Technology and Research Requirements for Combating Human Trafficking:
Enhancing Communication, Analysis, Reporting, and Information Sharing

SJ Kreyling
CL West
JR Olson

March 2011

Pacific Northwest
NATIONAL LABORATORY

Proudly Operated by **Battelle** *Since 1965*

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor Battelle Memorial Institute, nor any of their employees, makes **any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights** Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or Battelle Memorial Institute. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST NATIONAL LABORATORY
operated by
BATTELLE
for the
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
under Contract DE-AC05-76RL01830

Printed in the United States of America

Available to DOE and DOE contractors from the
Office Scientific and Technical Information,
P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, TN 37831-0062;
ph: (865) 576-8401
fax: (865) 576-5728
email: reports@adonis.osti.gov

Available to the public from the National Technical Information Service
5301 Shawnee Rd., Alexandra, VA 22312
ph: (800) 553-NTIS (6847)
email: orders@ntis.gov <http://www.ntis.gov/about/from.aspx>
Online ordering: http://www.ntis.gov

Technology and Research Requirements for Combating Human Trafficking:

Enhancing Communication, Analysis, Reporting, and Information Sharing

SJ Kreyling
CL West
JR Olson

March 2011

Pacific Northwest Laboratory
Richland, Washington 99352

Preface

This report was produced for the Knowledge Management Technologies Portfolio as part of the Integrated Federal, State, and Local/Regional Information Sharing and Collaboration (RISC) Program.

Program Manager: Bruce Baicar, DHS Office of Science & Technology

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

We [DHS] are, indeed, proud to play a strong role in combating human trafficking ...This past year, ICE, working with DOJ, initiated its highest ever number of cases with a nexus to human trafficking. Our success in combating human trafficking continues to be rooted in strong partnerships. This includes not only the partnership represented around this table today but also state, local, tribal, international, nongovernmental, and private sector partners who see this problem every day on the ground. [1]

> -- Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano, Remarks at the President's Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, 1 February, 2011.

DHS' Science & Technology Directorate tasked the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) to conduct an exploratory study to examine and identify technology and research requirements for enhancing communication, analysis, reporting, and information sharing – requirements that directly support efforts to track, identify, deter, and prosecute human trafficking activities within the Pacific Northwest region – including identification of potential national threats from smuggling and trafficking networks. To implement this mandate, the PNNL team set out to identify unmet technology requirements of the user community, in this case those of the Department's critical federal, state, local, tribal, and private sector partners. As a starting point for this effort, PNNL undertook to identify gaps in information sharing among members of the user community (local, state and regional) and between the user community and federal agencies (at the national level) from the user community perspective. This effort was conducted under the Knowledge Management Technologies Portfolio as part of the Integrated Federal, State, and Local/Regional Information Sharing and Collaboration (RISC) Program.

The major recommendations of this report are:

- Defensible methodologies are needed to estimate the number of victims of human trafficking, both nationally and regionally. Various modeling and expert elicitation techniques can be applied, using the members of each DOJ anti-trafficking task force as the pool of experts, including victim service providers. Separately, there is a need to harmonize and standardize the existing efforts to estimate the scale of human trafficking in the US.

- Variations in the definitions of human trafficking employed by law enforcement, service providers, and others pose a significant challenge to accurate measurement. Develop and implement a methodology that helps practitioners clarify and describe their conceptual frameworks/mental models.

- Further identification of information-sharing processes and technologies currently in use by both DHS component agencies and partner organizations that participate in each of the federally-funded Anti-Human-Trafficking Task Forces across the county is required.

---

[1] The President's Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (PITF) is a cabinet-level task force to coordinate federal efforts to combat human trafficking. The PITF is chaired by the Secretary of State and meets at least once a year. It includes the Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of Labor Hilda L. Solis, Attorney General Eric H. Holder, Jr., and Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano. Additionally, the February 2011 meeting was joined, for the first time, by the FBI, by the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of the Interior.

- Research is needed on the applicability of collecting victim data from a wide variety of sources beyond law enforcement, the outreach strategies necessary to increase the breadth of sources from which information is collected, the reduction of the methodological challenges as more data is collected from different sources, and methods for using this data for the regional examination of patterns and trends.

- The information collected about human trafficking investigations by local, regional and federal law enforcement is not easily accessible by investigating agents and data is not efficiently compared between agencies or across systems. Identify an emerging industry standard for federated search and begin to move existing and new systems to support it.

- Ad-hoc information sharing between investigating officers/agents in different agencies is difficult and not a routine occurrence. Given the difficulties of browsing and searching the systems of other agencies, research is needed into tools that can be accessed and edited by any vetted law enforcement officer, yet with fixed geographic and categorical sections to focus on their specific interests (human trafficking, Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC), gangs, narcotics, etc.).

- Despite significantly increased attention to human trafficking, Washington State has not seen an increase in identifiable and prosecutable human trafficking-related cases associated with forced labor and domestic servitude of foreign nationals. An analysis based on analyzing visa applications (e.g., B1, H2A, H2B) should be conducted to produce a "proactive triage" of potential victims from high-risk populations.

- Despite significantly increased attention to human trafficking nationwide, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) has not seen a comparable increase human trafficking related criminal convictions - only 30% of human trafficking cases that ICE initiated in FY09 eventually led to a criminal conviction. A lessons-learned study should be conducted to identify the factors that are most influential to a case's successful transition from investigation to a conviction.

- An International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) Working Group should be convened that builds on IACP's pre-existing work related to combating human trafficking with a specific focus on the application of technology for training and investigations from the user perspective. Lessons learned, best practices and tools or technologies needed by local law enforcement will be the expected knowledge-product outcomes.

- There is large body of knowledge and perspective on trafficking and smuggling residing in the Intelligence Community (IC) which is not widely available within law enforcement. Research should be conducted on lessons learned from the intelligence community concerning human trafficking and related networks (terrorism, smuggling, narcotics, weapons, etc.) which can then be applied to law enforcement and presented in an unclassified report.

- There is no systematic means of *proactively* assessing the scale, movement, demand, inter-connectedness, or general operation of juvenile prostitution and Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking (DMST) at a regional or larger level. A pilot sensor platform should be built to examine a significant subset of on-line prostitution sites in a regional set of participating urban areas, as well as, street-based prostitution associated with DMST.

- The greatest and most immediate need that the Co-Chairs of WashACT (Seattle Police, U.S. Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington, ICE, and the Washington Anti-trafficking Response Network) identified was for more shelters with specialized services for victims. In order to

successfully investigate and prosecute traffickers, victims must be stable and free from fear and intimidation to be effective witnesses.

- There is also a lack of capacity to deal with large numbers of trafficking victims at once, should the need arise (i.e., there is no "surge capacity").

Interactive web-based report with network maps
In addition to this document, there is also a web-based version of this report, which is divided into three text pages, representing the body of the report, and four interactive network maps showing the connections among the entities involved in combating human trafficking in the Seattle area. The maps allow for a more detailed drilldown into each entity (stakeholder, technology, etc.) for more detail about their role and relationships, as well as aid in the identification of technology gaps.

The network maps include the following:

- Relationships Map: This map shows institutionalized, formal relationships (such as membership in an organization) between entities identified by PNNL's research team.

- Information Sharing Map: This map shows all of the formal and informal information flows between entities that were identified by PNNL's research team.

- Technology Used Map: This map shows the technologies and information systems used by entities that were identified by PNNL's research team.

- Complete Map: This map combines the other three maps and shows all connections between entities that were identified by PNNL's research team including relationships, information sharing and technology use.

1. Introduction

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has developed a comprehensive strategy to combat human trafficking through coordination with domestic and foreign non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and law enforcement agencies in order to identify and provide services to trafficking victims and coordinate investigations. DHS' human trafficking strategy is focused on providing a commitment to victim-centered investigations and incorporates a multidisciplinary response.

> *The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) launched the "Blue Campaign" in February of 2010 — a DHS-wide initiative to combat human trafficking through enhanced public awareness, victim assistance programs, and law enforcement training and initiatives. The Blue Campaign encompasses a wide range of anti-trafficking programs designed to engage the American and global public, the Department's federal, state, local and tribal law enforcement partners, nonprofit and nongovernmental organizations, and governments around the world.*[2]

DHS' Blue Campaign strategy is organized around the "three Ps" of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000[3]: *Prevention, Protection, and Prosecution.* DHS has added a "fourth P" called *Partnership* in order to assist the department in operationalizing its strategy, focused on the Trafficking Victim's Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA). The purpose of each "P" is as follows: [4]

Prevention: To prevent human trafficking, the Department conducts public outreach both domestically and abroad. Domestic public outreach helps identify victims of human trafficking by raising general awareness and encouraging the public to report suspected instances of human trafficking; international public outreach raises awareness among potential trafficking victims seeking employment or other opportunities in the United States, who may fall prey to the lures of human traffickers.

