SETTING RESULTS IN HUMAN RIGHTS, DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT AND GOVERNANCE AT CIDA: A NEEDS ASSESSMENT

by

Ilan Kapoor

Consultant/Policy Advisor

Loka International

for the
Political and Social Policies Division
Policy Branch
Canadian International Development Agency

April 1997

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SETTING RESULTS IN HUMAN RIGHTS, DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT AND GOVERNANCE AT CIDA: A NEEDS ASSESSMENT

INTRODUCTION

During 1995-96, the Political and Social Policies Division of CIDA commissioned a preliminary study (Kapoor 1996) examining project, programme and policy level indicators in human rights and democratic development. After looking into the experience of CIDA, CIDA's partners and other donor/development organizations, the study found few examples of projects using indicators to track progress on human rights and democratic development either at CIDA or elsewhere. In an effort to initiate thinking and practice in this area, the study explored some of the methodological issues and challenges peculiar to measuring political change and proposed an approach to the deployment of indicators at the project, programme and policy levels. This approach suggests the need for the development of both quantitative and qualitative measurements for results-setting and emphasizes that such development can be greatly enhanced through participatory processes that bring together all stakeholders.

Based mainly on interviews at CIDA, the present report examines in more detail what is required at the Agency to better set results and choose indicators for programming in human rights, democratic development and governance (HR/DD/GG). The purpose of the report is to analyze the relevant needs of the Bilateral, Partnership and Multilateral Branches. Accordingly, after summarizing the extent to which and the constraints under which results-setting is taking place in the Agency, the report outlines what advice, guidance and technical support CIDA programme branches need in developing indicators to monitor projects and organizations that address HR/DD/GG.

The report is based on the following sources: (i) primarily person-to-person, and sometimes telephone, interviews with CIDA project, programme and policy officers engaged in programming in HR/DD/GG; and where appropriate, interviews with partner organizations (see Appendices I, II and III); (ii) relevant files and monitoring/evaluation reports of planned or operational projects (see Appendix II); and (iii) relevant academic and donor literature (see Bibliography).

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE RESULTS BEING SET IN HR/DD/GG PROGRAMMING?

Overall, results-setting in human rights, democratic development and governance is at a relatively early stage in much of CIDA. This should not be surprising, given the little time that has elapsed since the adoption of results-based management (RBM) within the Agency. As underlined below, moreover, there are a number of organizational and programming constraints which limit the extent to which, and the pace at which, results-setting can occur.

All officers interviewed appeared informed about RBM and most have taken at least preliminary steps in applying this knowledge to their particular programming requirements. Several have developed project/programme Logical Framework Analyses (LFAs) with corresponding

performance indicators. A few have developed grids outlining milestones and criteria for results-setting for the benefit of their project/programme executing agencies.

However, several problem areas and knowledge/experience gaps emerged from the interviews and review of project documentation:

> ƒ there is a tendency to rely more heavily on quantitative (viz. people trained, research material produced through project) than qualitative results measurements. Several officers expressed difficulty in devising indicators to measure such things as policy development or changes in human rights "attitudes", "culture" or "behaviour".

> ƒ the relative lack of use of qualitative indicators is complemented by a paucity of indicators for capacity development. Given that much of CIDA's support in HR/DD/GG activities is channelled through institutions, many officers mentioned their inability to come up with indicators to monitor, for example, an organization's strategic management, or its networking and lobbying activities.

> ƒ the documentation and interviews reveal that officers find it easier to develop indicators and measure results at the output and outcome levels than at the impact level; often, this is because project funding ends before it is possible to measure the extent to which wider and longer-term project goals are achieved.

> ƒ the development of indicators and LFAs, where this has taken place, has not for the most part been carried out in consultation with project/programme stakeholders. Project officers were either unaware of joint-stakeholder approaches to setting results, or expressed a lack of information and experience in this area.

Many or all of these problem areas can, and should, be seen in the context of the programming and institutional constraints that project officers and partner organizations face. The following are the principal ones that came out of the interview process, although they are not necessarily listed in order of priority:

> ƒ as alluded to earlier, RBM is a relatively recent policy orientation within the Agency. While most staff have undergone training, developed either at the corporate level (Performance Review Division) or at the Branch level (of particular note is Asia Branch's workshops for CIDA officers and partners on developing LFAs and performance indicators), staff are not always able to adapt this knowledge to HR/DD/GG programming.

