk and child welfare that the trafficking / smuggling / migrating distinction also becomes confusing and blurred in regards to child protection policy and practice. While child protection professionals should be able to distinguish between trafficked children and other unaccompanied or migrant children and respond appropriately (Dottridge 2007), in reality this distinction can be blurred and problematic, with a recognition that it is a continuum (Danziger 2006), reflecting the uncertainty in much child protection work.

Many children on the move, especially those separated from carers, will require additional supports because of their vulnerability. Trafficked children may require specialist services; other children on the move may require additional supports to indigenous children. Distinctions between children and categorising them will inevitably lead to difficulties in providing appropriate provision – in this respect good child welfare and safeguarding assessments are paramount to effective practice.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Children are arriving in Glasgow from many countries, with different backgrounds and socio-economic circumstances and having experienced multiple types of exploitation and abuse. However, it is also clear that for the majority of separated children, and those arriving with their families, there is no evidence of exploitation or abuse – although many have welfare and supports needs. Despite attempts to profile and identify trafficked children (see CEOP 2011), changing patterns of movement and a myriad of children's backgrounds and circumstances make profiling and identification problematic. The limited information available also determines that at the moment there is no definitive account of children's experiences, nor a 'photofit' for a trafficked child in the city and consequently this report provides an indicative account of children's experiences, providing a baseline for further investigation and research.

The account of developments in Glasgow does not provide an estimate of the numbers of trafficked children in the city, in reality this number may never be known (EHRC 2010). It has provided an indication of the numbers of children referred to the National Referral Mechanism, and of those who should have been referred following concerns raised with the child protection team. Whether the 30 referrals to the NRM, or the additional cases referred to the child protection team, reflects the level of child trafficking in the city is unknown. Previous research would suggest it is unlikely (SCCYP 2011; ATMG 2010; Cameron 2010), and this audit identified a further 15 cases since the implementation of the NRM where there was evidence of movement and exploitation, and in a number of cases clear concerns and references to trafficking, but no referral to the NRM. It is not known why these cases were not referred.

The evidence indicates that children are not always identified as trafficked, and that if identified they are not always subject to child protection procedures or referred to the NRM. Professionals - for whatever reasons, including difficulty of identification, lack of understanding and not willing to acknowledge it as a problem - are missing and overlooking cases of trafficking. In some cases evidence of abuse and exploitation may have been missed due to cultural misunderstanding, and a focus on immigration issues. In other cases, concerns about trafficking may have been unfounded as there was no evidence of exploitation or abuse, but plenty of support needs relating to the circumstances of separated children (and sometimes those in family groups). Despite the intensive work undertaken by partner agencies, the recognition that awareness is at a higher level in Glasgow (SCCYP 2011), and that workers are identifying children at risk, we are arguably no closer to understanding the extent of the issue in the city.

There remains confusion about what is and what is not trafficking and it is clear from this work and other research (Pearce 2011; Hynes 2010; Kelly 2005; Wirtz 2009), that workers are struggling to define and recognise trafficking – not helped by varying definitions applied by different agencies depending on their role and remit (Kelly 2005; UNODC 2006). Safeguarding and welfare issues are often lost amongst

immigration concerns (Pearce 2011), which take prominence in case recording in Glasgow, presumably reflecting the emphasis in practice.

The findings from this audit suggest that relying on a 'bureaucratic system' (London SCB 2011c), of referrals and decision making as a 'true' indicator of the extent of trafficking and child protection concerns is not tenable. Experience elicits the perhaps uncomfortable truth that estimating the extent of child trafficking cannot be understood by the 'official' numbers of children referred to the NRM, nor by asking practitioners if they think they have worked with trafficked children. The 'official' figures underestimate concerns raised by practitioners, but similarly practitioners and managers may also not recognise cases of trafficking when they are presented.

Notwithstanding the issue of prevalence, Glasgow has made substantial progress in addressing the issue of child trafficking, establishing a programme of research, development, training and awareness raising. Co-operation at a strategic level has ensured clear guidelines and advice are available for front line child protection practitioners across agencies. Updated guidelines and a streamlined assessment framework have recently been published by the CPC (Glasgow 2011), stipulating that children who are suspected of being trafficked should be subject to child protection procedures and multi-agency decision-making and referred to the NRM. The practice of referring to the NRM following a multi-agency child protection meeting is recognised as a model of good practice (London SCB 2011c), which clearly emphasises child centred practice and places the emphasis on the child protection aspects of the case.

