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The Policy Guide Process

Between April 2020 and March 2021, Delta 8.7 convened global expert working groups to produce three Policy Guides to address “what works” to achieve Target 8.7 of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals in three broad domains, Justice, Crisis and Markets.

The purpose of these Policy Guides is to provide a highly credible and current articulation of what we know about the global and national policy mix needed to accelerate progress towards Target 8.7 in a format that is useful for policy actors. They provide a snapshot of “what works” to achieve Target 8.7.

The audience for these guides is specifically multilateral and national-level policymakers. The Guides do not seek to dictate to policymakers how they should organize to achieve Target 8.7—because that requires an understanding of the specific problems in each country, the available resources and other contextual factors. Instead, they aim to provide an evidence-based policy resource that is useful across contexts and to policy actors around the world, including those thinking about multilateral policy frameworks.

The Policy Guides prioritize scientifically rigorous information regarding what works. As a result, the guidance offered is neither comprehensive nor definitive. It is thorough and deep in areas where evidence is comprehensive and robust, and in some cases, it is patchier and more speculative. This will, however, help to highlight areas where evidence is strong and areas where it is more lacking. The deliberative process by which the Policy guides are formulated is designed to be replicable. The aim is to capture the current state of knowledge on what works and allow future editions of these Policy Guides to reflect changes in the underlying state of knowledge.

The Working Group

Delta 8.7 convened a global expert working group to produce the Markets Policy Guide. Members were selected following an open call for nominations, with members selected for gender, geographic, age, institutional, stakeholder group and disciplinary diversity. The process endeavoured to include one or more survivor voices in each Working Group consultation process, either through having a survivor member of the Working Group, or through bespoke consultations on the draft Policy Guide documents. Working group members were allocated into subgroups based on their expertise and asked to assess the two research inputs for the hypotheses linked to their respective “sub-theme”.

Research Inputs

I. Assembling the evidence

Between July and September 2020, Delta 8.7 assembled a database of evidence on what works to achieve SDG Target 8.7. This was achieved through two processes: The Public Submission of Evidence and a non-comprehensive evidence review carried out by the University of Nottingham Rights Lab.

Both of these processes sought to identify sources and bodies of evidence that are based on rigorous scientific methods and/or have been tested through government implementation. For each piece of evidence submitted, information on over 20 different data points was collected. This database enables us to map the contours of bodies of evidence relating to specific thematic areas and specific hypotheses about what works to achieve Target 8.7.

II. Mapping the bodies of evidence
The database was mapped in two ways: qualitatively and quantitatively. Both approaches offered assessments of the strength of evidence associated with specific themes and, where possible, specific hypotheses. The strength of evidence was broken into three components:

1. **Diversity of evidence** – indicates the variety of type, methods and design of the evidence associated with different themes and hypotheses. This data allowed each Working Group to distinguish themes and hypotheses that have been explored through a variety of research and implementation approaches from those that are backed by less diverse evidence.

2. **Size of body of evidence** – quantifies the size, scale and geographic reach of evidence associated with a theme or hypothesis. This helped the Working Group identify themes and hypotheses that have been more extensively tested.

3. **Technical quality of evidence** – derives from data provided by submitters related to “Evidentiary Quality”. This allowed the Working Group to understand both which themes and hypotheses were backed by evidence that is perceived to be of quality.

Please see the [technical note](#) for a detailed breakdown of the process.

### III. Assessing the evidence

The Working Groups considered these background documents—The Rights Lab non-comprehensive evidence review, the underlying database and the Delta 8.7 quantitative assessment—and reworked them using a shared template into a Policy Guide aimed at providing a snapshot of evidence on what may work to achieve SDG Target 8.7. Some of their duties included:

1. Identifying evidentiary sources that were missing and needed to be incorporated
2. Discussing the strength of evidence associated with each theme and/or hypotheses
3. Identifying other interventions or hypotheses that were not reflected in evidence but may be promising
4. Assigning a confidence score to each hypothesis

#### Understanding and interpreting confidence scores

Working Groups were asked to indicate their level of confidence in the effectiveness of an intervention or the validity of the hypothesis using a prescribed scale. Confidence in the certainty of a finding is based on the strength of evidence – this is assessed on the a) diversity of evidence b) size of a body of evidence c) technical quality of the evidence.