> ƒ CIDA's traditional top-down, "blueprint" project management style and culture does not make it easy to make the transition towards more participatory and joint-stakeholder approaches to programming and RBM.

> ƒ results-setting is easier to integrate into new or planned projects/programmes than ones that are in mid-stream or close to termination (although there are noteworthy examples within the Agency of successful transitioning towards joint-stakeholder RBM; see next section).

ƒ there are types of HR/DD/GG programming that can make it particularly difficult to set results and design indicators: (a) programming in socio-politically volatile developing countries can make it arduous to measure project outcomes or impacts, and in some cases (for example, present-day Nigeria) can even pose a security risk to partner organizations operating semi-covertly; and (b) monitoring results of flexible and responsive HR/DD/GG funds that finance small projects and NGOs is sometimes too costly and time-consuming to make it worthwhile (although, here too, there might be easy and cheap alternatives available; see next section).

ƒ HR/DD/GG programming and RBM must be carried out in cooperation with partner organizations and executing agencies, which often face the following constraints (see next section for ways of addressing these constraints): (a) like CIDA staff, many NGO staff lack RBM experience, especially in its application to HR/DD/GG; (b) several partners are unaware of RBM or are unsure of what to report and how to report it; (c) while many are receptive, a few NGOs, especially those operating on shoestring budgets, see RBM as a CIDA imposition that generates additional paperwork and uses up already over-stretched resources; in this regard, a number of CIDA officers enquired whether the Agency is willing to meet the additional costs for NGOs implied by results monitoring, collection of baseline data, etc.; (d) partners covered by contribution agreements, which invest some of their own resources in HR/DD/GG programming, are less inclined to be open to RBM, or be convinced of the utility of RBM, since they often need to meet their own political/institutional priorities; and (e) executing agencies are sometimes reluctant to agree to the specification of performance indicators in project contracts for fear of having to accept all project risks.

ƒ RBM can be difficult to bring to bear on programme funding, because unlike project funding, programme funds are not earmarked for specific activities that can be monitored. This difficulty applies as much to Partnership programming [as implied in point (v), (d) above] as it does to Multilateral programming. Nonetheless, partner organizations can be convinced of the importance of HR/DD/GG results-setting through policy dialogue and in consultation with other funders. In the case of multilateral agencies such as the World Bank, UNDP or UNICEF, for example, CIDA/Canada does and can influence policy decisions relating to RBM and project evaluation as a member of these organizations' boards.

It should be noted that, while results-setting in HR/DD/GG is at an incipient stage at CIDA, two bilateral projects can be deemed to be the exception, and are hence worthy of mention as pioneers in this field: the Cameroon Programme's "Projet d'appui au développment democratique et aux droits de la personne", assisted by C.A.C. International, and the Guatemala Programme's "Democratic Development Fund", implemented by le Centre canadien d'études et de coopération internationale (CECI). Although still at early stages of implementation, these projects have designed and developed, in cooperation with all stakeholders, an impressive array of performance indicators and monitoring mechanisms (for details see Appendix IV).

WHAT ARE CIDA'S PRESENT NEEDS FOR SETTING RESULTS IN HR/DD/GG?

The above-mentioned achievements, problem areas and constraints point to the following sets of needs and suggestions relating to results-setting in HR/DD/GG. Once again, these are not necessarily listed in order of priority.

1. Training Needs

Many interview respondents believed that enough of their time had been spent on general RBM training, but almost all expressed the need for specialized training that would help them apply their RBM knowledge to HR/DD/GG programming and results-setting. Several officers suggested that such training be directed not only to programme officers, but also to staff from the Posts (especially those connected with HR/DD Funds), and where possible, representatives of relevant Canadian and Southern partner organizations.

According to those interviewed, the main characteristics of the HR/DD/GG training would be:

ƒ a half-day workshop on best practices in HR/DD/GG results-setting. The workshop would be devoted to sharing the experiences of 2-3 CIDA project cases (for example, the Cameroon and Guatemala HR/DD projects, presented perhaps by the CIDA project officers and CEA representatives), but would also allow participants to work through their own project LFAs.