Multi-agency collaboration in Glasgow has been particularly prominent with the CPC taking a child protection focussed lead on trafficking. The police – social work policy interface has been particularly positive in terms of referring to the Competent Authority, ensuring consistency and a central overview of practice. This centralised social work – police model has facilitated a clear reporting mechanism in line with national and international guidelines. However, multi-agency responses, while welcomed and a positive aspect of local practice, are often not particularly focussed and joined up at the point of working with children; nor sufficiently informed by a rigorous evidence base, about how to respond to trafficked children in the UK.

Despite local developments, practitioners and policy makers are struggling to grasp the complexities of the trafficking process and develop a conceptual framework and understanding that can adequately inform assessments that take into account all phases of a child's journey and life experiences to inform appropriate interventions.

As knowledge and practice has developed in Glasgow it has become increasingly clear that a more nuanced approach is required that adequately addresses the needs of all vulnerable children on the move who arrive in the city, either separated or part of a family. There is a danger that focussing on a small number of children who present with evidence of exploitation and abuse, may overlook the needs and risks existing amongst many children on the move. This includes nearly 500 UASCs looked after by Glasgow city council since 2005 and the increasing numbers of Eastern

European children arriving in the city, amongst whom there are welfare issues (Poole and Adamson 2009) and concerns that many are falling through welfare support gaps (Sime et al 2011).

Child protection and safeguarding practice in Glasgow, and most larger UK cities, is increasingly a global endeavour, requiring knowledge of cultures, socio-political systems and environments beyond the UK. Adapting assessments for a global focus, to include all of a child's background details, and not just since arrival in the UK, may be one of the biggest challenges facing practitioners. Questions may also arise about whether the child protection system, with its focus on 'evidence' and 'risk' (Barry 2007), is sufficiently flexible enough to accommodate the experiences and needs of children on the move (Rigby 2011), and to identify and support those who have been additionally exploited and abused through trafficking.

A clear message for policy makers, and practitioners who may be working with trafficking victims, is that good safeguarding and child protection practice should be paramount. It is not necessarily a label of trafficking, or referral to the National Referral Mechanism, which protects a child, but good, assessment informed, safeguarding practice. While there is evidence of improved practice, there is also evidence of practitioners 'panicking' and overlooking basic child centred practice, perhaps because of concerns about immigration issues, rather than viewing trafficking primarily as an issue of child abuse and protection.

Overall, Glasgow has made substantial progress in both policy and practice developments in relation to child trafficking. However, the increasingly complex and evolving nature of the phenomenon has tempered this progress through a developing realisation of the challenges faced by child protection services in responding effectively to children on the move who may have been trafficked. The ever-changing nature of trafficking requires a continuous and evolving response, addressing limitations and gaps in a culture of learning, which ultimately contributes to increased safeguarding practice. Despite improved identification and responses, supported by a developing evidence base and policy framework, concerns remain about the effectiveness of interventions and the confusion existing amongst workers about the required responses.

The complexities of child trafficking are substantial, with responses largely unsupported by a clear evidence base of prevalence and effective intervention. Until there emerges a clearer understanding of the issues, efforts to provide effective support to a particularly vulnerable group of children will remain a considerable challenge for policy makers and practitioners.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Continue monitoring all suspected trafficking cases on a local basis. There should be an annual statistical update of NRM referrals and other 'suspected' trafficking cases – documenting any trends and developments.

- Consider the development of a more in depth training programme. Despite awareness raising training, workers are often missing indicators of trafficking and / or not referring as per CPC guidance.

- From a child protection, rights based perspective consideration should be given to challenging and revisiting Competent Authority decisions regarding trafficking. The decision to refer in Glasgow is made by a multi-agency child protection focussed group, where the best interests of the child are paramount and should take precedence.

- Ensure that immigration / migration concerns do not override child protection and safeguarding considerations. All decisions should be taken in the best interests of the child.

- Develop clear protocols / guidance for practitioners to facilitate information gathering from countries and international organisations outwith the UK.

- Further research and practice knowledge is required to identify what interventions work, at what point in the rehabilitation process, with which individuals.

- Ensure the engagement and participation of children in developing services to meet their needs and in any future research projects.

