



2018:5

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Nicklas Svensson
Lone Lindholt
Henrik Alffram

Evaluation of Programme Work Methods of The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law

Final Report

Evaluation of Programme Work Methods of The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law

**Final Report
February 2018**

**Nicklas Svensson
Lone Lindholt
Henrik Alffram**

Authors: Nicklas Svensson, Lone Lindholt and Henrik Alffram

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2018:5

Commissioned by Sida, Department for EUROLATIN/ ENVIRONMENT,
MARKET DEVELOPMENT AND EASTERN EUROPE

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: 2018-02-12

Published by Nordic Morning 2018

Art. no. Sida62131en

urn:nbn:se:sida-62131en

This publication can be downloaded from: <http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms	5
Preface.....	6
Executive Summary.....	7
1 Introduction.....	13
2 Rationale and purpose	15
3 Findings.....	19
4 Conclusions	60
5 Recommendations.....	69
Annex 1: Terms of Reference	73
Annex 2: Evaluation matrix and methodology applied.....	81
Annex 3: Data collection instruments.....	90
Annex 4: Documentation.....	92
Annex 5: List of interviewees.....	95
Annex 6: Overview of RWI's Sida funded programmes, past and present: thematic focus, partner types, approaches and methods	98

Abbreviations and Acronyms

BSU	Belarusian State University
CHR-UP	Centre for Human Rights, University of Pretoria
CLE	Clinical legal education
CSO	Civil society organisation
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DIHR	Danish Institute for Human Rights
EU	European Union
FCG	Finnish Consulting Group
HRBA	Human rights-based approach
ICJ	International Commission of Jurists
IRC	Independent research centre
IT	Information technology
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
NANHRI	Network of African NHRIs
NHRI	National human rights institution
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
RBM	Result-based management
RWI	The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of trainers
Widhre	Working in difficult human rights environment

Preface

This evaluation was contracted by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) through the Framework Agreement for Evaluation Services, and conducted by the consortium partners FCG Sweden, Sthlm Policy Group AB and Tana Copenhagen.

The Evaluation Team consisted of the Team Leader, Nicklas Svensson (Sthlm Policy Group), and key experts Dr Lone Lindholt and Henrik Alffram. Nicklas Svensson and Lone Lindholt worked very closely throughout the evaluation process. Henrik Alffram supported the team regularly by participating in Skype and in-person meetings to discuss the methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations, as well as reviewing report drafts. Henrik also participated in the initial workshop in Lund and in the workshop in Stockholm during the reporting phase. Otherwise, Nicklas and Lone are responsible for data collection and analysis.

The Project Manager was Johanna Lindström at the Evaluation Unit at FCG Sweden.

The findings of the report are entirely the responsibility of the team and cannot be taken as an expression of official Sida policies or viewpoints.

Acknowledgements

In the course of this evaluation, the Evaluation Team had the privilege of interacting with a number of people who generously gave their time and knowledge. The Evaluation Team wishes to express its heartfelt thanks to all who contributed to this evaluation.

Executive Summary

This evaluation of The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (RWI)'s work methods was commissioned by Sida and carried out during September to December 2017.

The rationale and purpose were a shared desire by Sida and RWI to critically review the overall work methods RWI apply in its international partner-based programmes and projects. For both stakeholders, the purpose of the evaluation is learning, to improve conditions for positive results from international programmatic activity aimed at institutional human rights capacity development.

The evaluation focuses on the work methods RWI uses in programmes related to three key areas: human rights education; gender mainstreaming; and working in difficult human rights environments. It was guided by, but not limited to, questions on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of RWI's approach. This is not an evaluation of one specific intervention, or an evaluation of a project or programme, or an organisational assessment, but rather has a focus on methods. The evaluation has a global scope, and findings, conclusions and recommendations are informed by four case studies relevant to the methods in the three areas.¹

The evaluation draws concrete conclusions and provides action-oriented recommendations that RWI can apply globally. These can also feed into the preparation of new programme proposals and RWI's continued strategic and organisational development. Similarly, Sida's country/region teams can use the conclusions and recommendations in dialogue with RWI on their programmes.