Protection: To protect victims, the Department provides immigration assistance in the form of Continued Presence, T visas and U visas; employs Victim Assistance Specialists who work in tandem with law enforcement and non-governmental service providers throughout the country; and actively offers a number of victim assistance materials informing potential victims of their rights and how to receive help if they are violated. Immigration and Customs Enforcement also hosts "Train-the-Trainer" conferences with special agents and collateral duty victim assistance coordinators that cover victim assistance responsibilities for agents.

---

[2] Fact Sheet: DHS Blue Campaign, http://www.dhs.gov/ynews/gc_1279809595502.shtm (accessed 20 December, 2010).

[3] According to Amy Farrell, the program manager for Northeastern University's DOJ-funded Human Trafficking Reporting System (HTRS): "the TVPA accomplished five main goals: 1) it defined a specific crime of human trafficking; 2) it enhanced the penalties for slavery, involuntary servitude and peonage from 10 to 20 years; 3) it created a new visa category which allows trafficking victims to receive benefits and services in the U.S.; 4) it ordered a report ranking countries based on their response to trafficking and specified sanctions which can be applied to those countries whose governments do not take adequate steps to prevent trafficking; and 5) it provided funding for enforcement of anti-trafficking provisions and new assistance programs. The 2003 and 2005 reauthorizations further directed federal agencies to gain a better understanding of the scope of the trafficking problem and the sufficiency of the current U.S. responses."

[4] One DHS: The Blue Campaign, http://www.dhs.gov/files/programs/gc_1270739792024.shtm (accessed 20 December, 2010).

Prosecution: To increase prosecutions of traffickers, the Department trains thousands of federal, state, local and international law enforcement officials annually to recognize the indicators of human trafficking and to conduct successful human trafficking investigations. The Department also pursues an active and aggressive domestic and overseas human trafficking investigations program led by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Partnerships: Through the Blue Campaign, the Department works closely with domestic and international partners spanning federal, state, and local government; non-governmental organizations; and the private sector.

In addition to directly supporting DHS' Blue Campaign, this effort is relevant to supporting the broader DHS' **Mission #2** (**Securing and Managing Our Borders)** and **Mission #3 (Enforcing and Administering Our Immigration Laws)**, as identified in DHS' 2010 Quadrennial Homeland Security Review. According to Mission Goal 2.3 *Disrupt and Dismantle Transnational Criminal Organizations,* DHS is specifically tasked to: [5]

Disrupt transnational criminal or terrorist organizations involved in cross-border smuggling, trafficking, or other cross-border crimes, dismantle their infrastructure, and apprehend their leaders. Identifying, disrupting, and dismantling criminal and terrorist organizations transcends any one Federal agency, State, local, tribal, or territorial law enforcement agency, or Intelligence Community partner. Success will require many key activities. First, all relevant information held by authorities concerning known or suspected terrorists, criminals, illicit organizations and networks, and inadmissible foreign nationals must be appropriately shared among agencies so malicious actors are interdicted by authorities. Working together, the operations of the major transnational criminal and terrorist organizations must be disrupted, and supporting organizations, networks, and infrastructure must be substantially dismantled. The leaders of these organizations must be apprehended and brought to justice.

…In addition to exploiting lawful systems for global travel and trade, criminal and terrorist organizations create their own illegal pathways for smuggling and trafficking people and goods across international borders. While these routes and conveyances may be used today to transport illicit narcotics or facilitate illegal migration, the same routes may also be used to smuggle terrorists and their tools and finances, or even highly dangerous weapons and materials. Working appropriately with domestic law enforcement partners, the Intelligence Community, and foreign partners, we must identify these illicit pathways, understand their nodes and conveyances, monitor their use, and effectively intervene to stop dangerous people or goods in transit and dismantle the pathways themselves.

DHS' 2010 Bottom-Up Review went further in deliberately identifying human trafficking as a priority within Mission Goal 2.3. The Bottom-Up Review specifically recommended that in the department's efforts related to the security of global trade and travel systems, the "priorities within this proactive investigative portfolio will include **human smuggling and trafficking**, child sex tourism, counter-proliferation, financial, intellectual property, weapons trafficking, and narcotics investigations."[6]

---

[5] Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Report, February 1, 2010, www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/qhsr_report.pdf, pp. 48-49, (accessed 15 February, 2011).
[6] Bottom-Up Review Report, July, 2010, http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/bur_bottom_up_review.pdf, pp.16-17, (accessed 15 February, 2011).

In DHS *Mission Goal 3.2 Prevent Unlawful Immigration*,[7] the department is tasked to reduce conditions that encourage foreign nationals to illegally enter and remain in the United States, while identifying and removing those who violate U.S. laws. A key part of this effort is to:

> *Prevent fraud, abuse, and exploitation, and eliminate other systemic vulnerabilities that threaten the integrity of the immigration system. Systemic vulnerabilities that threaten the integrity of the immigration system must be eliminated by identifying and targeting system deficiencies and the root causes of system misuse.* ***Fraud facilitators, criminal and terrorist organizations, and individuals must be prevented from engaging in immigration fraud and violators must be prosecuted.*** *Targeting systemic vulnerabilities may require changing processes, amending regulations, collaborating with other partner agencies, or working with the Congress to strengthen our laws.* ***Information sharing on fraud schemes, trends, immigration crime subjects, and intelligence among Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement partners helps drive decisions and, thus, is a key component of this approach.*** *Timeliness, clarity, and completeness of information are vital to screening operations, immigration decision-making, and combating fraud.*

> *Homeland security efforts must focus on keeping criminal, fugitive, and other dangerous foreign nationals from entering the United States.* ***The use of technology and information sharing among key Federal partners is essential so that dangerous individuals are detected before they are granted an immigration benefit or visa, or are admitted at a port of entry.*** *Threat screening processes, biometric identification, and timely access to information on trends and fraud must all be strengthened to enhance their effectiveness.*

> *Arrest, detain, prosecute, and remove criminal, fugitive, dangerous, and other unauthorized foreign nationals consistent with due process and civil rights protections.* ***Dangerous criminal aliens, human rights violators, and other foreign nationals who threaten our national security must be a high priority for law enforcement.*** *This principle also applies when assigning detainees to higher or lower security detention facilities, or when providing alternatives to detention.* ***Arrested individuals must be screened to identify victims of trafficking, refugees, and exploited persons, and they must be provided with access to legal resources***.

Explaining the connection between human trafficking and alien smuggling with U.S. national security in further detail, John P. Torres, the then Deputy Assistant Director, Smuggling & Public Safety for ICE, stated in 2004 that:[8]

> *Our agency seeks to prevent terrorist acts and criminal activity by targeting the people, money, and materials that support terrorist and criminal organizations. In that mission, we recognize that human smuggling and trafficking into the United States constitutes a significant risk to national security and public safety. We know that these smuggling and trafficking pipelines serve as a conduit for undocumented aliens and criminals seeking entry to the United States. However, they could just as easily be exploited by terrorist and extremist organizations seeking to gain entry into the United States in order to carry out their own destructive schemes.*

---

[7] Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Report, February 1, 2010, www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/qhsr_report.pdf, pp. 52-53, (accessed 15 February, 2011).
[8] Statement of John P. Torres, Deputy Assistant Director, Smuggling & Public Safety, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Before the House Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Claims, Committee on the Judiciary, "Alien Smuggling: New Tools and Intelligence Initiatives," May 18, 2004, http://judiciary.house.gov/legacy/torres051804.htm (accessed 15 February, 2011).

I would initially like to provide an important clarification and necessary distinction between the terms "human smuggling" and "trafficking in persons." Human smuggling and trafficking in persons, while sharing certain elements and attributes and in some cases overlapping, are distinctively different offenses. Both practices encompass the organized and illicit movement of men, women, or children across or within national borders. Human trafficking, specifically what U.S. law defines as "severe forms of trafficking in persons," typically involves force, fraud or coercion, and occurs for the purpose of forced labor or commercial sexual exploitation. Smuggling and trafficking also differ with regard to the time frame of the offense. Human smuggling organizations typically generate short-term profits based on smuggled migrants. On the other hand, trafficking organizations frequently look to generate both short-term and long-term profits by forcing their victims into forced labor or commercial sexual exploitation arrangements.

The United States is a primary target destination for smugglers and traffickers, which means that literally tens of thousands of men, women and children are entering this nation illegally each year—undocumented, undetected and unprotected. This international criminal market is extraordinarily lucrative …In many cases, these profits fuel additional criminal enterprises, such as the trafficking of drugs, weapons, or other contraband, or the funds are laundered and invested in legitimate business enterprises. These untraced profits feed organized crime activities, undermining governmental action and the rule of law, while allowing these criminal networks to grow stronger, more resilient, and more dangerous.