- Extend the use of VYP procedures to all separated children arriving in Glasgow in recognition of their vulnerabilities and ensure that comprehensive assessments are undertaken on all children in line with the The Looked After Children (Scotland) Regulations (2009). Also consider the potential support needs of children on the move

REFERENCES

Almandras, S. (2011) *Human Trafficking: UK Responses* House of Commons Library Standard Note SN/HA/4324 www.parliament.uk/briefing-papers/SN04324.pdf [access 30/8/11]

AFRUCA (2007) *What is Child Trafficking?* London, AFRUCA
www.afruca.org/images/stories/reports/child-trafficking-info.pdf [access 1/9/11]

AFRUCA (2009) *What is Child Abuse?* London, AFRUCA
http://www.afruca.org/images/stories/reports/what%20is%20child%20abuse.pdf [access 22/10/11]

ATMG (2010) *Wrong Kind of Victim? One Year On: An Analysis of UK Measures to Protect Trafficked Persons* London, Anti-Trafficking Monitoring Group
www.antislavery.org/includes/documents/cm_docs/2010/f/full_report.pdf [access 9/8/11]

ATMG (2011a) *Trafficked Children* Briefing Paper, London, Anti-Trafficking Monitoring Group
www.antislavery.org/includes/documents/cm_docs/2011/c/children.pdf [access 9/8/11]

ATMG (2011b) *Discrimination in the Identification Process* Briefing paper, London, Anti-Trafficking Monitoring Group
www.ecpat.org.uk/sites/default/files/atmg_briefing_discrimination_in_the_identification_process.pdf [access 1/8/11]

Asquith S and Turner E (2008) *Recovery and Reintegration of Children from the Effects of Sexual Exploitation and Related Trafficking* Geneva, Oak Foundation

Bhabha, J. & Zard, M. (2006) 'Smuggled or trafficked?' *Forced Migration Review* 25, 6-8

Booth, R. (2009) 'A phone call, a car door opens – and another child vanishes' *Guardian* Wednesday 6 May 2009, 12-13

Bovarnick, S. (2010) 'How do you define a "trafficked child"? A discursive analysis of practitioners' perceptions around child trafficking', *Youth and Policy*, 104, pp. 80–97.

Brennan D (2005) 'Methodological challenges in research with trafficked persons: tales from the field' in Laczko F and Gozdziak E (eds) *Data and Research on Human Trafficking: A Global Survey* International Organization Migration
lastradainternational.org/lsidocs/282%20IOM%20survey%20trafficking%20%28Global%29.pdf [access 20/10/11]

Busch-Armendariz, Noel B.; Nsonwu, Maura B.; and Cook Heffron, Laurie (2011) "Human Trafficking Victims and Their Children: Assessing Needs, Vulnerabilities, Strengths, and Survivorship," *Journal of Applied Research on Children: Informing Policy for Children at Risk*: Vol. 2: Iss. 1, Article 3.
digitalcommons.library.tmc.edu/childrenatrisk/vol2/iss1/3 [access 16/8/11]

Cameron, H. (2010) *Child Trafficking: Mapping Resources in the City of Glasgow* – Unpublished report, Stirling, Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research

Care Commission (2008) *Private Fostering – The Unknown Arrangement* Dundee, Care Commission

CEOP (2011) *Child Trafficking Update – October 2011* London, Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre
ceop.police.uk/Documents/ceopdocs/child_trafficking_update_2011.pdf [access 19/10/11]

Council of Europe (2005) *Council of Europe Convention on Action Against Trafficking in Human Beings: And its Explanatory Report* Council of Europe Treaty Series - No. 197
www.coe.int/t/dg2/trafficking/campaign/Source/PDF_Conv_197_Trafficking_E.pdf [access 6/8/11]

Danziger R (2006) 'Where are the victims of trafficking' *Forced Migration Review* 25, 10-12 **www.fmreview.org/FMRpdfs/FMR25/FMR25full.pdf** [access 5/12/11]

Derluyn, I. and Broekaert, E. (2008) 'Unaccompanied refugee children and adolescents: the glaring contrasts between a legal and psychological perspective' *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry* 31, 319-330

Dottridge, M. (2007) *A Handbook on Planning Projects to Prevent Child Trafficking* Lausanne, Terres des Hommes
www.terredeshommes.org/pdf/publication/handbook_june8.pdf [access 12/12/11]

Dottridge M (2011) *Exploring Methods to Protect Children on the Move: working draft*, Lausanne, Terres des Hommes
www.terredeshommes.org/pdf/handbook/handbook_children_on_the_move.pdf [access 11/10/11]

ECPAT (2009) *Safeguarding children controlled through belief in ritual oaths, 'child witches', or religious and traditional practices* Understanding paper no 1, London,ECPAT
www.ecpat.org.uk/sites/default/files/understanding_papers/understanding_witchcraft.pdf [access 1/8/11]