Key findings and conclusions

An essential cross-cutting factor is the apparent absence of an internal system in RWI for absorbing and circulating learning on the various methods. This is critical, since project managers shoulder significant individual responsibility in terms of programme development. Without any systematic guidance on institutional best practice, there is a real risk that programme development processes are not fully informed by 'lessons learnt' from previous engagements. This in the long run has a detrimental effect on the operationalisation of the various methods and approaches.

¹ Academic Cooperation on Human Rights in Belarus 2015–2019; Turkey Human Rights Capacity Development Programme 2015–2020; Zimbabwe Human Rights Capacity Development Programme 2016–2018; RWI Regional Asia Programme on Human Rights and Sustainable Development 2017–2021.

1) In **human rights education**, the Evaluation Team identified eight sub-methods within RWI's landscape of methods and assessed them across the evaluation criteria. *Academic human rights education programmes (i.)* are established and supported at various levels (bachelor, graduate and post-graduate). RWI is one of the few actors globally implementing such a broad range of activities in this field in so many different contexts. The education methodology applied entails a shift towards blended learning and capacity development of lecturers to adapt their teaching approaches to more interactive methodologies. *Clinical legal education (ii.)* (CLE) passes on practical skills relating to various aspects of clinical practice, with the aim of strengthening the justice sector and achieving better understanding of the needs and challenges of access to justice and of vulnerable groups, including women. *Research (iii.)* includes support to individuals through scholarships and grants at national and international level; linking researchers to the global scene and creating research environments; coaching researchers; and assisting them in publishing internationally and attending conferences. *Other institutional support, enabling academic and related activity, including libraries (iv.)* encompasses library establishment/support; book grants; facilitation of opportunities for publishing research; and events such as academic conferences, colloquia, roundtables and public events. *Academic networking (v.)* brings scholars and academic staff together. Activities range from *ad hoc* joint events on specific themes to the establishment of ongoing networks or working groups. *Societal dialogue/outreach involving multiple actors (vi.)* brings individuals from public institutions, the justice sector, academia and civil society together for strategically identified activities, including training programmes as well as seminars and colloquia. *The professional training of non-academic actors (vii.)* brings together different actors, from the justice sector, national human rights institutions, academia and civil society, for human rights-related training. Finally, with respect to partners' *results-based management (RBM) and other related skills (viii.)*, RWI focuses, albeit only to a limited degree, at least in the case programmes, on enhancing the institutional capacity of partners in project management and related skills.

In terms of **strengths**, the methods RWI applies in human rights education are overall relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable. Partnerships with academic institutions, based on their organisational qualities and qualified staff, reflect a successful approach to strengthening institutional human rights capacity. RWI's degree of influence depends on a number of factors, including the local political context, degrees of commitment and trust between RWI and the partners and transparency around the intentions and project goals.

The evaluation also looked at **challenges** to various aspects pertaining to the evaluation criteria. To be able to fully measure the effects of academic human rights education in the long term and beyond individuals, there is a need for more systematic and solid baselines at an institutional and individual level, including qualitative aspects. In its academic programmes, to remain relevant RWI will need to consider moving beyond basic and general to tailored and more specific programmes, when appropriate. Furthermore, RWI should draw more on capacity already in place within partner institutions, including in terms of identification of resources. CLE must

be integrated into legal and human rights education; this relies on partner financial and administrative commitment. In terms of research support, for effectiveness and efficiency, supported individual researchers need to come under the ongoing supervision of senior RWI researchers, or equivalent associated expertise. The development of long-term publication strategies and funding modalities for research is essential. With respect to library support, systematic tracking of usage of literature and materials substantiates and qualifies effectiveness and relevance, including when it comes to subjects and language of publications. Commitment to ensuring the maintenance of materials and facilitates needs to be secured to promote further sustainability. Effective networking among academia requires careful facilitation and regular follow-up. With respect to societal dialogue and outreach, the human rights climate and, in particular, the general relationship between state and non-state actors may make constructive results in this area very difficult. RWI has an opportunity to facilitate dialogue on a factual basis, drawing in particular on research capacity and findings in key areas of common interest. In terms of programming development processes, a challenge to effectiveness persists in terms of the lack of systematic institutional sharing of experience within RWI on the application of the various methods. Programme frameworks need to better accommodate this, which also necessitates dialogue for common understanding between Sida and RWI.