Given the department's emphasis on combating human trafficking, DHS' Science & Technology Directorate tasked PNNL to conduct an exploratory study to examine and identify technology and research requirements for enhancing communication, analysis, reporting, and information sharing – requirements that directly support efforts to track, identify, deter, and prosecute **human trafficking** activities within the Pacific Northwest region – including identification of potential national threats from smuggling and trafficking networks. To implement this mandate, the PNNL team set out to identify unmet technology requirements of the user community, in this case those of the Department's critical federal, state, local, tribal, and private sector partners. As a starting point for this effort, PNNL undertook to identify gaps in information sharing among members of the user community (local, state and regional) and between the user community and federal agencies (at the national level) from the user community perspective.

This effort was conducted under the Knowledge Management Technologies Portfolio as part of the Integrated Federal, State, and Local/Regional Information Sharing and Collaboration (RISC) Program.

2. Methodology

PNNL selected the local user community level as a focus for this effort. The federal government has expressed a desire for local law enforcement to become the "eyes and ears for recognizing, uncovering and responding to circumstances that may appear to be a routine street crime, but may ultimately turn out to be a human trafficking case." PNNL's principal point of engagement with a local user community was with the Washington Advisory Committee on Trafficking (WashACT) – a federally-funded task force comprised of representatives from local, state and federal agencies that had been convened to combat human trafficking in Washington State. The task force is co-chaired by the Seattle Police Department, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington and the Washington Anti-trafficking Response Network. WashACT's goals are to: improve the identification of human trafficking victims; provide enhanced coordinated enforcement and prosecution of human trafficking crimes; and provide comprehensive services to victims of trafficking.

As a starting point for identifying unmet technology requirements, PNNL conducted a general investigation of the challenges faced by members of the local user community, as perceived by the participants of that community. We accomplished this by:

- Relationship building with members of the WashACT task force;

- Interviewing members of the WashACT task force, including, but not limited to those representing the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington, Seattle Police Department (High Risk Victims/Vice Unit), Port of Seattle; Port of Seattle Police Department, City of Seattle (Human Services Department), Washington Anti-trafficking Response Network (a coalition of local service providers for pre-certified victims of trafficking), Washington State Attorney General's Office, Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's (Human Smuggling and Trafficking Unit), and U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

- Identifying the broad set of challenges facing the user community in Washington State;

- Identifying other critical stakeholders beyond WashACT members;

- Producing an interactive web-based map of the task force in terms of relationships, information flows, and technology systems; and

- Conducting analysis to determine which of the identified challenges might lend themselves to technology-based solutions.

The study utilized a multi-method, iterative design for data collection that included:

- Attendance at Washington Advisory Committee on Trafficking (WashACT) meetings: Participation with this task force assisted PNNL's efforts in three ways: (1) it allowed us to build the necessary relationships at the local and regional level; (2) it allowed us to observe the interagency process from the perspective of the user community; and (3) it was the one organization where participation of many of the key stakeholders could be found, including state and local law enforcement, trafficking victim services providers, federal law enforcement, and the U.S. Attorney's Office.

- Interviews of WashACT members: The WashACT interviews were twofold and included both in-person and telephone interviews. The interviews were designed to capture WashACT members' general experiences and their most important self-identified challenges of investigating or prosecuting human trafficking-related case. The second portion was a series of follow-up interviews with the core members of WashACT, responsible for either the investigation or prosecution phase, in order to identify how information is shared within the task force, as well as identify how, where and when service providers intersected with either the investigation or prosecution phases of TVPA-related cases.

- Survey of Selected WashACT members: Surveys were administered to selected WashACT members to capture basic information on the type of information and/or data that each member had in their possession, identify other members or agencies that each WashACT member shared information with, and describe what method or technology was used to capture or share information related to human trafficking. The following eight WashACT members, each

- Seattle Police Department (High Risk Victims/Vice Unit);
- Washington Anti-trafficking Response Network (a coalition of local service providers for pre-certified victims of trafficking);
- U.S. Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington;
- U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Homeland Security Investigations – Seattle Office;
- U.S. Customs and Border Protection – Seattle Office;
- U.S. Department of State Diplomatic Security Service, Seattle Office;
- King County Prosecutor's Office; and
- The Center for Forensic Nursing Excellence.

3. Issues, Discussions, and Recommendations

Based on this information gathering and analysis effort, the PNNL team identified the following thirteen issues. This section briefly summarizes each issue, provides a short discussion of the issue, and recommends ways the issue might be addressed.

Issue #1: Lack of reliable estimates of the scale of human trafficking in the Task Force's area of responsibility

> ***Discussion*:** Currently, there is "limited reliable information about the prevalence of human trafficking or adequate measures of either law enforcement or non-governmental agency responses to the problem." [9] The lack of reliable estimates is a local, national and global challenge. According to the United States Government Accountability Office (GAO), "while some estimates at the global level do exist, the accuracy of the estimates is in doubt because of methodological weaknesses, gaps in data, and numerical discrepancies."[10] This is equally true at the national and local level. Human trafficking estimation is difficult in general because it often coincides with other illicit activities such as drug trafficking, prostitution and forced labor, which are consistently underreported. Estimation is made even harder due to a lack of uniformity in law enforcement focus, as well as, resources devoted to the problem. [11]
>
> Without reliable estimates of trafficking in the United States that are disaggregated, at least to a regional level, U.S. government agencies have not been able to develop a coordinated strategy for combating trafficking in the United States nor has DHS been able to develop a way to the gauge results of its programs, prioritize its efforts, identify transit patterns and target overall assistance.[12] Currently, there are efforts to make this estimation both regionally and locally.

---

[9] Amy Farrell and J. McDevitt, "Enhancing the collection and standardization of human trafficking data: examples from data collection efforts in the United States," Workshop on Developing New Approaches to the Study of Trafficking, Cairo, 2008; Alexis Aronowitz, Human Trafficking, Human Misery: the Global Trade in Human Beings, Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2009.

[10] United States Government Accountability Office (GAO), Human Trafficking: Better Data, Strategy, and Reporting Needed to Enhance U.S. Anti-trafficking Efforts Abroad, GAO-06-825, July 2006, p. 2.

[11] Jacob Barney, Bourke M, Fernando N, Harris A, Human Trafficking in the United States: An Elusive Number - A market-based approach to quantifying victims, presented by George Washington University's Trachtenberg School to Alice Hill, Senior Counselor to Secretary Napolitano, Dec. 4, 2010.

[12] Interview with Special Agent Angie Salazar, National Program Manager of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's (ICE) Human Trafficking program.

According to attendees at a DOJ Regional Meeting on Trafficking in San Jose, there are at least six agencies and organizations that are conducting separate efforts to estimate the scale of trafficking.[13] However, upon further examination, much of this work might be better defined as capturing and tracking trafficking statistics that are generated by their own databases. Locally, Dr. Debra Boyer has conducted a study and made estimates on a specific population of trafficked minors in Seattle.[14] However, none of these efforts are synchronized, nor are they standardized.

Developing a structural methodology for estimating the scale of human trafficking has multiple benefits: when taken across multiple locales and/or task forces, quality estimates would inform resource allocations; the structured basis for the estimates can provide more focused guidance for attacking and mitigating human trafficking; and a structured approach can provide a basis for harmonizing disparate information used to estimate human trafficking.

Recommendation: Three general topics warrant further research: (1) methodologies to estimate the number of victims of human trafficking that are defensible and that can be replicated nationwide to estimate the scale of human trafficking in the U.S.; (2) estimates of the scale of human trafficking (HT) in the U.S. *by region*; and (3) harmonizing and standardizing the existing efforts to estimate the scale of human trafficking in the US.

One specific technique would be to use a structured approach. The structures in this case are defined as small, discrete model or scenario components. The components represent details of recruitment, transport, victim activities and the associated infrastructure, as well as, other involved individuals and organizations. These components are then formally represented as "event sequences" using the mathematics of Bayesian networks. Some of these structured model components and associated estimates already exist[15] - and will be leveraged accordingly. Additional structures and scenarios will be taken from the existing literature and reports, as well as from anti-trafficking task force members. Taken together, these components and their relationships constrain, inform and harmonize aspects of human trafficking combine to result in an estimate of the overall scale of human trafficking.