ECPAT (2010) *Child Trafficking in the UK: A Snapshot* London, ECPAT UK
www.ecpat.org.uk/sites/default/files/child_trafficking_in_the_uk_a_snapshot.pdf [access 20/10/11]

ECPAT (2011) *Child Trafficking and Private Fostering* Understanding paper ECPAT,London
www.ecpat.org.uk/sites/default/files/understanding_papers/understanding_private_fostering.pdf [access 19/10/11]

European Commission (2010) *Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on Preventing and Combating Trafficking in Human Beings, and Protecting Victims* Brussels, European Commission
eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0095:FIN:EN:PDF[access 6/8/11]

EHRC (2010) *Formal Inquiry Opened into Human Trafficking in Scotland* Edinburgh, Equalities and Human Rights Commission
www.equalityhumanrights.com/scotland/projects-and-campaigns-in-scotland/inquiry-into-human-trafficking-in-scotland/ [access 9/8/11]

EHRC (2011) *Inquiry into Human Trafficking in Scotland* Edinburgh, Equality and Human Rights Commission
http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/Scotland/Human_Trafficking_in_Scotland_/inquiry_into_human_trafficking_in_scotland-full-report_pdf_.pdf [access 12/12/11]

Farrel, A., McDevitt, J., Fahy, S. (2010) 'Where are all the victims? Understanding the determinants of official identification of human trafficking victims' *Criminology and public Policy* 9(2), 201-233

Gallagher, A. (2002) "Trafficking, Smuggling and Human Rights: Tricks and Treaties." *Forced Migration Review,* 12, 25-28
www.fmreview.org/FMRpdfs/FMR12/fmr12full.pdf [access 10/10/11]

Gallagher, A. (2010) *The International Law of Human Trafficking* Cambridge University Press

Glasgow CPC (2009) *Inter Agency Guidance for Child Trafficking* Glasgow Child Protection Committee

Glasgow CPC (2011) *Inter Agency Guidance for Child Trafficking* Glasgow Child Protection Committee
www.glasgowchildprotection.org.uk/NR/rdonlyres/AADFD622-A183-4B96-9D5E-D6F3C2C37A79/0/GLASGOWCHILDTRAFFICKINGGUIDANCESept09.pdf [access 20/10/11]

Global Movement for Children (2011) *Protecting and Supporting Children on the Move Conference*, Barcelona, October 2010
www.gmfc.org/images/pdf/com_executive%20summary.pdf [access 12/10/11]

Gozdziak, E. (2008) 'Social thought and commentary on challenges, dilemmas, and opportunities in studying trafficked children' *Anthropological Quarterly* 81(4), 903-923

Gozdziak, E. Bump, M. Duncan, J. MacDonnell, M. Loiselle, MB. (2006) 'The trafficked child, trauma and resilience' *Forced Migration Review* 24, 4-15

Herald Scotland (2011) Is there really a sex trafficking epidemic?
www.heraldscotland.com/news/crime-courts/is-there-really-a-sex-trafficking-epidemic-1.1128258 [access 11/10/11]

Home Office (2007) *UK Action Plan on Tacking Human Trafficking London, Home Office*
www.ungift.org/doc/knowledgehub/resourcecentre/Governments/UK_Action_Plan_to_Combat_Human_Trafficking_en.pdf *[access 20/10/11]*

Home Office (2009) *Update to the UK Action Plan on Tacking Human Trafficking London, Home Office*
www.ungift.org/doc/knowledgehub/resourcecentre/Governments/Update_to_the_UK_Action_Plan_on_Tackling_Human_Trafficking_en_2009.pdf [access 20/10/11]

Home Office (2011) Human Trafficking: The Government's Strategy London, Home Office www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/crime/human-trafficking-strategy?view=Binary [access 20/10/11]

Hugman, R., Pittaway, E., and Bartolomei, L. (2011) When 'do no harm' is not enough: the ethics of research with refugees and other vulnerable groups *British Journal of Social Work* 41, 1271-1287

Hynes, P. (2010) Understanding the 'Vulnerabilities', 'resilience' and processes of the trafficking of children and young people into, within and out of the UK' *Youth and Policy* 104, 97-118

IOM (2007) *The IOM Handbook on Direct Assistance for Victims of Trafficking* Geneva, International Organisation for Migration

IOM (2009) *Guidelines for the Collection of Data on Trafficking in Human Beings, Including Comparable Indicators* Vienna, International Organisation for Migration
http://publications.iom.int/bookstore/index.php?main_page=product_info&products_id=590[access 16/08/11]