2) With respect to **gender mainstreaming**, the Evaluation Team identified two sub-methods within the landscape of RWI's gender mainstreaming methods: *Mainstreaming of gender in various forms through all aspects of the engagement (i.)*, which can be facilitated through a systematic process involving gender analysis planning, implementation and monitoring; and assessment, as well as gender 'coding'. *Specifically designed activities and modalities (ii.)* include activities directly aimed at ensuring gender parity in programme benefits, and modalities designed with a specific gender-strengthening aspect (implicitly targeting women) for their implementation.

The evaluation **concludes** that RWI's gender mainstreaming in programming is still developing, but methods have proven successful where used. In the four case programmes, gender mainstreaming has been achieved, to varying degrees, with concept papers developed for three of these and gender indicators incorporated into results frameworks and/or monitoring and evaluation (M&E). Relevance seems to be assured in all four cases. In terms of effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, it is too early to draw concrete conclusions beyond individual programmes, although indications are that further developing and applying the methods in a consolidated manner may well ensure this.

In terms of **strengths**, the programmes reflect strong intentions and identification of relevant approaches, including, as a minimum, the development and implementation of M&E frameworks that incorporate gender aspects. However, when it comes to **challenges**, there is a clear need to further integrating the gender dimension in all relevant types of analyses. One part of RWI's structured approach is the design of gender-based indicators and investment in baselines, including the development of questionnaires for participants in various capacity development processes, to monitor implementation. It is important to systematically capture

lessons learnt from what so far has been developed in this area, to take the work to the next level. Research and analysis must focus on context, actors and power structures to identify gender inequalities and develop measures to redress these. RWI research funding modalities should continue to support this.

3) In terms of **working in difficult human rights environments**, the Evaluation Team identified five key qualities of RWI. In terms of *status (i.)*, the institute has in-house and closely affiliated research capacity, as well as an extensive track record in academic human rights education. RWI self-implements, through a non-monitoring approach, a comprehensive portfolio of partner-based programmes with funding from and in close engagement with Swedish development cooperation authorities. It has created a strong global network of individuals who anchor programmatic activity around the world in targeted contexts. When it comes to *thematic focus (ii.)*, the four focus areas outlined in the new strategy, once implemented across the international portfolio, mark a radical shift from the current actor-oriented focus. A shift from civil and political rights to economic and social rights can be detected as well. In terms of *context understanding (iii.)*, RWI shows a deep understanding of both thematic and institutional contexts, underpinned by research and analysis, with highly qualified staff providing a foundation for context-tailored programming. In terms of strategic choices on *partners and presence (iv.)*, RWI identifies and engages with, on a long-term and broad basis, relevant partners in the context based on the institutional rationale. This allows for stronger policy engagements and enables RWI to shift partnerships more flexibly. RWI's different partner modalities seem to make sense and enable effective implementation. Finally, in terms of *programme development (v.)*, the international programmes are mostly designed in the local context in close dialogue with partners, with close support from RWI in Lund.

The analysis ***concludes*** that RWI has well-documented ability to work in difficult environments, generating results and contributing to outcomes that are relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable.

In terms of ***strengths***, RWI's technical work in terms of enhancing the institutional human rights capacity and gender equality of academic and government institutions as well as other organisations has proven effective as an entry point for engagement in these contexts and provides credibility. RWI, through these combined aspects, has a status and identity comparable to that of relatively few other institutions globally in the human rights field.

In terms of ***challenges***, the current funding structure is hard to reconcile with the need for strong institutional anchoring with in-house expertise and mechanisms for knowledge-sharing across programmes, operating through partnership-related processes. With respect to thematic focus, RWI needs to implement the strategy with due flexibility to encompass the current portfolio. At the same time, this includes developing the portfolio to meet strategic objectives, ensuring in all cases that programmes are sufficiently and appropriately institutionally anchored. In terms of context understanding, RWI needs to ensure this is organisationally grounded through collegial knowledge transfer, to ensure continuity. Particularly in contexts where state actors are contributing to shrinking space for civil society, RWI must very carefully consider its strategy for partnerships, and translate its cooperation into effective ways

to deepen commitment to human rights and gender equality. This includes bringing duty-bearers and rights-holders together in constructive dialogue, actively using academic institutions as legitimate platforms for this. RWI recognises rightly that its operations are in some cases vulnerable to risks relating to the involvement and commitment of key partners at management level, as well as partner institution staff turnover, necessitating further institutional anchoring. Specifically on engaging partners in also handling programme funds, RWI approaches this with caution and from a risk management perspective. Meanwhile, further efforts to develop programme frameworks specifically tailored to implementation in difficult contexts, including credible theories of change and risk analysis and mitigation, within the framework of Sida requirements and in dialogue with Sida and partners, seem essential.