ƒ a workshop, perhaps held in conjunction with the best practices workshop mentioned above, on the participatory dimensions of RBM. Case studies (for example, the CIDA-Pakistan Programme's Women's Vocational Training Project) of the use of joint-stakeholder approaches to rescue problem-ridden projects in mid-stream could also form part of this workshop. Several officers interviewed stressed the need to direct this workshop not only to programme staff, but senior CIDA management as well, to expose them to joint-stakeholder project management.

ƒ a training workshop, held either separate from or as part of the Agency's RBM course, devoted specifically to the development of HR/DD/GG indicators, in particular qualitative indicators, impact and outcome indicators, and capacity development indicators/institutional assessment.

ƒ a workshop directed exclusively to CIDA HR/DD/GG partner organizations for training and sharing in several areas: the mutual advantages for CIDA and its partners in adopting RBM; joint-stakeholder approaches to project designing, programming and contracting; the collection of baseline data and the development of results monitoring mechanisms; and self-assessments of performance. Self-assessments could help mitigate the need for external monitoring/evaluation of results and could be an easy and cheap solution to results monitoring for small projects and organizations (that are sometimes supported through HR/DD Funds).

2. Development of Informational Resources

The following were suggestions made to improve CIDA staff and partners' knowledge of HR/DD/GG results management:

ƒ a short illustrative guide, perhaps based on the best practices workshop mentioned above, outlining best CIDA HR/DD/GG programming practices and case studies, including LFAs and corresponding performance indicators.

ƒ circulation within the Agency and to partner organizations of the following types of short, 2-3 page documents: (i) illustrative menus of qualitative and quantitative indicators; (ii) a list of key questions to be asked and key steps to be taken when developing indicators; and (iii) a list of the main CIDA partner organizations and executing agencies engaged in HR/DD/GG activities.

ƒ a manual to drawing up HR/DD/GG-related contracts and contribution agreements, including the steps and pitfalls of joint-contracting, joint-accountability and risk-sharing.

ƒ a guide to policy dialogue, and multi-donor and multi-NGO results-monitoring and evaluation. Several staff believed that better knowledge of these activities can help increase programme information sharing and coherence, reduce monitoring costs, and allow for more effective and long-term monitoring of project impacts.

3. Development of HR/DD/GG Pool of Consultants

It was felt by a number of those interviewed that a pool of consultants, experienced in HR/DD/GG results-based management and easily accessible through such mechanisms as Standing Offers, would be valuable. The consultants could be called upon to help, for example, with the development of project/programme indicators or with joint-project design and contracting. Particular mention was made of the need for effective, culturally-sensitive animators/facilitators for joint-stakeholder RBM workshops.

4. HR/DD/GG Information Sharing

Although it was already believed to be happening, several respondents nonetheless underlined the need for greater sharing: (a) within the Agency, of HR/DD/GG resources developed by other donors and partner organizations (UN, DAC, World Bank, etc.) to allow staff to keep abreast of state-of-the-art thinking and practice; and (b) with other donors and partner organizations, of CIDA-developed HR/DD/GG RBM information to strengthen policy coherence and dialogue in this area.

5. CIDA HR/DD/GG Results Network

Most CIDA officers emphasized the need for a HR/DD/GG Results network within the Agency, along the following lines:

ƒ the network would track HR/DD/GG corporate policy and programming goals, performance and funding (some of this is already done at the Branch level as part of the new corporate planning cycle). The network would coordinate information, lessons learned and staff training.

ƒ the network could be separate from or integrated with the existing RBM network or general HR/DD/GG network.

ƒ the vast majority of respondents considered that membership to the network should be informal, with officers being able to join as and when required. However, all emphasized that, for the network to be effective and sustainable, specific time and person hours would need to be earmarked for it (most logically by the Political and Social Policies Division), and each Branch would need to assign a permanent network representative (most logically from the Branch policy divisions) to ensure continuity and coordination.

ƒ the network could develop and maintain a web-site, storing relevant documents, information and announcements.