ILO (2006) *Rehabilitation of the Victims of Child Trafficking: A Multi-disciplinary Approach* Bangkok, International Labour Office

ILPA (2009) 'ILPA submission to the home affairs committee enquiry into trafficking' Immigration Law Practitioner's Association March 2009
www.ilpa.org.uk/data/resources/13107/08.02.600.pdf [access 20/10/11]

Jonson-Reid, M. and Drake, B. (2008) Multisector Longitudinal Administrative Databases: An Indispensible Tool for Evidence-Based Policy *Child Maltreatment* 13(4), 392-399

Kane, S. (2006) The Ecological Approach to the Assessment of Asylum Seeking and Refugee Children: The Social Worker's Guide to Looking at the Child in Context National Children's Bureau
www.ncb.org.uk/dotpdf/open%20access%20%20phase%201%20only/arc_1_1ecologicalapproach.pdf [access 20/10/11]

Kelly E (2009) 'Safeguarding trafficked children' in Hughes L and Owen H (eds) *Good Practice in Safeguarding Children: Working Effectively in Child Protection* London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers

Kelly, L. (2005) 'You can find anything you want: a critical reflection on research on trafficking on persons within and into Europe' Laczko F and Gozdziak E (eds) *Data and Research on Human Trafficking: A Global Survey* International Organization Migration

Kohli, R. (2002) 'Social work with unaccompanied asylum seeking young people' *Forced Migration Review* 12 31-33

Koser, K. (2000) 'Asylum policies, trafficking and vulnerability' *International Migration* 38(3), 91-109, Special Issue

Leask, D. (2011) *Scotland Fails Child Victims of Trafficking* Herald Scotland www.heraldscotland.com/news/home-news/scotland-fails-child-victims-of-trafficking-1.1090201 [access 1/9/11]

Lebov, K. (2009) *Human Trafficking in Scotland* 2007/08 Edinburgh, Scottish Government www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/266520/0079757.pdf [access 20/10/11]

London SCB (2011a) *London Safeguarding Trafficked Children Guidance* London Safeguarding Children Board www.londonscb.gov.uk/trafficking [access 5/8/11]

London SCB (2011b) *London Safeguarding Trafficked Children Toolkit* London Safeguarding Children Board www.londonscb.gov.uk/trafficking [access 5/8/11]

London SCB (2011c) *Final Monitoring Report Local Authority Pilots of the London Safeguarding Trafficked Children Guidance and Toolkit* London Safeguarding Children Board www.londonscb.gov.uk/trafficking [access 5/8/11]

Macy, R. and Johns, N. (2011) 'Aftercare services for international sex trafficking survivors: informing US service and program development in an emerging practice area' *Trauma, Violence, Abuse* 12(2), 87-98 tva.sagepub.com/content/12/2/87 DOI: 10.1177/1524838010390709

Mattar, M. & Van Slyke, S. (2010) 'Improving our approach to human trafficking' *Criminology and public Policy* 9(2) 197-200

Migrant Helpline (2010) Equal opportunities committee inquiry into migration and trafficking: written submission www.scottish.parliament.uk/s3/committees/equal/inquiries/migration/subs/MT06MigrantHelpline.pdf [access 1/9/11]

Mitchell, F. (2003) 'The social services response to unaccompanied children in England' *Child and Family Social Work* 8, 179-189

Omelaniuk, I. (2005) *Trafficking in Human Beings* UN expert group meeting on international migration and development www.un.org/esa/population/meetings/ittmigdev2005/P15_IOmelaniuk.pdf [accessed 4/8/11]

OSCE (2004) *National Referral Mechanisms: Joining Efforts to Protect the Rights of Trafficked Persons – A Practical Handbook* Warsaw, Organisation for Security Cooperation Europe, Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights

OSCE (2009) 2006/2007 *Review on the Protection of Trafficked Persons In England and Wales* Background paper distributed at the UK meeting on identification and protection of trafficked Persons and national referral mechanisms

Parmentier, S. (2010) 'Epilogue: Human trafficking seen from the future' *European Journal of Criminology* 7(1), 95-100

Pearce, J. (2011) 'Working with trafficked children and young people: complexities in practice' *British Journal of Social Work* Advanced access published 30/3/11 doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcr029, 1-18

Pearce, J., Hynes, P., Bovarnick, S. (2009) *Breaking the Wall of Silence: Practitioners Responses to Trafficked Children and Young People* London NSPCC www.nspcc.org.uk/Inform/research/findings/breaking_the_wall_of_silence_report_wdf66135.pdf [access 20/10/11]