As an example of the constraints across model fragments, consider the low-skill labor market into which labor trafficking may feed. This market has limits which will constrain the transportation needs for supporting human trafficking, in order to fill the needs of that market. Another component, transportation, has characteristics that regulate resource flows that support human trafficking. Therefore, estimates of each component are derived by a combination of: 1) eliciting bounding information from individuals in close contact with each component system; 2) survey-type data when available; and 3) existing records, as available. Such records include police reports and information gathered by social workers and victim service providers. For this work,

---

[13] Presenters describing their organizations' work on estimating the scale of human trafficking: (1) Duren Banks, Chief, Prosecution and Adjudication Statistics Unit, Bureau of Justice Statistics; (2) Steven Adaway, Unit Chief, Human Trafficking and Smuggling Unit, Immigration and Customs Enforcement; (3) Stephanie Benitez, Supervisory Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation; (4) Lindsay Waldrop, Human Trafficking Technical Assistance Specialist, Office for Victims of Crime Training and Technical Assistance Center; (5) Diane Bayly, Outreach and Education Coordinator, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops/Migration & Refugee Services; (6) Sarah Jakiel, Associate Director, Polaris Project.

[14] Debra Boyer, "Who Pays the Price? Assessment of Youth Involvement in Prostitution in Seattle," report commissioned by the City of Seattle, Human Services Department, Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention Division, 2008.

[15] Heather J. Clawson, Mary Layne, Kevonne Small, Estimating Human Trafficking into the United States: Development of a Methodology, Caliber, an ICF International Company - under task order 2004TO178 from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), U.S. Department of Justice, 2006.

when eliciting information relevant to the structures and scales of human trafficking, our definition of experts will be individuals with direct involvement in either conducting human trafficking investigations (e.g., the local office of ICE/HSI's Human Smuggling and Trafficking Unit, Seattle Police Department's High Risk Victims/Vice Unit, etc.) or providing services to victims (e.g., DOJ OVC- or DHHS ORR-funded grant recipients).

Issue #2: Variations in the definitions of human trafficking employed by law enforcement, service providers, and others pose a significant challenge to accurate measurement. In addition, the frequent practice of conflating migration, trafficking, and smuggling threatens the reliability and interpretability of different measurement strategies. Lack of clarity about definitions also impedes effective communication and collaboration.

> ***Discussion***: As is typical with emerging issues in general, the nature and magnitude of human trafficking in the WashACT task force's area of responsibility is unclear – a challenge that is shared by all of the 38 task forces nationwide. It is not known the extent to which differences in the characterization of human trafficking result from differences in definitions and "mental models" of what constitutes human trafficking by those engaged in efforts to prevent and mitigate its effects or from differences in the actual nature and magnitude of the trafficking that is occurring.
>
> > *A clear definition of the target population is a prerequisite for any production of primary data, whether qualitative or quantitative. The target population is the group of people (or other units under study) that we want to say something about, and that we collect data from. The population of trafficking victims is likely to change over time, and across national borders or arenas where trafficking takes place. Consequently our data will depend on how we understand the boundaries of our target population, not only conceptually, but also in terms of time and space. – ("Coping with Biases in Trafficking Data," Guri Tyldum, 2008)*
>
> Previous research has demonstrated that a lack of shared definitions and systematic categorization and recording of information by the agencies and personnel attempting to identify and prosecute perpetrators and identify and assist victims, along with incomplete pooling of information, are impeding efforts to characterize, quantify, and address human trafficking. Consequently, it is not yet clear to what extent the types and characteristics of human trafficking differ from one part of the country to another. It is frequently noted that human trafficking is a diverse activity and that a wide variety of organizations are engaged in efforts to counter it and assist its victims. These organizations and individuals work within different policy and administrative frameworks that lead them to use different terminology, conceptual frameworks, and mental models. Although different types of human trafficking are described in the research literature and policy guidance, no clear typology of trafficking has emerged that maps how the various organizations and individuals conceptualize, categorize, and describe the trafficking instances with which they are involved. In addition to impeding the development of accurate estimates of the magnitude and nature of human trafficking, there is concern that inaccurate, incomplete, and differing conceptual frameworks/mental models about the nature of human trafficking may also be adversely affecting strategies, decision making, and inter-organizational cooperation.
>
> ***Recommendation***: Develop and implement a methodology that helps practitioners clarify and describe their conceptual frameworks/mental models. Integrate this information into a typology of trafficking that maps these characterizations and their corresponding terminologies. Utilize this typology and mapping to examine the congruence of the frameworks/models with available

evidence and identify areas where further clarification might narrow the zone of uncertainty about the nature and magnitude of human trafficking that is occurring and improve the clarity of communication and the meaning of data across organizations.

Issue #3: There is still not a good understanding of specifically what information and data, applicable to combating human trafficking, is held at the local and regional level across the country.

Discussion: Previously, PNNL conducted a research effort on information sharing and technology applicable to combating human trafficking, which was focused on one of the Department of Justice funded anti-trafficking task forces – the Washington Advisory Committee on Trafficking (WashACT). WashACT is comprised of representatives from local, state, and federal agencies, convened to combat human trafficking in Washington State. The task force is co-chaired by the Seattle Police Department, the Washington Anti-trafficking Response Network (WARN) and the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington. WashACT's goals are to improve the identification of human trafficking victims; provide enhanced coordinated enforcement and prosecution of human trafficking crimes; and provide comprehensive services to victims of trafficking. Participation with this task force assisted our efforts in three ways: (1) it allowed us to build the necessary relationships at the local and regional level; (2) it allows us to observe the interagency process from the perspective of the user community; and (3) it was the one organization where participation of many of the key stakeholders could be found - including state and local law enforcement, trafficking victim services providers, federal law enforcement, and U.S. Attorneys Offices.

DOJ's Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) funds 38 similar anti human trafficking task forces across the nation. Due to the participation of many of the key stakeholders, these task forces provide a useful focal point for examining on-the-ground efforts to combat human trafficking and a unique opportunity to observe and identify the types of information sharing taking place at the local level. The collaboration and informal information sharing that currently takes place between "executive" members of the Washington task force (i.e., local law enforcement, local and federal prosecutors and selected service providers) has been identified as an essential dynamic, unique to the task force construct. In the case of WashACT, collaboration has been very useful in overcoming limitations resulting from specific funding streams (i.e., grant restrictions on both local police and service providers), as well as informing community and anti-trafficking advocacy groups on the necessity of securing single-party consent for Seattle police investigations in trafficking cases.[16]

As identified by our research, there are a variety of different stakeholders that participate in the anti-trafficking task force, with a corresponding variety of systems and procedures used to collect and share information – some unique to WashACT. This pertains both to data and processes for collecting and sharing victim information, as well as, for law enforcement investigations. Studying collaboration and information sharing at the task force level is recognized as an important aspect of data collection. According to Amy Farrell, who manages the Department of

---

[16] A bill in the Washington state legislature would exempt suspected pimps from a state law making it illegal to eavesdrop on phone calls without a warrant. Allowing the recording of conversations between child prostitutes and their pimps offers law enforcement another tool to fight the growing problem of young girls forced into prostitution. Police often face an uphill battle building enough evidence to apprehend pimps. Often, young victims are too frightened to help or testify. http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/editorials/2014271102_edit21prostitutes.html (accessed 20 February, 2011).

Justice funded 'Human Trafficking Reporting System' (HTRS), and her colleague at Northeastern University, Jack McDevitt:

> *[There is a] need to diversify sources of information on human trafficking victimization and offending. Social service agencies, labor unions, health and municipal inspectors, health care workers, church leaders and others may be well suited to provide valuable information about human trafficking in local communities. Data collection and outreach strategies should be developed to increase the breadth of sources from which information is collected (Amy Farrell, Jack McDevitt, "Enhancing the Collection and Standardization of Human Trafficking Data: Examples from Data Collection Efforts in the United States," 2008).*

As identified by Special Agent Angie Salazar, National Program Manager of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's (ICE) Human Trafficking program, this mapping of the task forces' information sharing, while useful in and of itself, could also be compared to a similar mapping effort occurring within DHS' subordinate agencies at the departmental level, which in turn provides the basis for a gap analysis in information sharing systems between the field and the headquarters for DHS component agencies.

Recommendation: Research should be conducted to identify information-sharing processes and technologies currently being used by DHS component agencies and partner organizations that participate in the federally-funded Anti-Human-Trafficking Task Forces across the county. This effort should document the technical systems, general types of information shared, and pathways for information sharing necessary for interagency communication, analysis, reporting with component agencies, partner organizations and local non-governmental partners that could assist efforts to track, identify, deter and prosecute human trafficking activities within a given region. Lessons learned in this process could then be compared with similar efforts occurring at the departmental level.

Issue #4: The information collected about human trafficking victims by non-governmental organizations (NGOs), victim service providers, and local law enforcement is not standardized; relevant information is not consistently and uniformly submitted into existing reporting systems; and data is not compared between agencies or across systems.