<u>Appendix I</u>

INTERVIEW LIST

1. Louise Bergeron, Multilateral Technical Cooperation, Multilateral Branch, CIDA
2. Gilles Bernier, Professional Associations Programme, Partnership Branch, CIDA
3. Chuck Boode, Caribbean Division, Americas Branch, CIDA
4. Barbara Brown, Political and Social Policies Division, Policy Branch, CIDA
5. Sarah Camblin-Breault, Ukraine Programme, Central & Eastern Europe Branch, CIDA
6. Marilyn Collette, Strategic Planning and Policy Division, Asia Branch, CIDA
7. Hélène Corneau, Multilateral Technical Cooperation, Multilateral Branch, CIDA
8. Barbara Curran, Northern Europe Division, Central and Eastern Europe Branch, CIDA
9. Katherine Dunlop, Strategic Planning and Management, Africa & Middle East Branch, CIDA
10. Linda Ervin, International Financial Institutions, Multilateral Branch, CIDA
11. Louise Filion, Policy, Planning and Multilateral Division, Central & Eastern European Branch, CIDA
12. Peter Gillespie, Interpares, Ottawa
13. Ruth Groberman, NGO Division, Partnership Branch, CIDA
14. Julia Hill, West Africa Division, Africa and Middle East Branch, CIDA
15. Marlène Jacques, Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), Ottawa
16. Gareth Jones, UNICEF, New York
17. Marc Lalonde, Caribbean Division, Americas Branch, CIDA
18. Vaughan Lantz, Russia Division, Central and Eastern Europe Branch, CIDA
19. Louise Lavigne, Policy, Strategy Planning & Management Division, Americas Branch, CIDA
20. Louise Lesage, South America Division, Americas Branch, CIDA
21. Zahir Meghji, India/Nepal/Sri Lanka Division, CIDA
22. Werner Meier, Performance Review Division, Corporate Management Branch, CIDA
23. Maury Miloff, Ukraine Programme, Central and Eastern Europe Branch
24. Ardith Molson, Multilateral Technical Cooperation, Multilateral Branch, CIDA
25. Robert Morrow, Caribbean Division, Americas Branch, CIDA
26. Peter Newton, West Africa Division, Africa and Middle East Branch, CIDA
27. Henri-Paul Normandin, Indochina, Thailand and Malaysia Division, Asia Branch, CIDA
28. Leslie Norton, Southern Africa, Africa and Middle-East Branch, CIDA
29. David Pankhurst, Policy, Strategic Planning & Operations Division, Partnership Branch, CIDA
30. Doriane Prévost, Central Africa Programme, Africa and Middle East Division
31. Dave Rushton, Professional Associations Programme, Partnership Branch, CIDA
32. Marta Samper, Central America Division, Americas Branch, CIDA
33. Francine Trempe, Consultant, West Africa Division, Africa and Middle East Branch, CIDA
34. Pascale Turcotte, Policy, Strategy Planning & Management Division, Americas Branch, CIDA
35. Scott Wade, Political and Social Policies Division, Policy Branch, CIDA
36. Jonathan Wheatcroft, Indochina, Thailand, Malaysia Division, Asia Branch, CIDA
37. Bill Wiseman, Institutional Cooperation Division, Partnership Branch, CIDA

Appendix II

PROJECTS/PROGRAMMES REVIEWED

Partnership Branch

ƒ Interpares
ƒ Oxfam
ƒ Horizons of Friendship
ƒ Parliamentary Centre
ƒ Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM)
ƒ IPAC

Multilateral Branch

ƒ UNICEF
ƒ UNIFEM
ƒ UNDP
ƒ Commonwealth Secretariat and CFTC
ƒ World Bank

Africa & Middle East Branch

ƒ Zimbabwe Legal Resources Foundation
ƒ Southern Africa Rights, Democracy and Governance Bridging Fund
ƒ Southern Africa Democratic/Capacity Development Programme
ƒ Assistance to Auditor General- Mozambique, Malawi
ƒ Promotion de la Démocratie et des Droits de la Personne - l'Afrique Francophone Regional
ƒ Afrique de l'Ouest - Medias et Démocratie
ƒ Projet d'appui au développment democratique et aux droits de la personne - Cameroun
ƒ Democratic Development Fund for Nigeria, Sierra Leone and the Gambia