Poole, L. and Adamson, K. (2009) *Report on the Situation of the Roma Community in Govanhill, Glasgow* University of the West of Scotland

Rafferty, Y. (2007) 'Children for sale: child trafficking in southeast Asia' *Child Abuse Review* 16, 401-422

Rafferty, Y. (2008) 'The impact of trafficking on children: psychological and social policy perspectives' *Child Development Perspectives* 2(1), 13-18

Rigby, P. (2009) *Child Trafficking in Glasgow: Report of a Case File Analysis of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children* – Glasgow Child Protection Committee www.glasgowchildprotection.org.uk/NR/rdonlyres/F4470FF7-1586-4ADB-8217-03A0E45EA07A/0/GCPC_child_traffic_2009.pdf [access 1/9/11]

Rigby, P. (2010) *Child Trafficking in Glasgow 2: The Views of Professionals* Glasgow Child Protection Committee www.glasgowchildprotection.org.uk/NR/rdonlyres/C3597A7A-8D4C-4F98-B846-76A6F7CB1D1C/0/GCPC_child_traffic_research2010.pdf [access 1/9/11]

Rigby, P. (2011) 'Separated and Trafficked Children: The Challenges for Child Protection Professionals' *Child Abuse Review* Wiley online library doi:10.1002/car.1193

Schloenhardt, A. and Long, M. (2011) Return and Reintegration of Human Trafficking Victims from Australia *International Journal of Refugee Law* (2011) 23(2): 143-173

Scotland's Commissioner for Children and Young People (2011) *Scotland: A Safe Place for Child Traffickers – A Scoping Study into the Nature and Extent of Child Trafficking in Scotland* Edinburgh, Scotland's Commissioner for Children and Young People / University of Highlands and Islands www.sccyp.org.uk [access10/10/11]

Scottish Government (2008a) *Guidance to local authorities on the assessment and support for kinship carers of looked after children* Edinburgh, Scottish Government www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2008/09/11124435/0 [accessed 1/8/11]

Scottish Government (2008b) *A Guide to Getting It Right for Every Child* Edinburgh, Scottish Government www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2008/09/22091734/9 [access 21/10/11]

Scottish Government (2009a) *Safeguarding Children in Scotland Who May Have Been Trafficked* Edinburgh, Scottish Government www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2009/02/18092546/0 [access 10/7/09]

Scottish Government (2009b) The Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings: Identifying and recording cases of child trafficking: The national referral mechanism - letter to CPC Chairs 31/3/09 www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/254429/0080167.pdf [access 1/8/11]

Scottish Government (2011) *Getting it Right: Practical Tools* www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/People/Young-People/gettingitright/practical-tools [access 21/10/11]

Scottish Parliament (2010) Equal Opportunities Committee Inquiry into Migration and Trafficking www.scottish.parliament.uk/s3/committees/equal/or-10/eo10-0802.htm#Col1649 [access 9/8/11]

SOCA Serious Organised Crime Agency (2011) *NRM Statistical data April 2009 to March 2011* www.soca.gov.uk/about-the-ukhtc/statistical-data [access 18/8/11]

Sime, D., Fox. R., Pietka, E. (2011) *At Home Abroad: The Life Experiences of Eastern European Migrant Children in Scotland* University of Strathclyde

Surtees R (2007) *Listening to Victims: Experiences of Identification, Return and Assistance in South Eastern Europe* Austria, International Centre for Migration Policy Development http://www.childtrafficking.com/Docs/listening_to_victims_1007.pdf [access 17/11/11]

Surtees R (2010) *Monitoring Anti-Trafficking Re/integration Programmes: A Manual*, Washington, Nexus Institute www.kbs-frb.be/uploadedFiles/KBS-FRB/05)_Pictures,_documents_and_external_sites/09)_Publications/PUB-2051-FRB-reintegration.pdf?utm_source=Child+Recovery+Network+subscription+list&utm_campaign=4c0b1c30d0-Updates_from_Child_Recovery_Network_014_15_2011&utm_medium=email [access 29/8/11]

TARA (2010) Equal opportunities committee inquiry into migration and trafficking: written submission received from Glasgow Community and Safety Services www.scottish.parliament.uk/s3/committees/equal/inquiries/migration/subs/MT16TARA.pdf [access 1/9/11]

Tyldum, G. (2009) "Coping with biases in trafficking data" in *Human Trafficking: New Directions for Research* IOM – International Organisation for Migration www.iom.ch/jahia/webdav/shared/shared/mainsite/microsites/IDM/workshops/ensuring_protection_070909/human_trafficking_new_directions_for_research.pdf [access 27/10/11]