The Confidence Score created a metric for the Working Group to discuss, consider and validate the two primary research inputs into the Policy Guides: The Rights Lab Evidence Review and the Delta 8.7 Quantitative Score. The evaluation to obtain a confidence score acts as an additional quality check, allowing the Working Group to assess bodies of evidence that the two research inputs may have struggled to recognize or map. The degree of certainty in key findings is therefore based on the Working Group’s evaluations of the two primary research inputs. In the Policy Guide documents, it is expressed as a qualitative level of confidence from “very low” to “very high”.

#### Implementation notes

Delta 8.7 built these working groups to include practitioners and policy actors precisely because we want to bridge the research-to-policy gaps. With this in mind working groups were able to include an ‘implementation note’, in cases where a hypothesis may seem to have contradicted their own experience of practice/policy implementation,
The Markets Policy Guide: Introduction

What actually works to end modern slavery in the context of markets? In the past decade we have witnessed a heightened awareness of the risk of modern slavery occurring within global supply chains, with a corresponding increase in regulation, funding, private sector engagement and programming to address it. The growth in multi-stakeholder collaboration is an indication of our shared commitment to end modern slavery in all its forms, and a sign of hope that it will be possible. What is needed now is a common understanding of what programmatic interventions effectively reduce the number of people who suffer from this crime, to guide policy and investment decisions.

The expert Working Group that came together to compile this Policy Guide alongside Delta 8.7 - The Alliance 8.7 Knowledge Platform as part of United Nations University Centre for Policy Research was tasked with reviewing the available research conducted to date related to modern slavery in the context of markets. For the purposes of this Policy Guide, markets in this context encompassed economic policy, trade policy, financial policy, development policy and supply chains. Significant progress has been made in this field to date through government regulation and voluntary efforts that span the globe. In 2011, the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights became the first corporate responsibility framework to be endorsed by the UN. The three pillars within this voluntary framework—Protect, Respect and Remedy—assign responsibilities to the private sector and governments and have thus gained support and consensus where previous attempts had failed. The Guiding Principles affirmed the responsibility of governments to enforce national laws prohibiting modern slavery—laws which exist in every country in some form—and to regulate the behaviour of private actors.

Action by governments in this area has taken the form of regulation of corporations through disclosure and reporting; as well as legal action in the form of sanctions or import restrictions of goods suspected to have been made using forced labour. Voluntary efforts within the private sector to identify, remedy and prevent modern slavery within supply chains have included endorsement of the UN Guiding Principles, adherence to due diligence guidelines (such as those drafted by the OECD), supplier training, voluntary audits, industry-specific codes of conduct and worker voice grievance mechanisms. Through these efforts, extensive multi-stakeholder collaboration, innovative programming and advances in prevalence measurement we are seeing very promising emerging best practices that have the potential for replication and scale.

At the same time, discussion among Working Group members responsible for drafting this Guide highlighted the ongoing gaps in knowledge and research that still exist in this still relatively new field. The research quality requirements for this project demonstrated the limited number of studies that meet rigorous academic standards, a dramatic contrast to the quantity of available research in the fields of health, education and the environment. Research quality and quantity are critical factors in determining whether key findings can be extrapolated and applied to other contexts and are thus key inputs for decision-makers in determining approaches to funding, policy/legislation and programming.