Americas Branch

ƒ Colombia Human Rights Promotion Project
ƒ Guatemala Democratic Development Fund
ƒ Formation et Appui Institutionnel à la Justice en Haïti
ƒ Trinidad Drug Interdiction Project
ƒ Haiti National Police Training Project

Asia Branch

ƒ Sri Lanka Human Rights and Peace Funds
ƒ Canada-Southeast Asia Governance Innovation Network
ƒ Institutional Capacity for Human Rights in Indonesia
ƒ Seafild Project - SE Asia Human Rights and Democratic Practices
ƒ Vietnam-Canada Information Technology Project
ƒ Vietnam - Policy Implementation Assistance

Central and Eastern Europe Branch

ƒ Good Governance Project - Moravia
ƒ Rule of Law Project - Czech Republic and Slovakia
ƒ Canada-Ukraine Legislative Cooperation Project
ƒ Ukraine Judicial Reform Project
ƒ Russia - Democratic Development Fund

Appendix III

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

i)   - what indicators (outcome or impact indicators), if any, have been instituted in   the project?
- how have project results been monitored?
- what reporting systems, no matter how rudimentary, are being used?

ii)   - is there a project LFA? what are project purpose/goal/risks?
- what specific measures of performance have been selected, why, and how are   they to be measured?
- are there provisions to revise or re-design results indicators?

iii)   check for:
- inclusion of baseline data against which results are measured,
- use of quantitative/qualitative/participatory indicators and balance between   these,
-whether results are measured over short/intermediate/long-term.

iv)   - if indicators/reporting systems have been instituted, how were they established?
- if there is a project LFA, how was it drawn up?
- which stakeholders were involved in the creation/selection of indicators?
- risks, roles and responsibilities for budget, timing etc. for results collection and reporting

v)   - has the project been evaluated? check for evaluation/monitoring reports.
- what lessons have been learned from these reports? what follow-up, if any, has occurred?

vi)   - what support/further support is needed to set or modify results?
- what specific instruments, tools, techniques or guidelines for reporting/monitoring projects are required?

vii)   - what would be the most useful mechanisms for sharing lessons learned and experience in HR/DD/GG?

Appendix IV

CAMEROON AND GUATEMALA HRDD FUNDS
PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

1. Cameroon: Support to Democratic Development and Human Rights

Description: the project consists of a decentralized HRDD Fund, worth $4.5 million and covering a 5-year (1995-2000) period.

Purpose and Goal: to strengthen relevant public and private HRDD institutions in order to contribute towards democratization and the promotion of human rights in the Cameroon.

Long-term Result: democratic practices and the respect for human rights are strongly embedded within society. **Indicators**: free, multi-party, democratic elections held; reduced human rights violations.

Short-term Result: strengthened capacity of main HRDD institutions. **Indicators**: greater initiative taken by public institutions involved in HRDD; greater involvement of NGOs in HRDD-related debates and initiatives.

Measurable Results in the Year 2000:

ƒ The **Comité national des droits de l'homme et des libertés** is able to fulfil its mandate. **Indicators**: the CNDHL is operational; it has national and international credibility; it is independent; it is active throughout the country, in collaboration with relevant HRDD NGOs; it is active in the following areas: public education; investigation of HR violations; coordination and consultation with relevant NGOs; networking with national/international/multilateral organizations; reports to the President on the HR situation; HR training and education of police, prison staff, magistrates.

ƒ A **strengthened civil society**, better organized and able to act as an influential and efficient "countervailing power". **Indicators**: increased involvement of NGOs in HRDD; establishment of national networks of legal aid clinics and of HR organizations (especially those involved in women's and children's rights); HRDD NGOs and associations have increased management and operational capacity.

ƒ **diversified and decentralized information base** for citizen's duties and rights. **Indicators**: installation and operation of 2 rural radio stations (local community participation and programming, programming in local languages, sustainable management and financial capacity); the community radio stations are part of a network of 4 other up-and-running stations.

ƒ **strong and transparent electoral institutions** capable of holding free and democratic elections. **Indicators**: appropriate electoral laws; computerized and publicized electoral lists; independent and permanent electoral commissions; elected representatives trained to carry out their mandates.

ƒ **a working judicial system**. **Indicators**: computerized judicial dossier system; coherent and integrated French and English legal system; simplified legal procedures.