United Nations (2000) *Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, Supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (Palermo Protocol)* http://www.uncjin.org/Documents/Conventions/dcatoc/final_documents_2/convention_%20traff_eng.pdf [access 21/10/11]

UNODC (2006) *Trafficking in Persons: Global Patterns* United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Vienna www.unodc.org/pdf/traffickinginpersons_report_2006-04.pdf [access20/10/11]

UNODC (2006b) *Toolkit to Combat Trafficking in Persons* United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime http://www.unodc.org/documents/human-trafficking/HT-toolkit-en.pdf [access 1/9/11]

UNODC (2009) *Transnational Law and the Rule of Law in West Africa: Threat Assessment* United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime http://img.modernghana.com/images/content/report_content/westafricareport2009.pdf [access 9/8/11]

United States Department of State (2011) Trafficking in Persons Report 2011 http://www.state.gov/g/tip/rls/tiprpt/2011 [access 20/10/11]

Wallace, MM., and Wylie, K. (2011) Child Trafficking: A Scottish Perspective *Commonwealth Judicial Journal* 19, 1, June.

Wirtz, L. (2009) *Hidden Children: Separated Children at Risk* London, Children's Society

APPENDIX 1 - Children on the move definition from Global Movement for Children

http://www.gmfc.org/en/action-within-the-movement/gmc-actions/actions-by-imperatives/other-campaigns-a-actions/current-actions/90

*"Children on the move is an umbrella definition for **persons under the age of 18 who have left their place of habitual residence and are either on the way towards a new destination**, or have already reached such destination. Children on the Move may be:*

- *across State borders or within countries;*
- *movement can be of a seasonal or more permanent nature;*
- *movement can be voluntary or forced;*
- *they can be accompanied by parents, peers or others, or not;*
- *and children who are, for instance: internally displaced persons, asylum seekers and refugees, migrants, trafficked persons or child soldiers.*

During movement, a child can float from one sub category to the other. For example, an internally displaced child can be recruited by armed forces or moved across borders for the purpose of exploitation. The risks and opportunities differ per trajectory and conditions of movement."

APPENDIX 2 - All 'suspected' cases by region referred to child protection team for advice since 2007 where region of origin is known

Region	Nos
Asia	6
West Africa	27
East Africa	22
Central Africa	3
Southern Africa	1
Unknown Africa	3
East Asia	15
Eastern Europe	20
Western Europe	2

APPENDIX 3

DATABASE FIELDS
- Name
- ID
- Sex
- Date of birth
- Citizenship
- Ethnicity
- Children
- Marital status
- Education
- Traffickers (relationship to child)
- Trafficking recruitment process
- Methods of control (journey / home country)
- Home circumstances
- Transit countries and cities
- Type of exploitation
- Where exploited
- Length of exploitation
- Means of control (UK)
- Date departed home country
- Date first arrived UK
- Movement within UK
- Date arrived Glasgow
- Time from home country to Glasgow
- How arrived in Glasgow
- Date first contact with social work services in Glasgow
- Referred to social work by
- Date initial child protection case conference
- Date of child protection decision
- National Referral Mechanism
- Date referred to NRM
- Age at referral to NRM
- Reasonable decision and date
- Conclusive decision and date
- Reasons for decisions
- Health / mental health issues
- Assistance received by child
- Legal action (Police; SCRA)
- Outcomes @date
- Missing – Y/N
- Updates / free text notes

Adapted from IOM (2009)

APPENDIX 4

GLASGOW CHILD PROTECTION COMMITTEE
CHILD TRAFFICKING ASSESSMENT (CTA)

Child's surname:		Known as:		Forenames:	

Date of birth		Place of birth		Nationality	

Ethnicity		Language		Religion	

Carefirst no		Home Office no		ID docs	

Home address:	Current address:

Family / household members:		
Name:	Relationship:	Address:

Legal / asylum status:	
Legal status(looked after etc & previous):	Asylum status:

Agencies involved & contact details:

Referrer / Report writer		Date		Agency / Team	

				If not contacting centre child protection team and anti trafficking unit or referring to NRM please explain why
Social work CP team Centenary House contacted		NRM referral & date		
Police vice & anti trafficking unit contacted				
All concerns about child trafficking should be discussed with the child protection team and anti trafficking unit. **A copy of this assessment should be forwarded to them**				