Summary of Recommendations

In terms of recommendations for RWI, in the area of human rights education, RWI should develop and implement *internal mechanism for anchoring knowledge and experience on human rights education* within the organisation and across programmes, including the designation of focal point(s) within the institution for the purpose of systematic learning. Along the same lines, RWI should strengthen *internal mechanisms for results-based management and programme development*, and further develop and implement tools for *mapping and baselining* key aspects of human rights education, to ensure a factual basis for documenting the longer-term effects of academic human rights education programmes. In terms of the sub-methods, RWI should consider moving towards *providing for graduate and post-graduate level academic education programmes* aimed at in-depth specialisation in key human rights areas. RWI should also continue to ensure and systematise the development of methodologies and concepts on *clinical legal education*, including mechanisms for promoting exchanges of experience between partners. RWI should strengthen internal and associated *research capacity* to enhance linking between research and the international programmes, and include mechanisms for publication of research. RWI should continue to consider how best to *support library development* and ensure sustainability with partner institutions. RWI should continue to support *academic networking* and identify ways to ensure more effective facilitation and the durability of networking platforms. Finally, RWI should continue to support *societal dialogue/outreach involving multiple actors*.

With respect to gender mainstreaming, RWI should maintain and further support an internal institutional *gender focal point*. RWI should continue and strengthen efforts to develop and implement *tools and methods* for ensuring gender mainstreaming throughout the portfolio in light of lessons learnt from programme implementation in this area. RWI should strengthen and consider supporting, also as part of programme activity and in collaboration with partners, the further development of *field-based research on gender equality aspects* relating to human rights. Finally, RWI should continue and systematically engage in dialogue with partners on how to ensure the presence of active and committed *gender focal points*

within their institutions (at appropriate levels) and to engage them in all aspects of the programme management cycle.

When it comes to working in difficult human rights environments, RWI should continue to actively draw on its *distinct status* in programme engagements, and ensure *strategic and institutional anchoring* of programmes, including engaging with Sida on how to flexibly adapt current results frameworks, if necessary. RWI should, in close dialogue with Sida, identify various ways *to support cross-programmatic and institutional anchoring of lessons learnt* for continued efficiency in terms of applying methods and approaches. RWI should continue and strengthen efforts to *institutionalise context understanding* at all levels of the organisation. RWI should increase efforts to *further strengthen its partnership approach*, including funding and accountability mechanisms. Finally, RWI should increase efforts to develop *programme frameworks* specifically tailored to implementation in difficult human rights contexts in accordance with Sida requirements and in dialogue with Sida and partners.

Recommendations for Sida include *using this report as a tool and an overall reference for the general operationalisation of 'Strategi för Sveriges utvecklingssamarbete avseende arbetet med de mänskliga rättigheterna, demokrati och rättstatens principer 2018-2022'*. The innovative breakdown provided in this report will allow Sida to learn about working methods, including adaptation and application, to use in developing institutional human rights and gender equality capacity. This will entail *internal circulation* through all levels of the organisation. Sida should consider the sensitive challenge for RWI and similar stakeholders of *facilitating cooperation between different governmental actors and non-governmental organisations*, given the shrinking space for civil society and potentially tense relations between actors when it comes to human rights issues. Sida should prompt partners in *developing comprehensive risk management systems* and increase risk awareness reflected at headquarters and field levels. Finally, Sida should ensure a *highly conflict-sensitive and flexible approach* to RWI's programmes, and carry out its own conflict-sensitivity assessment of RWI's programmes and of other partners working in difficult human rights environments.

1 Introduction

The following is an evaluation of The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (RWI)'s work methods, commissioned by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), and carried out during the period September to December 2017.

RWI is a charitable trust and a non-profit organisation, founded in 1984. It is an independent academic institution, with a mission to contribute to a wider understanding of and respect for human rights and international humanitarian law. RWI engages in research and academic education, as well as in institutional capacity development programmes, in Sweden and in some ten countries and regions around the world. It has an agreement of cooperation with Lund University and is closely affiliated with its Faculty of Law.