Hypothesis 1

Collaboration among civil society organizations that work with the private sector to raise awareness and offer...
effective remedies can help to address forced labour and human trafficking in their business operations – High Confidence Score

Description

The need for businesses to work with NGOs to effectively address modern slavery in relation to their business operations was captured across ten studies with focuses on specific industries, populations and geographic regions; the findings are not widely applicable. These records emphasized the importance of multi-sector collaboration and coordination in addressing modern slavery in the private sector. Most studies and findings are specific to geographic contexts and/or labour sectors and may not be extrapolatable to other sectors. The studies: (a) make recommendations that could be implemented in the context that formed the subject matter of the report; (b) suggest that corporate engagement and action in partnership with governments, NGOs and charities, and other local stakeholders is critical for addressing modern slavery; and (c) show that a multi-stakeholder regional forum would provide a platform for the discussion of best practices in management and oversight, support improved labour conditions across the value chain, and suggest how governments may improve their labour standards and regulations to address labour exploitation. However, the actual impact of these efforts in terms of improving efforts to address forced labour and human trafficking in their business operations is not clear. Although the majority of respondents received anti-human trafficking interagency collaborative training, they were not required to participate in anti-human trafficking collaborative activities as part of their job description and were not evaluated for such efforts during performance reviews (93.2 per cent). A small exception is the Thai fishing industry, wherein labour standards and conditions in the canned tuna industry showed a marked improvement as a result of pressure from overseas buyers; which needs to be seen as a proxy and not as evidence of direct impact. The evidence is given for specific sectors/industries and it is not apparent that it translates to all/other sectors/industries. The impact is anecdotal, and the claims have bias, based on the type of publication/author organizations; it is reasonable that they are motivated to support the hypothesis despite there being little quantifiable evidence of impact. Companies historically have not shown a high level of participation in transparency practices on elimination of forced labour in supply chains. Companies that do try to engage with civil society organizations to eliminate forced labour and human trafficking can still face obstacles addressing forced labour in mining or production of goods within the source country.

Strength of evidence

Diversity

2 Quintin Lake, Jamie MacAlister, Cindy Berman, Matthew Gitsham and Nadine Page, "Corporate Leadership on Modern Slavery: How have companies responded to the UK Modern Slavery Act one year on?," (United Kingdom: Hult International Business School and The Ethical Trading Initiative, 2016).
The majority of claims in this grouping were tested through studies that involved primary data collection, predominantly adopting qualitative research methods and observational designs.

**Size**

Studies were geographically diverse, with two global in nature. One study considered the regional context of Africa with a comparative of six countries (Ghana, Ethiopia, Uganda, Tanzania, Zanzibar and Kenya), and another focusing on developed countries (the United Kingdom, the United States, Germany, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and New Zealand). The remaining records were national studies, covering Mauritania, Thailand, the United States (Michigan), and India.

**Technical Quality of Evidence**

Evidence underpinning the hypothesis was considered to be transparent or somewhat transparent, valid or somewhat valid, and reliable or somewhat reliable in all cases. All studies were published, the majority (six) were published in non-peer reviewed settings by non-governmental organizations, the rest were published in peer-reviewed journals and authored by academics.

---

**Hypothesis 2**

**Brands working in collaboration with buyers and suppliers improves the effectiveness of efforts to reduce forced labour and human trafficking in supply chains - High Confidence**

**Description**

The evidentiary base for this hypothesis included nine studies that were primarily focused on theories of policy impact, with a few studies on specific industries, populations and regions; the findings are not widely applicable. Assessment of the importance of collaboration between different stakeholders within the supply chains is limited. Moreover, findings are likely to be specific to an area, and may not be extrapolatable to other sectors.

Existing research makes good assertions and the initiatives examined have seen promising beginnings; however, there is no real data on their outcomes. Some studies in this group highlighted limitations of traditional compliance mechanisms, especially in developing countries. They stressed the importance of trust and responsibility for aligning supplier behaviour with buyers’ codes of conduct. Others argued that collaboration with other stakeholders, such as trade unions, would help buying firms to improve labour standards in their suppliers. Similarly, rather than establishing arm’s length relationships with suppliers, creation of a shared responsibility culture across supply chains was argued to foster higher standards for workers.

Shortening the labour supply chain allows firms to better control the terms under which workers are initially approached, helping to avoid using rent-seeking local labour brokers in source countries. Countries and owners of mines and factories that engage in forced labour practices often engage in administrative and trade practices that conceal or make unclear the exact nature of their labour practices.