Consultative Mechanism: the project is implemented through a permanent secretariat, which takes its direction from a consultative committee. This committee is made up of representatives of all project stakeholders: the Cameroon government, the Canadian government, other donor agencies (UNDP), HRDD NGOs and the CNDHL. The Committee meets every 3 months and, among other things, identifies project results and assesses the project's progress towards them on an annual basis.

2. Guatemala: Human Rights and Democratic Development Fund

Description: the project consist of the second phase of a decentralized HRDD Fund. Phase II allocates $4.9 million over 41 months beginning in 1995.

Goal: to contribute towards the sustainable promotion of democracy and human rights in Guatemala. **Purpose**: to support Canadian and local partners (NGOs, community groups, etc.) in building the country's legal and judicial system, promoting respect for the identity and rights of the Mayan peoples, and strengthening civil society and participatory democracy.

Project Objectives and Results Indicators (illustrative list):

Objective 1: support HRDD organizations

Results	Indicators
better HR information available and exchanged; HR violations fought	more transparent media information; better quality of HR dossiers by HR organizations
strengthened capacity for negotiation and conflict resolution within society	resolution of conflict through mediation and dialogue; increased presentation of dossiers through higher levels of the court system
women conscious of their rights and identify as actors of social change	increased participation of women HR-related activities/discussions; establishment of improved legal dossiers relating to sexual equality
Guatemalan organizations are recognized regionally as actors of change and consulted by political authorities	strengthening of Guatemalan institutions through exchange of information and expertise with regional organizations; their participation in consultative forums

Objective 2: contribute to the establishment of a formal and participatory democracy.

Results	**Indicators**
increased ability of the Civil Society Assembly to verify implementation of the Peace Accords	respect of signed peace accords; credibility of Assembly; Assembly committees working

healthy climate for consultation and dialogue between government and civil society

new decentralization laws passed; public participation in municipal affairs

women's issues become part of other social groups and organizations

participation of women in talks on government and civil politics; recognition of women's issues and increased assistance to women's projects; reduced violations of women's rights; participation of women's groups in regional meetings on government

strengthened local community organizations (legal and consultative capacity)

increased participation of local communities in national politics; elected representatives encourage citizen participation in decision-making; emergence of new and alternative community organizations

Objective 3: contribute towards respect for the identity and rights of the Mayan peoples.

Results

recognition of a multi-ethnic, -cultural and -linguistic indigenous nation; COMPMAGUA is recognized as the official Mayan representative in the peace talks

Indicators

ratification of accords on Mayan identity and rights; acceptance of COMPMAGUA's platform

improvement of dialogue and consultation between civil society and Mayan organizations

recognition of Mayan land rights; involvement of Mayan groups in public institutions and services

increased participation of Mayan women in local socio-political issues

increased participation of Mayan women in civil society organizations; reduced cases of Mayan women's rights violations

links between Mayan groups and other regional   increased participation in regional meetings
indigenous peoples' organizations

Consultative Mechanism: the project is directed by a Consultative Committee, made up of representatives of CIDA, Guatemalan NGOs, Canadian NGOs, Guatemalan government, Canadian Executing Agency. The Committee meets twice a year and, among other things, identifies results and verifies progress towards them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barbara Brown (1996), "Democracy and Human Rights, What Are We Learning?" (Policy Branch, CIDA).

CIDA (1995), "Promotion de la Démocratie et des Droits de la Personne, Evaluation de Fin de Projet", R. Thomassin et A. Bissonnette (Direction de L'Afrique de L'Ouest).

CIDA (1994), "A Hitch-Hiker's Guide to Managing for Results".

Ilan Kapoor (1996), "Indicators for Programming in Human Rights and Democratic Development: A Preliminary Study" (Policy Branch, CIDA).

Dennis Rondinelli (1993), "Strategic and Results-Based Management in CIDA: Reflection on the Process" (CIDA, June 1993).

Stephen J. Toope (1995), "Evaluation of CIDA's Human Rights Program Mechanisms in Sri Lanka" (Sri Lanka Program, CIDA).

World Bank (1994), *An Overview of Monitoring and Evaluation in the World Bank* (Washington, D.C.).