Since 2015, RWI has undergone an organisational reform process, which has included the implementation of a new organisational structure. In early 2017, a Strategic Plan for the period 2017–2021 was adopted, outlining four thematic focus areas to guide the institute's overall work.

In 2016, the RWI budget for international programmes with Sida funding amounted to around SEK 68. Sida is the largest donor to RWI, contributing approximately 92 per cent of its total budget in 2016.² Sida and RWI have cooperated since the early 1990s, in work that currently covers bilateral and regional programmes in Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Eastern Europe. RWI's programme partners have mainly been academic national human rights and justice sector institutions. The funding is not provided as a global core contribution, but as separate funding by embassies or Sida-HQ to country and/or regional RWI programmes where Sida has assessed that RWI has a comparative advantage.

No previous review or evaluation has evaluated RWI's work methods cutting across programmes in the different countries and/or regions. This global evaluation is therefore an initiative to strengthen learning, at both RWI and Sida, with regard to work methods used in RWI's international programmes. As such, the evaluation has a strong focus on utility, and aims to contribute to improving RWI programmes further

² It is to be noted that this figure includes funding support from other organisations, which in turn have received funding for such support from Sida. *Direct* funding from Sida contributed approximately 82 per cent of RWI's total budget in 2016.

and in this way also to facilitate Sida appraisals of ongoing and future such programmes.

2 Rationale and purpose

The rationale and purpose of this assignment was a shared desire by Sida and RWI to critically review the overall work methods that RWI applies in its international partner-based programmes and projects. For both stakeholders, the purpose of the evaluation was learning, with a focus on improving conditions to enable the achievement of positive results in international programmatic activity aimed at institutional human rights capacity development. As understood from the Terms of Reference (ToR), this was to be accomplished through a process of institutional reflection with RWI – that is, fundamentally, an optimisation process with a strong emphasis on uptake of the evaluation findings into future practice in terms of implementation of international programmes, embracing the principles of the ‘learning organisation’. The evaluation also represents an opportunity for Sida to learn more about work methods used in RWI international programmes.

The evaluation focuses on the work methods used by RWI in programmes related to:

1. *Human rights education* – a key focus in most or all of the programmes, with a predominance of academic teaching and related activities, as well as training and similar capacity development of key actors, for example in the justice field;
2. *Gender mainstreaming* – a key dimension running through all aspects of RWI’s work, with a particular focus within this assignment on the degree to which RWI manages to include this most meaningfully through its programming modalities, and to what effect; and
3. *Working in difficult human rights environments* – a key factor that in various ways characterises the countries on which this evaluation focuses. A particular focus proposed by the Evaluation Team was to address how RWI operates in highly fluid contexts characterised by a variety of human rights challenges. These include limited space for constructive/critical dialogue across different sectors of society. At the same time, Sida, RWI and partners in these contexts strive to consolidate change processes at an institutional level. When achieved, this should help ensure the achievement of long-term sustainable results.

On the basis of its findings, the evaluation draws concrete conclusions and provides action-oriented recommendations that RWI can apply globally. Furthermore, this report is designed to feed into the preparation of new programme proposals as well as RWI’s continued strategic and organisational development. Similarly, Sida’s country/region teams can use these conclusions and recommendations in their dialogue with RWI in relation to their programmes.

2.1 EVALUATION OBJECT AND SCOPE

This is neither an evaluation of one specific development intervention, nor an evaluation of a project or programme, nor an organisational assessment. The focus of this evaluation is on *methods* RWI applies, based on specific case programmes that serve as data sources for the assessment. The four programmes were proposed by RWI and approved by Sida.³ In addition, the team has drawn on reflections and recommendations from previously conducted evaluations of a broader scope of programmes. The four programme cases reflect to some extent the variation in programmatic life cycles and the different methods of engagement of RWI during the period 2013–2016.

RWI has been engaged in **Belarus** since 2008, with the previous Sida-funded programme running during the period 2010–2014, and the current one from 2015–2019. No evaluation of this programme has been carried out. Annual work plans and monitoring plans and budgets for 2015, 2016 and 2017 reflect the ongoing process of reflection on work methods as related to the achievement of outcomes.