In order for this hypothesis to be rated higher, further empirical research needs to be conducted which also reviews the substantial breadth of law in relation to ultimate buying firms. The evidence suggests collaboration alone is more...

---

5 Marley S. Weiss, "Human Trafficking and Forced Labor: A Primer," ABA Journal of Labor & Employment Law 31: 1-
insufficient, robust regulations and laws that are adequately enforced are also needed in tandem with collaboration
to combat modern slavery. Sufficient time has not yet passed to adequately assess the impact of this regulatory
approach.

Strength of evidence

Diversity

The majority of claims involved either primary or secondary studies. Only 1 study adopted a mixed study approach,
and there were no conceptual studies in this group. 11 claims (84%) were tested with qualitative research
methods.

Size

Studies were geographically diverse, with the majority focusing on one country. One study considered the regional
context of Africa, and one considered supply chain relationships between Brazil and the United Kingdom. Others
focused on a single national context, covering India, New Zealand, Viet Nam, the United Kingdom, and the United
States. The majority of studies used interviews for data collection. The sample size in these studies ranged from 21
to 293. The grouping also included one systematic review and one experimental study. Characteristics of interview
samples varied significantly between studies. While one study focused on the textile industry and conducted
interviews exclusively with migrant crew members.

Technical Quality of Evidence

The evidence underpinning this hypothesis was assessed to be strong, with the majority of claims recorded as
clear, transparent, context-appropriate, valid, and reliable. Qualitative studies in this group were generally
supported by literature reviews.

Hypothesis 3

*Government legislation that enforces mandatory corporate reporting on modern slavery offers transparency that
helps to reduce forced labour – High Confidence Score*

Description

The evidentiary base for this hypothesis included 12 studies, most of which examined country- or region-specific
policy impacts; the findings are not widely applicable. The evidence supporting this hypothesis has a geographical
reach that is relatively small. Legislation against modern slavery and human trafficking is mostly found in developed
economies. Therefore, it is no surprise that most studies in this grouping had samples from developed countries for
claim testing. Studies generally agreed on the positive impact of anti-slavery legislation in tackling forced labour
and human trafficking. It was stated that legislation increased the number and quality of company disclosures.
Similarities were observed among competing companies’ reports. It is suggested that certain initiatives would


improve corporate responses to modern slavery risk. However, there is no evidence of actual impact. Other sources offer a theoretical discussion of existing approaches to imposition of corporate duties in relation to supply chains. Assessments of the extensiveness of information provided indicate that the disclosure response appeared to be more symbolic than substantive in nature. Disclosures tended to focus on company policy, rather than on specific slavery-related subthemes or problems that could be addressed, on any quantitative targets, or on financial resources provided to deal with the problems. Simply requiring corporate reporting or statements is insufficient. There is a lack of transparency and accountability from companies who have statements listed on company websites. Stricter standards for what is required in the reporting, quantitative measures, and accountability are required. There is certainly evidence that the UK policy is taken seriously. There are also small studies that show unintended consequences in the implementation of such policies. A broader analysis of how compliance is measured and of policies in different geographical areas to better assess the impact of government policies is required. The evidence suggests it is not just collaboration, but regulations and laws that are needed, and the government must enforce them to combat trafficking. Sufficient time has not yet passed to adequately assess the impact of this regulatory approach.

**Strength of evidence**

**Diversity**

The majority of claims were found in primary and secondary studies. Only 1 study adopted a mixed-study approach, and there were four conceptual studies. Eight claims were tested with qualitative research methods. Studies used a variety of research methods and data sources.

**Size**

Studies were geographically diverse, with the majority focusing on a single national context. While most of the studies focused on firms based in developed economies, one study focused on Sri Lanka.

Although data was drawn from various countries, four studies used firms ‘modern slavery statements for analysis. These studies benefitted from both quantitative and qualitative research methods. The number of firms under investigation in these samples varied between 30 and 204. Two studies utilized interview techniques for data collection, with sample sizes ranging from 30 to 41.