Note: each section should encompass the views and accounts of all agencies with relevant information.
Please make it clear where you obtained the evidence / information

1.Brief background details (give a pen picture of the young person within their family / country of origin context)

2. Movement (within countries; across borders; across UK; across city; across accommodation. Include details of how travelled; timescales; time at locations etc; entry into trafficking process;– eg sold; passage bought; abducted; escape; present accommodation)

3. Exploitation / abuse (detail evidence and / or suspicions; types of exploitation; locations; length of exploitation; freedom of movement)

4. Trafficker (description; relatives; gender; title; job; names; relationship to child; still in contact etc)

5.Means of control
(how has trafficker controlled child; threats (to child & family); grooming; violence, voodoo, oaths, captivity, debt)

6. Additional risk factors
(likely to be identified from indicator matrix; may include health; other contacts)

7. Agency contact / actions taken (police; social work; UKBA; voluntary; overseas)

8.Views of young person (if appropriate)

9.Analysis / Assessment of Needs and Risks in relation to trafficking
(inc analysis of why believe trafficked / not; present safety; future risk of trafficking)

10 Conclusion & recommendation (VYP/not & reasons, action plan, identify specific outcomes; by whom)

If there are immediate child protection concerns this assessment form is not a substitute for following child protection procedures.

CHILD TRAFFICKING ASSESSMENT

This form should be completed by social workers and police in conjunction with the child protection team and vice and anti-trafficking unit.

The Child Trafficking Assessment is designed to assess potential victims of trafficking and / or future risk of trafficking. It is not a substitute for a comprehensive assessment of risk and needs in terms of a holistic GIRFEC assessment – such an assessment should be completed as per child protection procedures and guidelines. The assessments should complement and inform each other. If initial concerns are about trafficking it is likely that the CTA is completed first; if the IAF / CP1 / VYP (or equivalent) is being completed and suspicions about trafficking become apparent the CTA should be completed to focus on trafficking specific concerns.

When the assessment is completed sections 1 to 10 can be copied into section G of the NRM form as evidence if a referral is being made to UKHTC.

It is likely the CTA will be informed by the use of the indicator matrix for trafficking - the matrix is not an exhaustive list of indicators, *or an assessment* of future risk. Other factors may also be present that are not included on the matrix – eg for internal trafficking movement may be between cities and accommodation rather than countries.

If there are indications, or intent, of movement (section 2) and exploitation / abuse (section 3) – the minimum requirements for child trafficking – a referral should be made to the National Referral Mechanism following CPC guidelines.

The presence of other indicators may also be sufficient for a referral to the NRM (please discuss with child protection team or trafficking unit).

In completing the assessment remember that background information may be available from agencies and organisations outside the UK – eg NGOs working in country of origin; country of origin embassies; social services in countries of origin.

1. Background details
Include social / economic circumstances of the family; why child left the family; continued contact with family; any previous work / employment;

2. Movement
- Trafficking can occur at any stage throughout a child's journey; it is not limited to the final destination.
- UK nationals are also vulnerable to internal trafficking (movement between and within cities and between people) and may also be trafficked out of UK
- A child may be trafficked through legitimate routes and with legal documents, in

addition to covert routes with no documents

- Child may arrive alone or accompanied.
- Once trafficked may be at increased risk for future trafficking
- Are child movements restricted and / or accommodation locked?

3. Exploitation / abuse

What is the nature of the exploitation? Where did it occur? Is it ongoing?

- Trafficking is a process, not a single event.
- Trafficked children may be forced into criminal activity.

4. Trafficker(s)

- Children may remain in contact with the trafficker or the person who brought them into the country.
- Contact may be lost only to be recommenced days / months / years later.
- Children may describe the trafficker as a 'friend' 'boy/girl friend'.
- Who are the people involved in a child's life

5. Means of control

- Children may be physically threatened
- Children may be controlled psychologically
- Consider threats to family
- Trafficked children may be groomed

6. Other risk factors

- Consider factors that may be concerning, but on their own not indicative / evidence of trafficking
- There are no validated risk assessments for child trafficking
- Children may move in and out of trafficking situations

7. Agency involvement

- Agencies may have been previously involved and not identified trafficking as an issue

8. Views of young person

- Children do not usually say they have been trafficked.
- Children may deny any exploitation / abuse
- Children may not consider their experiences exploitative

9-10. Analysis and conclusions

NB Trafficking and its assessment is not a static process - due to the nature of child trafficking it is likely that much of the required information may not be initially available, or sketchy; it is important that the assessment is regularly updated.