The latest previous programme for **Turkey** funded by Sida (2011–2014) was evaluated in August 2015, and the current one (2015–2017) has been adjusted since 2016, as reflected in the interim reporting and adjusted work plans and budgets for the programme.

RWI has supported various activities in **Zimbabwe** through other programmes since the early 1990s. The current programme, for the period 2016–2018, was preceded by a feasibility study in early 2015, which established the foundation for the current engagement. Narrative reporting for the inception phase (completed June 2016) and for the year 2016 also informs this analysis.

The previous **Regional Asia** programme (2010–2015) was evaluated in November 2015. The current programme (2017–2021) was granted only in June 2017, and no reporting exists to date.

RWI does not have a clearly defined catalogue of methods to be assessed or evaluated. Instead, the Evaluation Team has, through documentation review, workshop and interviews during the inception phase, arrived at an initial finding that *human rights education* and *gender mainstreaming* include several activity types and sub-methods, which run through the programme portfolio and are adapted to the programme objectives and the local context. *Working in difficult human rights environments* seems to form and shape an approach employed by RWI rather than a specific technical method. Thus, the Evaluation Team finds that it is critical to

³ Academic Cooperation on Human Rights in Belarus 2015–2019; Turkey Human Rights Capacity Development Programme 2015–2020; Zimbabwe Human Rights Capacity Development Programme 2016–2018; RWI Regional Asia Programme on Human Rights and Sustainable Development 2017–2021.

broaden the definition of ‘methods’ for human rights education and gender mainstreaming so it can be understood as something more comprehensive, which takes into account RWI’s qualitative institutional aspects. These relate to, for example, programme goal/objectives, context, choice of partners, thematic focus and approaches. See an overview of the results of the initial mapping in Annex 6.

Furthermore, as noted in the ToR, the evaluation does not assess results – or performance – as such of RWI programmes, since this is done in programme-specific evaluations, but instead looks at *work methods to achieve results*. The evaluation focuses on the quality of RWI’s work and methods in relation to achieving expected results, and does *not* specifically assess efficiency aspects relating to RWI programmes overall.

The Evaluation Team is aware of the need to avoid duplication of what has already been assessed in previous evaluations, reviews and audits of RWI programmes carried out during the period 2011–2016, and rather to complement, add value to and draw on these.

2.2 EVALUATION QUESTIONS

As noted in the ToR, the evaluation was guided by, but not limited to, the following evaluation questions:

- ❖ **Relevance**
 - i. Assess the relevance of the methods employed by RWI to develop institutional human rights capacity: Are the methods, as used by RWI, adequate in relation to the main results RWI programmes seek to achieve as well as the needs and situation of intended beneficiaries and programme partners?
- ❖ **Effectiveness**
 - ii. Assess the effectiveness of the methods as used by RWI: To what extent have these methods influenced positive achievement of expected results (qualitatively and quantitatively); what are the main factors (including the use of results-based management, RBM) that have affected positive results achievement, and that have affected non-achievement of results?
- ❖ **Efficiency**
 - iii. Assess the cost effectiveness of the different methods used: Have measures been/are measures taken during planning and implementation to ensure resources are efficiently used for implementation of the methods; could the methods employed be implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results; and could the methods be employed differently using the same amount of resources to achieve more and better results?
- ❖ **Sustainability**
 - iv. Assess sustainability aspects of the methods used: To what extent are the methods consistent with partners’ priorities; to what extent is there a local/regional ownership of the methods and in what ways do the methods contribute to such ownership of programmes; and to what extent do the methods used provide for mechanisms for, as and when appropriate, exiting or transitioning from interventions?

2.3 METHODOLOGY

Annex 2 presents a detailed elaboration of the methodology applied in the evaluation. The methodology is utilisation-focused, to enhance the likely and practical use of the evaluation by the affected stakeholders. The overall approach for this evaluation therefore embodies strong elements of dialogue, collaboration, reflection and learning.

The Evaluation Team applied a mixed method approach setting out with a desk-based analysis drawing on data and examples from the four programme cases, and including, when relevant, examples from evaluations of a broader scope of programmes in other countries and regions. In addition, the team carried out interviews with key stakeholders in a manner intended to triangulate the findings for greater reliability.