> *Discussion***:** In the United States alone, more than 500 nonprofit organizations are engaged in anti-trafficking initiatives. While these organizations contribute much-needed momentum in the fight against human trafficking, most groups operate in isolation from one another and engage in only minimal coordination of their activities. Currently, based on examination of the Washington anti-trafficking task force, human trafficking data is collected by local (i.e., non-federal, non-state) agencies via two main systems: the Trafficking Information Management System (TIMS), which is used to report on victims served by the Department of Justice's (DOJ) Office of Victims of Crime (OVC)-funded service providers (like WARN) to victims of trafficking programs; and the Human Trafficking Reporting System (HTRS),[17] which is used to capture data reported by

---

[17] HTRS collects data on suspected human trafficking incidents, offenders, victims from DOJ-funded human trafficking task forces. Information collected includes incident status, type of human trafficking, lead investigating agency, number of known victims, number of known offenders, whether the case was confirmed as human trafficking, the demographic characteristics of offenders and victims, case processing information of offenders, and victim service provision information. It is important to note, that the data in HTRS has some type of Congressional restrictions for its use beyond reporting.

law enforcement agencies receiving human trafficking funding from DOJ's Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). Service providers input data every 6 months to OVC's Training and Technical Assistance Center (TTAC) via TIMS, while local law enforcement (i.e., the Seattle Police Department) inputs their data separately into HTRS, which is then published by DOJ's Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). DHS component agencies (i.e., ICE, CBP) do not have access to either HTRS or TIMS. Depending on the situation, information from an investigation by ICE's Homeland Security Investigations unit (ICE/HSI) can make it into HTRS. For example, if Seattle PD is involved with a case run by ICE/HSI then data may be, but is not necessarily, entered into HTRS – but again, the data is entered by Seattle PD and not DHS. The same is true for data collected by the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) Innocence Lost Task Force.[18] Data from this task force is sometimes, but not always, reported to HTRS. Additionally, there is no "TIMS equivalent" for reporting victim information by service providers to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). Victim information is reported to HHS via an unstructured narrative report along with some quantified performance measures, submitted as Excel spreadsheets. These submittals are sent both as attachments to e-mails and as hard-copies via regular mail.

These separate reporting systems effectively obscure the actual numbers of trafficking victims, because it is difficult, if not impossible, to discern if any of the victims are double counted. Additionally, none of the data in one system is compared to or analyzed against the other. The International Organization for Migration (IOM), a highly respected authority noted by the U.S. GAO for its work collecting data on human trafficking,[19] has observed this same phenomenon worldwide. In fact, the IOM concludes that many public and private service providers, and some law enforcement and judicial agencies, collect (or are in a position to collect) substantial information on trafficking that is often neither processed and broadly distributed nor harmonized with or matched to data collected by others. In addition, agencies may collect only enough data to satisfy administrative requirements rather than to contribute to a better understanding of trafficking dynamics and developments. Additionally, different agencies (i.e. NGOs, local authorities and international organizations) involved in the implementation of projects and programs aimed at supporting victims of trafficking are obliged by their donors to collect data and issue regular reports on their activities and the persons assisted. This is certainly a positive element, but if all collected data are not processed and analyzed at a regional or national level the scope of information at the disposal of the federal government is restricted. Lastly, Secretary Clinton's creation of a fourth 'P' of partnership in the fight against trafficking attempts to coordinate the U.S. Department of State with other federal agencies (including DHS), the private sector, academic institutions, or NGOs. This means that there is potentially a great deal of information available, outside of DHS and the anti-trafficking task forces, which is not being compared or analyzed against the previously mentioned systems.

Recommendations: (1) Research is needed on the applicability of data collection from a wide variety of sources, as well as on the outreach strategies necessary to increase the breadth of sources from which information is collected. Analysis should include a series of "use-cases," where processes for gathering, collecting, and disseminating information are described for specific organizations of relevance. (2) Further research is required on the collection of victim and case data used by members of the Washington State anti-trafficking task force, including but

---

[18] This task force focuses on children who are sex trafficked in Seattle and includes the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Department of Justice's Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC).

[19] United States Government Accountability Office (GAO), Report on Human Trafficking: Better Data, Strategy, and Reporting Needed to Enhance U.S. Anti-trafficking Efforts Abroad, GAO-06-825, 2006.

not limited to, HTRS and TIMS. This type of analysis should explore opportunities for data-sharing where applicable; reduction of the methodological challenges as more data is collected from different sources, including double counting victims across different sources of data and inconsistent classification across agencies (i.e. individuals are identified as human trafficking victims in victim service data but are not classified as victims in law enforcement data); and methods for using this data for the regional examination of patterns and trends.

Issue #5: The information collected about <u>human trafficking investigations</u> by local, regional and federal law enforcement is not easily accessible by investigating agents and data is not efficiently compared between agencies or across systems.

> *Discussion***:** The previous issue (Issue #4) addresses problems relating to victim information. However, standardization, availability, and completeness of data pertinent to investigations are also challenges for law enforcement personnel and organizations. Similar to the collection and sharing of victim data, not all data from participating law enforcement agencies related to investigations or cases are entered into the existing databases, nor are all relevant organizations and agencies connected in some fashion to those systems. Furthermore, the data that **is** entered by law enforcement sometimes cannot be shared among investigating agencies. To illustrate this complexity, consider the variety of systems used by the Seattle field office of ICE's Homeland Security Investigations unit (HSI), which includes, but is not limited to, the following technical systems: Treasury's Enforcement Communications Systems (TECS), ICE Pattern Analysis and Information Collection (ICEPIC), Lexis Nexus, CLEAR, National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (NLETS), ICE's Intelligence Document Exploitation system (IDOCX), and the FBI's National Crime Information Center database (NCIC). The number one request from special agents in ICE's Homeland Security Investigations unit (HSI) was: "how can I search all of these at once?" There is a real need to federate to all of these to enhance law enforcement's ability to find information relevant for law enforcement investigations.

> *Recommendation***:** identify an emerging industry standard for federated search and begin to slowly move existing and new systems to support it. This is a more flexible integration approach – instead of sharing data (in effect connecting systems) with a common data interchange, we allow them to search each other. There is a further need to connect these systems in a progressively intelligent way – if I search for a name, can the system also connect up a driver's license number or a social security number as it discovers them? This is a well known and very difficult problem. Continued research funding for connecting ontologies, ontological based search, and related areas is needed. A visual metaphor and tool for exploring data in this type of multi-database environment is also an area for research.

Issue #6: Ad-hoc information sharing between investigating officers/agents in within DHS is difficult and not a routine occurrence. ICE/HSI members see this as a weakness in their on-going investigations.

> *Discussion***:** Human trafficking investigations, efforts, and knowledge are not synchronized and integrated across ICE/HSI units in different offices (e.g., Seattle, Blaine, Tacoma, Yakima, Portland, etc.). Formal sharing of information and related systems are necessary and useful (issues 4 and 5), but they do not allow for the flexibility and timeliness on a case-by-case basis that explores activities, trends, patterns, etc. in real time. Across all investigative agencies there is a continued need for tools to support ad-hoc information sharing. Weekly or monthly meetings, conferences, and phone calls to share information are popular and useful; however, there is a need for more immediate and specific data. Information needs to be geographically and topically specific and allow investigating agents the ability to communicate with one another on topics relevant to combating human trafficking.

While there are at least a few systems that currently provide some type of information sharing - the Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN), the Regional Information Sharing System (RISS), or the Joint Regional Information Exchange System (JRIES) - they each have their own specific purposes and goals. Unfortunately, neither knowledge about, nor access to, all of these systems is widespread within the law enforcement community responsible for investigating human trafficking cases. For example, HSIN does not currently allow ad-hoc sharing. Each user is tied to a specific a Community of Interest (COI) which is often further tied to a specific geographic region. In its current configuration, it doesn't appear to allow for easy access to different COI's (i.e., it is brittle for problems that don't fit). Additionally, it does not currently have a COI for human trafficking.

Investigating human trafficking cases takes a unique skill set to do properly. Based on our interviews with ICE/HSI, many offices, especially smaller ones, don't have personnel that have great familiarity in conducting these investigations, or managing them at a supervisory level. While there is a two-week class that is occasionally held on human smuggling and trafficking, second-hand sources indicated that it was outdated and focused primarily on southern border issues. Ad-hoc information sharing might also be suited to address *some* of the issues stemming from a lack of knowledge, skills, training and experience.

Increased functionality for ad-hoc information sharing might include: 1) having a secure and trusted web-based portal for information sharing and collaboration between federal, state, local, tribal, law enforcement partners engaged in combating human trafficking; 2) the ability to utilize Communities of Interest (COI) which would be organized by state organizations, federal organizations, or mission areas like narcotics, human trafficking or intelligence; 3) users can securely share within their communities or reach out to other communities as needed; and 4) provides secure, real-time collaboration tools, including a virtual meeting space, instant messaging and document sharing.