**Technical Quality of Evidence**

The evidence underpinning this hypothesis was assessed to be strong, with the majority of claims recorded as clear, transparent, context-appropriate, and valid. Cogency and reliability in these studies could have been improved, although the majority of claims were considered to be underpinned that was reliable and cogent, or somewhat so. All studies were published, with nine (75 per cent) published in peer-reviewed journals.

---

**Hypothesis 4**

If forced labour, human trafficking and child labour are treated as an issue in silo there can be unintended socio-economic consequences which prevent their eradication - **High Confidence**

**Description**

Research and evidence have repeatedly demonstrated that forced labour, human trafficking and child labour are complex issues intertwining with elements such as poverty, debt, vulnerability, legal structure and social norms. There is therefore a need to recognize and address forced labour, human trafficking and child labour through a systems lens instead of treating them as issues in the silo. Failing to recognize its complexity can result in unintended socio-economic consequences, as the systems may adapt in unexpected ways. For example, if not supported carefully, survivors of human trafficking rescued through raids may fall back into trafficking again due to lack of options to sustain a livelihood. Interventions have to take into account the dynamic system and should aim to address the underlying systemic issues that result in forced labour, human trafficking and child labour.

**Diversity**

The diversity of evidence underpinning this hypothesis is varied; among the evidence base a diverse range of research and implementation approaches were used. The majority of claims in this grouping were tested through studies that involved primary data collection, predominantly adopting qualitative research methods and observational designs.

**Size**

There are six pieces of evidence collected to support this hypothesis. The studies in this hypothesis group were geographically diverse. National studies covered India, Brazil, Ghana, Indonesia, and Mozambique, Japan, Thailand, Spain, Italy, the United States, Greece, Australia, Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Gambia, Libya, Benin, Malaysia, India, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, Syria, Turkey, Sri Lanka, the United Kingdom (Yorkshire and the Humber) and Indonesia.

**Technical Quality of evidence**

The strength of evidence underpinning this hypothesis was assessed to support a positive finding on the hypothesis, with the majority considered to be clear, transparent, context-appropriate, valid, reliable and cogent.

---

**Hypothesis 5**

In the formal economy, well-designed state regulation and implementation of the labour market would help mitigate forced labour and human trafficking - **High Confidence**

**Description**

Implementation of effective changes against pervasive modern slavery requires key stakeholders in government to change recruitment and payment practices drastically. Market-friendly business and labour regulations correlate with an increase in labour trafficking whereas more stringently regulated labour markets correlate with a reduction in labour trafficking. However, regulation should be designed in a way that considers the whole systems dynamic with careful consultation to avoid unintended consequences. Increasing the remit of, and resources assigned to, the
Employment Agency Standards Inspectorate so that it is relevant to more companies and other intermediaries in the supply chain would result in labour exploitation being more easily identified and reduced. Improved regular immigration policies would make legal immigration easier and more affordable than illicit routes, making human trafficking and smuggling less profitable. However, while the formal sector benefits from well-designed state regulation, regulations for the informal sector—where workers are most vulnerable to subject to modern slavery and human trafficking—require recognition of the reality on the ground and ingenuity.

Diversity

The diversity of evidence underpinning this hypothesis is varied across academic paper and NGO reports; among the evidence base a diverse range of research and implementation approaches were used. Three claims in this grouping were tested through studies that involved primary data collection, others were using secondary data and theoretical or conceptual sources.

Size

There are 14 pieces of evidence collected to support this hypothesis. The studies in this hypothesis group were geographically diverse, with some focusing on a single jurisdiction and others with an international focus. National studies covered India, the United Kingdom, South Africa, Malaysia, Slovakia, Indonesia and China.