Recommendation: Given the difficulties of browsing and searching the systems of other agencies, one approach might be to create an agency-independent tool that can be accessed and edited by any vetted law enforcement officer, yet with fixed geographic and categorical sections to focus on their specific interests (human trafficking, ICAC, gangs, narcotics, etc.). This would work to both extend an individual officers network of contacts in a specialty and also allow for querying and sharing of information on an as needed basis. The communication is cop-to-cop (or agent to agent) and is also strengthening regional connections between departments. Examples of the types of queries and information in this tool might be: "have you seen this person before, here is a trend we are seeing in X type of activity, have you seen this tattoo, etc." Some topic sites exist; however, they are often organized by discussion threads and not geographically centered, which make finding information much more difficult and time consuming. The ability to rapidly focus on both topic and place with the flexibility to accommodate heterogeneous data is a key requirement.

Issue #7: Despite significantly increased attention to human trafficking, Washington State has not seen an increase in identifiable and prosecutable human trafficking-related cases associated with forced labor and domestic servitude of foreign nationals.

> ***Discussion***: During the 10 years since Congress passed the Trafficking Victim's Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA), law enforcement agencies, social service providers, faith-based organizations and community groups have grown increasingly concerned about human trafficking crimes such as sex trafficking, domestic servitude and forced labor. In Washington State, the Washington Advisory Committee on Trafficking (WashACT), one of 40 federally-funded human trafficking task forces, has been recognized by the Department of Justice as a top task force in the United States and has conducted training on effective task force operations to multiple task forces in

other states through an organized "immersion" training program. Washington State is also the home of multiple groups of "abolitionists" and activists who have succeeded in not only educating thousands of individuals about human trafficking, but have convinced the Washington State legislature to pass multiple State laws criminalizing trafficking in persons.

Despite this attention to human trafficking, Washington has not seen an uptick in identifiable and prosecutable human trafficking-related cases. DHS personnel in Seattle[20], along with WashACT members, believe that foreign-born human trafficking victims in our region are more likely to be involved in forced labor and domestic servitude scenarios than in sex trafficking. Additionally, ICE/HSI members that we interviewed believe that there are large quantities of data than can be analyzed to target and predict potential human trafficking victims and suspects. As an example, it was explained to us that DHS is "targeting": cargo shipments that comes into the US, non-immigrants entering from special interest countries, plus there are already advanced queries to identify potential narco-smuggling and terrorist targets. Couldn't these queries and the knowledge used to create these queries (which are primarily in the Automatic Targeting System—ATS—a series of CBP databases linked in with TECS and other DHS databases) be utilized to target trafficking victims?

One proposal from ICE and CBP personnel in Seattle,[21] designed to increase identifiable and prosecutable human trafficking-related cases, has been to conduct an intelligence-driven operation in an attempt to identify victims of human trafficking based on cases that have already been detected in the Northwestern United States, as well as around the country. Successful execution of this effort requires searching data from B1, H2A and H2B non-immigrant visas, CBP form I-94 (Arrival-Departure Records), and public records in order to: (1) identify and interview aliens who are targeted as potential victims of domestic servitude or forced labor and are applying for entry as either an immigrant or non-immigrant at a port of entry in Washington and Oregon; and (2) identify citizens of Thailand and the Philippines, who may be victims of forced labor and domestic servitude, and have already entered the United States and overstayed their non-immigrant visa.

**Recommendations**: Conduct an analysis to produce a "proactive triage" of potential victims from high-risk populations by: (1) identifying the requirements and provide technical support for an intelligence-led investigation on potential human trafficking victims based on analyzing visa applications (B1, H2A, H2B); (2) conduct a pilot effort on DHS and component agency data that could be leveraged in support of this effort; (3) identify the most successful technical aspects of the effort for immediate scale-up to other regions; and (4) recommend areas of future research areas needed based on lessons learned from the pilot. Based on the results of this analysis, we will have a better understanding of vulnerable populations and if the underlying assumption is correct – that is there an undiscovered pool of victims.

---

[20] Key members include: Chris Cronin: Supervisory Intelligence Research Specialist, ICE Homeland Security Investigations, Office of Intelligence, Field Intelligence Group Seattle; Jorge Comas: Field Analysis Specialist, US Customs and Border Protection, Office of Field Operations, Seattle Field Office; and Todd Rignel: Special Agent, ICE Homeland Security Investigations, Office of the Special Agent in Charge, Seattle, Human Smuggling and Trafficking Group.

[21] The proposal is referred to as "Operation Cascade Restoration." In addition to the ICE and CBP personnel mentioned in the previous footnote, additional assistance in proposing this effort was provided by other CBP intelligence and analysis personnel, as well as CBP Enforcement Officers and Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS), Fraud Detection and National Security (FDNS)

Issue #8: Despite significantly increased attention to human trafficking nationwide, ICE has not seen a comparable increase human trafficking related criminal convictions - only 30% of human trafficking cases that ICE initiated in FY09 eventually led to a criminal conviction.

> *Discussion***:** In Fiscal Year (FY) 2009, ICE initiated 566 human trafficking investigations resulting in 388 arrests, 148 indictments, and 165 convictions. This represents a 31 percent increase in the number of investigations over the previous year, a commendable improvement. However, only 30 percent of those human trafficking investigations actually led to a conviction. With respect to human smuggling, 60 percent of cases that are initiated eventually lead to a conviction. This begs a series of questions ranging from: what are the differences between identifying and initiating a human trafficking case versus one on human smuggling? Why is the ratio of cases to convictions almost twice as large for human smuggling as it is for human trafficking? What specific lessons (including tactics, techniques and procedures) can be learned by examining successful criminal convictions – as they relate back to ICE's investigation stage? Additionally, what lessons can be learned from the ICE-initiated cases that never made it the arrest or indictment stage?

DHS Activities and accomplishments	Cases initiated	Criminal arrests	Criminal indictments	Criminal convictions	Admin
Human trafficking investigations	566	388	148	165	416
Human smuggling investigations	2268	2316	1252	1338	4942
Totals	2834	2704	1400	1503	5358

To date, exploratory studies on prosecuting and investigating human trafficking cases have provided basic and high-level overviews of how law enforcement and prosecutors are responding to trafficking.[22] However, there is a lack of specificity in their identification of challenges and recommendations, none of which focuses explicitly on ICE's Homeland Security Investigation Unit.

Examples of the current type of analyses/recommendations are:[23]

> *Prosecutors called for greater buy-in and dedicated law enforcement to investigate these crimes. Prosecutors noted an unwillingness at times of law enforcement in dealing with these cases as well as seeing a victim as a human trafficking victim. They also identified the need for better relationships with agents on the case; greater resources to address trafficking cases (from investigation through to prosecution of cases); availability of more and better services for victims, in particular emergency and safe housing; access to more interpreters for the prosecution; and more training for law enforcement and prosecutors across the board.*

---

[22] Heather J. Clawson, Nicole Dutch, Megan Cummings, <u>Law Enforcement Response to Human Trafficking and the Implications for Victims: Current Practices and Lessons Learned</u>, Caliber, an ICF International Company - under grant number 2004-WG-BX-0088 from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), U.S. Department of Justice., 2006; Heather J. Clawson, Nicole Dutch, Susan Lopez, Suzanna Tiapula, <u>Prosecuting Human Trafficking Cases: Lessons Learned and Promising Practices</u>, Caliber, an ICF International Company - under grant number 2006-NIJ-1163 from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), U.S. Department of Justice, 2008.
[23] Ibid.

Increase collaboration among law enforcement (Federal, State, and local), prosecutors, and victim service providers. Working collaboratively with other agencies was important to address human trafficking adequately and meet the needs of victims. Through formal memoranda of understanding, data and information sharing protocols, and sharing policies, practices, and procedures, agencies can begin to learn the boundaries of their work, the work of others, and areas where they overlap.

Greater specificity is required to provide a basis for prioritizing and implementing measures that would enhance the successful movement of cases through the criminal justice process. Identification of the factors most critical to successfully transitioning cases from one stage of the process to the next requires identification of both the elements essential to success and the elements contributing to failure. This understanding could be enhanced by comparison between human smuggling and human trafficking investigations, and between investigations that successfully transition from one stage to another, as well as those that did not make the transition.