Technical Quality of evidence

The strength of evidence underpinning this hypothesis was assessed to support a positive finding on the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 9

In the formal sector, increased focus on worker voice mechanisms, including union/worker associations, result in better identification and prevention of forced labour and human trafficking in the workplace - **Medium Confidence**

Description

Workers being allowed to organize and participate in workers’ unions to contribute to political action addressing worker rights reduces their vulnerabilities and helps progress the role trade unions can play in addressing more serious issues like exploitation (as opposed to more linear workplace rights). Through forming the network among workers and connecting to third parties, identification and prevention are made easier. However, the hypothesis stresses the element of ‘formal sector’ as a reminder that worker voice mechanisms are almost unattainable in most of the informal sector industry, where the likelihood of forced labour and human trafficking is much higher than the formal sector.

Strength of evidence

Diversity

The diversity of evidence underpinning this hypothesis is limited, with the majority from academia resources and one from NGO reports; amongst the evidence base a diverse range of research and implementation approaches were used. The majority of claims in this grouping were tested through studies that involved primary data collection,
predominantly adopting a mixed method.

Size

There are six pieces of evidence collected to support this hypothesis. The studies in this hypothesis group were geographically diverse, with focus on a single jurisdiction. National studies covered India, New Zealand, Argentina, the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, New Zealand and China.

Technical quality of evidence

The strength of evidence underpinning this hypothesis was assessed to be unsatisfactory. It is clear that further research and study needs to be conducted to support this hypothesis. However, members and practitioners of the working group do support the logic that worker voice mechanisms contribute to reduce vulnerability of workers, which in turn, reduce the likelihood of forced labour and human trafficking in the workplace.

Hypothesis 10

Mandatory corporate disclosure and supply chain management requirements increase private sector responses and engagement to tackling Modern Slavery but there is insufficient evidence that this is effective in addressing slavery - Confidence score still to be assigned

Description

Laws requiring corporate responses to modern slavery help companies engage with tackling modern slavery in their supply chains, but their impact is limited. Corporate disclosure frameworks targeting only larger companies and requiring only some information are insufficient.

Legislation must ensure that disclosure and transparency are not just symbolic—only big companies concerned about reputational damage seem to really try to improve their approach to tackling modern slavery. Measures have typically used either mandatory or voluntary regimes for disclosure; based on the evidence, voluntary measures are ineffective and often lead to inadequate disclosure. Weak enforcement of disclosure requirements contributes to inadequate disclosures.

Reporting is meaningful only when companies have taken effective action to identify, prevent, mitigate and address the human rights impacts of their business activities and when these actions result in tangible improvements to rights-holders.

Further research needs to be done to demonstrate how corporate disclosure requirements can impact modern slavery in supply chains. Additionally, more time may be needed to assess measures that are currently in place.

Strength of evidence

Diversity

A major part of the evidence used to support this hypothesis are secondary studies mostly published in non peer-reviewed journals, and predominantly adopting qualitative research methods. One publication is used twice. Publications are quite recent and were written either by academics or by NGOs. There are no governmental studies nor reports/studies from international organizations.
While some of the studies in this hypothesis group were geographically global, the majority focused on a single jurisdiction, and more specifically on the United Kingdom. Other national studies covered Australia, France, the United States, and Brazil. Most of the studies are based on case studies and data analysis from companies from different sectors, while others describe legislations and recommendations without assessing their effectiveness.

**Technical quality of evidence**

The vast majority of the evidence used for hypothesis seven it is clear, context-appropriate, transparent, valid, reliable and cogent. However, while most of the evidence is judged to be “context appropriate” as the content matches the claim tested, only a very few actually matches the hypothesis. In fact, some of the publications even support the opposite: that corporate disclosure and reporting are only symbolic and not efficient in practice, and that more needs to be done.

**Hypothesis 6:**

For private sector’s engagement in anti-slavery activity to be meaningful, increased corporate liability provisions and/or financial penalties or incentives are required - Confidence score still to be assigned

**Description**

With new regulations to combat modern slavery in supply chains, companies are increasingly reporting on their engagement in anti-slavery efforts and increasing transparency in their supply chains. The increasing engagement is only partial among corporate entities however.\(^8\) Several studies assessing corporate compliance under existing legislation in the United States and the United Kingdom note significant levels of non-compliance, as high as 50 per cent in the US\(^9\) and 75 per cent in the UK\(^10\). The UK government conceptually introduced “unlimited fines” for lack of compliance and to “name-and-shame” non-compliant companies\(^11\), however there has been little evidence of follow through.

While this does not establish that compliance would improve with the introduction of corporate liability provisions and/or financial penalties or incentives, it does suggest that non-compliance is likely without them.

Further, the engagement tends to only become effective (as a rule) when there is sufficient attention brought to the modern slavery practices in a sector that could harm firms’ reputations or market. The accountability the new

---


\(^10\) Walk Free and WikiRate (2018), assessing modern slavery statements submitted by 418 companies reporting under the 2015 UK Modern Slavery Act, found that only 26 percent of the statements were legally compliant. Similarly, the 2019 report by Walk Free, WikiRate, Australian National University, and Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, assessed modern slavery statements from companies within the hotels sector, finding that only 25 percent of statements met minimum requirements.

regulations have brought are variable, and the minimal requirements of reporting on any action taken has not been sufficient to create substantial change.

More substantial liability, with concurrent impact on reputation and market share may be more effective in bringing change in corporate practices. This is particularly the case in industries with more complex supply chains and particularly in which modern slavery and forced labour practices are more ambiguous.

**Diversity**

All but one piece of evidence were discussion papers mainly from academic journals, one being from an NGO. All findings and analysis were not proven; however, some made some adequate suggestions. Most were secondary qualitative studies using mixed methods, making it difficult for quality testing and cross-country comparison. One piece of evidence used quantitative data, and another collected some primary qualitative data. One study was repeated twice. Publications are all recent, the oldest being from 2016. There is a general lack of quantitative data in the evidence. There were no governmental or intergovernmental sources. There was an overwhelming lack of diversity for each aspect of SDG 8.7, with nearly all studies focusing on human trafficking and modern slavery. One paper focused on forced labour while none included child labour.

**Size**

The majority of the studies focused on a single jurisdiction including the United Kingdom, the United States and Australia, India, Slovakia, Malaysia and Thailand. One study focused on trafficking journeys from Viet Nam to Europe, encompassing Belgium, the Czech Republic, France, the Netherlands, Poland, the United Kingdom and Ukraine. Most of the studies are based on case studies and data analysis from companies from different sectors, while others describe legislations and recommendations without assessing their effectiveness.

**Technical quality of evidence**

Some evidence claimed that voluntary reporting alone does not work but did not go as far to say financial penalties or incentives would increase private sector’s engagement. Some evidence suggested that incentives would improve private sector engagement in anti-slavery activity, but again, did not support the hypothesis. A discussion paper found results that the idea of legislation would increase engagement, but the results were not proven. Another piece of evidence suggests a policy recommendation to strengthen the Modern Slavery Act, and two other pieces discussed the idea of ethical consumerism and consumer behaviour.

Overall, the evidence included some potentially important suggestions for improving private sector’s engagement in anti-slavery activity, but none were sufficiently proven. We found insufficient evidence to support the hypothesis.

Moreover, there was an overwhelming lack of diversity for each aspect of SDG 8.7, with nearly all studies focusing on human trafficking and modern slavery. One paper focused on forced labour whilst none included child labour.

Globally, the legislative landscape presents limited opportunity to evaluate the efficacy of legal mechanisms that motivate corporations to engage in anti-slavery activity. Where such legislation does exist, for example, in the United States, The United Kingdom, Brazil and Australia, it is relatively recent. For example, supply chain legislation in Australia has only been in effect since 2018. As such, data on corporate actions resulting from these legal mechanisms, e.g. modern slavery statements, is limited. Furthermore, fewer examples exist of legislation with
accompanying incentives or penalties, other than reputational risk. Brazil’s Dirty List is a notable exception, with companies on the list barred from receiving state loans and some private loans.