There are some emerging human smuggling and trafficking trends in the Western Region that must be considered during an examination of investigations and cases. First, ICE is seeing its regional offices pursuing trafficking counts in cases that were initiated in another programmatic area (i.e., other than by the Human Smuggling and Trafficking Unit). It is assumed this is due to the fact that cases are being examined more closely because of the recognition that trafficking can be associated with many different types of criminal activity. Second, ICE has placed an increased emphasis on the financial aspects of the investigation, in order to remove the proceeds of the activity and gain restitution for the victims. Both of these emerging trends are thought to impact the nature and complexity of future investigations.[24]

***Recommendations*:** (1) Conduct a stage-progression analysis on a sample of the human trafficking and human smuggling cases and characterize the attributes of the cases and the resources used in/available to the investigations as they proceeded through the different stages of the criminal justice process; (2) to supplement this stage-progression analysis, it would be useful to conduct a "look back" through the process for each of the cases that concluded with a successful conviction. The objective of this research would be to identify, for each stage of the investigative/prosecutorial process, the factors that are most influential to a case's successful transition to the next stage, and ultimately, to a conviction; (3) a similar analysis could be conducted to determine the factors influential to a case's success in identifying and assisting victims; (4) any effort should look at identifying similarities between human smuggling and trafficking investigations and the tools and technologies necessary for each; the purpose being the identification of tools or technologies that can be effectively applied to both domains when/where appropriate; (5) Investigate how and where technology might assist in conducting a thorough review of all cases with a potential nexus to trafficking, as well as in conducting investigations into the financial aspects of trafficking cases.

Issue #9: There is no consistency in training on investigating human trafficking cases for local law enforcement, nor is a comprehensive understanding of best practices in using existing technology in training for human trafficking cases, or in leveraging technology in the conduct of the investigations themselves – a potential "force multiplier" for smaller departments.

---

[24] Steven Adaway, Unit Chief, Human Trafficking and Smuggling Unit, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, "Western Regional Trends," OVC/BJA Western Regional Anti-Trafficking Task Force Training Forum, January 11, 2011, San Jose, California.

__Discussion__: There is a wide disparity between different local law enforcement departments when it comes to size and money available, with Seattle Police Department on one end of the scale (with 1,250 sworn law enforcement officers and a budget of ~$240M in 2009) and the Pacific Police Department representative of departments on the other (with ~15 sworn officers and a budget significantly lower than Seattle's). Therefore, it stands to reason that this disparity will have an impact on the ability of individual departments to conduct training in human trafficking investigations – not only for new officers, but for veterans on the force.

Recently, the International Association of Chiefs of Police's (IACP's) "Police Response to Violence Against Women" Project, with funding from the Department of Justice's Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), focused on the development of tools and policies to assist law enforcement in responding effectively to human trafficking by police officers. They have produced a guidebook and video called "The Crime of Human Trafficking: A Law Enforcement Guide to Identification and Investigation." In this guidebook, the IACP presents an <u>Action Agenda Checklist</u> which includes the following recommendations:

- Conduct department-wide training on human trafficking, including dispatch
- Educate your community about the crime of human trafficking
- Develop foreign language resources for your department
- Identify non-profit agencies that provide victim assistance
- Develop collaborative relationships before a human trafficking case occurs
- Assess locations that may serve as fronts for illegal activity
- Identify industrial/service-based businesses that employ low paid workers and learn how they are recruited and treated
- Assess the local sex industry in your community and the forms it takes (e.g., street prostitution, massage parlors, strip clubs, etc.)
- Identify escort agencies in your community that advertise foreign or "exotic" women
- Ensure officers responding to prostitution offenses address and document possible indicators of human trafficking
- Locate neighborhoods or communities where domestic servants are typically employed

These topics could be used as the starting point for examining how technology could be leveraged to help smaller departments (in either size or resources) conduct better training or investigations of human trafficking.

__Recommendation:__ Convene an IACP Working Group that builds on IACP's pre-existing work related to combating human trafficking with a specific focus on the application of technology for training and investigations from the user perspective. Lessons learned, best practices and tools or technologies needed by local law enforcement will be the expected knowledge product outcomes.

Issue #10: There is large body of knowledge and perspective on Trafficking and Smuggling residing in the Intelligence Community (IC) which is not widely available within law enforcement.

__Discussion:__ Connecting with these sources of knowledge (people and documents), reviewing the information, and pulling out key ideas in a non-classified format would bring decade's worth of study to bear on what to law enforcement is an "emerging problem". The lab is unique in its strong ties to both law enforcement and the intelligence community and possessing clearances/ADC's to broker between the two. Specifics are not as important here as the structure, organization, and methods of networks doing this type of activity. The IC has been thinking about this and tracking this activity for a long time – especially in the global arena. Law enforcement

has only recently (in relative terms) been hit by these "globalization" types of issues. Additionally, ICE/HSI members that we interviewed believe that there are large quantities of data – some of which *might* be held by the IC – that can be analyzed to target and predict potential human trafficking victims and suspects.

A necessary part of this research will be to develop a relationship with the Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center (HSTC) in order to see what information from the IC is already being shared or migrated over into the law enforcement community. The HSTC was established by the 2004 *Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Protection Act* to serve as a clearinghouse for information related to terrorist travel, migrant smuggling, and human trafficking. It also prepares strategic assessments. The center is jointly operated by the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of State, and the Department of Justice, and is utilized by law enforcement, intelligence, and diplomatic communities. There are also other organizations with in the IC that are working this issue independently of the HSTC, with whom we already have contact.

Recommendation: Research should be conducted on lessons learned from the intelligence community concerning human trafficking and related networks (terrorism, smuggling, narcotics, weapons, etc.) which can then be applied to law enforcement and presented in an unclassified report. PNNL is in a unique position to straddle the two worlds of Law enforcement and the IC with heavy contacts in both groups. Through our on-going projects, we have a variety of contacts that are well outside of the mainstream of law enforcement that might be brought to bear to produce a sensitive, but unclassified report brining key lessons to light. This will also allow us to further examine the national security implications of these networks – the reality vs. the guessed, known vs. unknown.

Issue #11: There is no systematic means of *proactively* assessing the scale, movement, demand, inter-connectedness, or general operation of juvenile prostitution at a local, regional or larger level.

Discussion: There is no systematic way of proactively assessing the scale, movement, inter-connectedness, or general operation of juvenile prostitution, which would allow investigators to better prioritize their investigations and prosecute more felony charges for multi-state trafficking and Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking (DMST). The sheer volume of online prostitution advertisements alone gives credence to the problem law enforcement is facing; the problem dwarfs the resources any law enforcement agency has to address it. The revenue generated by *the advertisement* of prostitution in the US is estimated at $3.15 million/month. A leading player in the on-line advertising market had between 80,000 and 100,000 listings online *every month* last year. Yearly profits from the advertisements are estimated at $70 million per year across 24 main websites. This gives a glimpse into the scale of the problem as *this is what the human traffickers pay just to advertise.* Websites offering advertising reviews, and contact information for prostitution combined for 4,315,353 unique views in January 2011 alone.[25] . We do not know how much of this is DMST vs. adult prostitution.

There are vague notions concerning this market, including:
- Victims are systematically moved among "tracks" (physical areas of street prostitution) within a city or metropolitan area
- Victims are systematically moved between cities on a "circuit" that encompasses multiple jurisdictions, indeed whole regions of the country

---

[25] Whitaker, Mark. 2010. "Backpage continues to gain from prostitution advertising." AIM Group, LLC. 18 February, 2011. http://aimgroup.com/blog/2011/02/25/backpage-continues-to-gain-from-prostitution-advertising/. Accessed 9 March, 2011.

- Victims are cross-advertised: on-line, as well as, put on the street
- Demand is particularly strong for underage girls, but the total number of "johns" or "hobbyists" (as they call themselves) is unknown.
- Demand, in general, is significantly higher during major sporting, political, and other public events, with a corresponding adjustment in the "circuit" to meet that concentrated increase in demand.
- Male victims are typically only advertised online and do not appear to have a "track" in some cities.

But data to confirm these notions is sparse; and while plausible, they are difficult to confirm empirically. In addition, victims are typically unwilling to reveal information about their circumstances, as they do not often see themselves as victims. This is a complex scenario is which intimidation, co-dependency, and other factors play a part. This lack of systematic market information causes problems for policy-makers as they allocate resources. Systematic trafficking information is currently limited to systems like the Human Trafficking Reporting System (HTRS) and Trafficking Information Management System (TIMS). As victims are encountered, service providers and investigators enter it into the system. This is a reactive process and provides very little proactive value or predictive power to analysts or investigators.

Investigators currently monitor these sites manually, but the volume of data makes it difficult to triage investigations to identify high impact prosecutions of pimps, traffickers and Domestic Minor Sex Traffickers. All of these websites include key data about the market:
- Images of prostitutes
- dates posted
- city targeted
- reviews by johns who have visited a particular girl
- aliases for both Johns and prostitutes
- contact information for services – phone and email

Transitioning from online advertising to street-based prostitution associated with DMST, information on street-based prostitution of this nature could be obtained from "tracks" and "circuits" using Automated License Plate Readers (ALPRs) placed in multiple locations within multiple cities. ALPRs are currently used in a number of police applications, are robust, and have been tested in the courts as a legal means to obtain data. A network of these readers, in multiple fixed locations of known prostitution tracks could be used to identify vehicles that frequent these areas at *abnormal times and in abnormal frequencies*. Johns are known to be very cautious and it is not uncommon to circle and observe potential "dates" for several hours, often circling a single 2-4 block region for hours. The probability of being a john, victim, or pimp connected with these vehicles is extremely high, while most everyone else falls out of the set. This set of data could also be easily linked with Department of Licensing records to provide further information. Merging all of this data with the data from the online websites, a more complete picture of activities could emerge. Cars, phone numbers, addresses, known locations, etc. – all of this would provide a solid basis for further investigation and prosecution.

Extending these ideas further, research is underway to utilize existing facial recognition algorithms for the triage of on-line images by comparing them to known images of minors from a variety of sources and allowing a human analyst to examine the best matches. This would allow a more

proactive approach in getting known minors off the street. Combining this technology with website data from multiple sites could provide a significant national level capability.

Work is also underway to visualize and quickly analyze data stored on mobile devices voluntarily provided or seized during arrests. These devices contain a wealth of information about an individual and their day-to-day network. This includes incoming and outgoing phone numbers, text messages, images and more. Combining this data with all the preceding brings a local network quickly into focus.

This capability would benefit investigators by triaging high value investigations, providing leads for investigation and improving situational awareness regarding the scope and nature of the overall problem. It would benefit policy-makers by providing better data regarding the scope of the problem and allowing for better allocation of resources. While there are challenges, all of these basic technologies exist and no fundamental research is required to produce a functioning system. The platform would also provide a place to plug-in longer term research efforts such as:

- algorithmic determination of age based on photo analysis
- algorithmic identification of individuals based on photo comparison
- geo-location based on surroundings/background analysis
- large scale graph visualizations

Additionally, it could have fringe benefits for investigations of activities associated with prostitution such as identifying suspects for serial rapist and homicide cases. This type of system is also a model for similar approaches that might be used in other domains such at counter-terrorism, hate groups, and organized crime.

Recommendation: Build a pilot sensor platform integrating the above techniques across a significant subset of on-line prostitution sites and a regional set of participating urban areas. Prove the concept at a regional scale while obtaining feedback directly from the local and federal taskforce members. The pilot would include a regional platform operating within a small group of cities within the Western United States (an example set might be Portland, Seattle, San Francisco, Las Vegas, San Diego, and Phoenix). This would include multiple ALPR installations across all the known "tracks" and a central collection server to integrate all of the collected data. The pilot would also produce a report detailing what was learned about the scale, movement, demand, inter-connectedness, general operation based on analysis of all the collected data. This offers the possibility of a never before attempted analysis of human trafficking networks, their operation and scale.

Issue #12: The greatest and most immediate need that the Co-Chairs of WashACT (Seattle Police, U.S. Attorney's Office, ICE, and the Washington Anti-trafficking Response Network) identified was for more shelters with specialized services for victims.

Discussion: DHS recognizes that in order to successfully investigate and prosecute traffickers, victims must be stable and free from fear and intimidation to be effective witnesses. Equal value is placed on the identification and rescue of victims and the prosecution of traffickers. This recognition compliments the United States Government's victim-centered approach[26] aimed at countering trafficking in persons. At its most basic level, support and assistance includes access to shelters or

---

[26] Enacted in 2000 and reauthorized in 2003 and 2005, the U.S. "Trafficking Victims Protection Act" (TVPA) promoted a victim-centered approach that reflects the understanding that the mission of government is to remove trafficking victims from the abuse setting, place them into safe programs or restorative care, and hold the traffickers accountable – prevention, protection, and prosecution.

other forms of housing, as well as specialized services, such as psychological, legal and medical counseling.

Currently, the City of Seattle and a number of community partners have raised funds to support a three-year pilot project, formerly referred to as the Residential Recovery Program for Prostituted Youth, but now officially named The Bridge Program.[27] The program delivers services in a highly structured environment, with activities designed to meet both the individual and collective needs of participants. There is a full-time mental health provider and chemical dependency counselor on staff. This program provides six beds and comprehensive wraparound services for an estimated 20 young people (between the ages of 14 and 17) per year. However, these six beds are the only ones specifically designated for trafficking victims, and then only for juvenile victims of trafficking. There are no shelters specifically designated for adult victims.

To make up any shortfalls, victim service providers in Seattle use a variety of housing providers ranging from women's shelters and domestic violence (DV) shelters to transitional housing and rented apartments, depending on the victim's needs. Service providers have established relationships with the YWCA, Salvation Army, and other housing providers. It is important to note that sometimes service providers cannot use DV shelters because their funding requires the person to be a victim of "intimate partner violence" specifically.

Issue #13: There is also a lack of capacity to deal with large numbers of trafficking victims at once, should the need arise (i.e., there is no "surge capacity").

*Discussion***:** As identified above in issue #1, the City of Seattle can theoretically handle up to six victims at once, but the beds in the Bridge Program are not always available, nor are other beds guaranteed to be unoccupied. In fact, at the time of writing, all six beds in the Bridge Program are currently occupied. The current plan for dealing with a surge of human trafficking victims is to place them in detention (jail) in order to ensure their safety, gather witness statements, and attempt to separate the victims from perpetrators. Aside for the obvious additional trauma of placing victims in detention, the U.S. Attorney's Office loses access during detention further hampering their ability to conduct interviews and gather the necessary information required in prosecution of the traffickers. While there are other possible options that the WashACT task force co-chairs are exploring as temporary solutions, none of these have options currently have on-site supervision; a situation that is certainly less than ideal for a large group of victims.

What is required is a coordinated, multi-agency response from both law enforcement and service providers. This will be needed regardless of the type of trafficking (either agricultural workers, forced labor cases, or commercial sex workers). In fact, the need for this type of surge capacity could be highly useful during other types of emergency response scenarios.

---

[27] See the Seattle Times article on the Bridge Program.

Annex A – Initial Survey Form

U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Science and Technology Directorate – Regional Information Sharing and Collaboration (RISC)

The overall goal of the research effort is to identify technology requirements to enhance interagency communication, analysis, reporting, and information sharing with local non-governmental partners that could assist efforts to track, identify, deter and prosecute human trafficking activities within the region, as well as identify potential national threats from smuggling and trafficking networks. In phase I, we will concentrate on identifying requirements at the user level, incorporating the needs of critical stakeholders including state, local, tribal, and private sector partners.

1. Your job title and organization?

2. What are the key tasks and responsibilities with respect to combating human trafficking?
   a. Your individual tasks and responsibilities
   b. Your organizations tasks and responsibilities

3. Your organization's staffing level and relative priority for combating human trafficking. (individual, one-level up, & two-levels up)
   a. How many staff members in your organization?
   b. How many staff members involved in combating human trafficking?
   c. How many volunteers are involved in your organization's efforts to combat human trafficking?
   d. How much time is spent on tasks related to combating human trafficking? (hours per week)

4. For each task or responsibility, how does your organization measure its success/effectiveness with respect to accomplishing its role in combating human trafficking?
   a. List any and all official/formal measures
   b. List any and all informal measures
   c. Does this measure require or trigger a reporting action or information requirement for the organization? If yes, what?

5. Agencies/organizations that you interact with regarding combat human trafficking (i.e., the landscape of people and agencies you deal with)
   a. List the agency/org.
   b. Type of org. (Local, State, Federal, NGO)
   c. Type/description of information you share with them and how often you provide it (e.g., official reports, data, surveys, etc.)
   d. Type/description of information they share with you and how often they provide it (official reports, data, surveys, etc.)
   e. Why do you share this information? (e.g., officially mandated, un-mandated professional interaction, etc.)
   f. Utility of interaction in relation to your official reporting requirements (scale of 1 to 10; with 1 being no impact and 10 being essential to accomplishing your mission)

6. Types of information and its uses (i.e., what do you keep track of and why)
   a. Type & purpose of information collected or managed

b. In what form? (e.g., digital, paper files, verbal, etc.)
c. Name of the collection/management "system"
d. Where did the system come from? (Internally developed, federal agency, NGO, university, etc.)
e. Is analysis conducted with or on this information? If yes, what type of analysis?
f. Perceived risks/concerns for your organization associated with using or sharing this information? (e.g., political risks, privacy issues, leaks, FOIA, etc.)

7. For each type of information collected or managed, describe the reporting pathway (i.e., where does the information go? To which agency or agencies?)

8. In the conduct of analysis of human trafficking information/data, please describe the following:
   a. Type of Analysis
   b. Tools used
   c. Products generated
   d. Decisions, processes, or actions