Sections 3.1–3.3 further present the identified and selected methods for human rights education, gender mainstreaming and working in difficult human rights environments.

3 Findings

In this section, the Evaluation Team presents findings from the evaluation in the three areas informed by the four programme case studies: Belarus, Regional Asia, Turkey and Zimbabwe.

The analysis first sets out the ‘landscape’ of RWI’s human rights education methods and approaches, including so-called ‘sub-methods’ as identified by the Evaluation Team. Similar approaches apply to the findings in relation to gender mainstreaming methods and approaches for RWI’s work in difficult human rights environments. This is followed (in accordance with the ToR for the evaluation, Annex 1) by an analysis of these findings in accordance with the evaluation criteria of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD DAC) of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. When relevant, examples from other comparable institutions are included as a backdrop for the evaluation.⁴

3.1 HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION

As developed in the inception report, the Evaluation Team has identified eight ‘sub-methods’ within human rights education. Below is a short summary of each of these, based primarily on programme documentation.

3.1.1 Landscape

i. Academic human rights education

Examples include, in particular, the establishment of and support for human rights education programmes at various levels (Bachelors, graduate and post-graduate), primarily Masters programmes in law and/or from a multi-disciplinary perspective.⁵ Such support comprises various forms of material assistance and capacity development in line with the human rights education methodology and the principles

⁴ In order to place RWI in the institutional landscape in which it operates, the analysis includes three institutions, which, in the experience of the team, share a number of characteristics similar to those of RWI and thus enable a comparative perspective. The three institutions are the Danish Institute for Human Rights (DIHR); the Centre for Human Rights, University of Pretoria (CHR-UP); and the International Commission of Jurists (ICJ). See Annex 7 for overview.

⁵ A focus similar to that of CHR-UP.

of ‘education about, through and for human rights’.⁶ Key activities include curriculum development; facilitation of international and other resource persons; training of trainers (ToT) for lecturers; and international textbook translation and publication, as well as the production of local textbooks. This overall cluster of activities forms a key element in the majority of the RWI programmes, including three of the case study programmes.⁷ In many programmes it is linked directly to the central objectives for the engagement.⁸ It is also an area of engagement that stretches back in time to RWI’s initial international activity in the 1990s, at the regional level as well as for multiple programmes at national/university level.⁹

ii. Clinical legal education

Clinical legal education (CLE) is an element that has a strong identity as a sub-method¹⁰ in itself, more so than some of the others mentioned above and below.¹¹ RWI approaches CLE primarily within the framework of academic human rights education – that is, it is linked strongly to the previous sub-method. It forms a key element in relation to human rights education for two reasons: it hones the practical legal skills of students; and it sensitises them to the needs of vulnerable groups in society.¹² Partner interviews indicated that CLE took various forms in the portfolio of RWI programmes. In some cases, this includes on-campus counselling facilities (where vulnerable members of society can receive advice). Even within one country, individual partners may approach CLE differently, or be at different stages of development in terms of implementing CLE.

⁶ General Assembly Resolution 66/137 of 19 December 2011, ‘United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training’, which forms the explicit normative reference for RWI’s work in the area of human rights education.

⁷ Belarus, Turkey and Zimbabwe.

⁸ Examples from the programme portfolio include Belarus 2010–2014; Cambodia 2012–2017; China 2014–2016; Middle East and North Africa (MENA) 2009–2013; Regional Asia 2010–2015; Regional Africa 2011–2015; and Turkey 2011–2014.

⁹ E.g. the establishment of the first Asian Regional Human Rights Masters Programme at Mahidol University, Bangkok, and the establishment of the Masters programme on human rights, peace and development initiated at Africa University in Mutare, Zimbabwe, under the Regional Africa Programme.

¹⁰ CLE has, in contrast with the other sub-methods, a distinct conceptual identity that has been recognised for decades. One of the earlier works is Grossman, G. 1974. ‘Clinical Legal Education: History and Diagnosis’, *Journal of Legal Education* 26.2:162–93, which examines the application of the concept in a number of US universities. Almost all literature dates back to the late 1990s and early 2000s, and has a strong basis in the US perspective. Peggi Maisel shares lessons learnt of relevance, for example for Africa (Maisel, P. 2007. ‘Expanding and Sustaining Clinical Legal Education in Developing Countries: What We Can Learn from South Africa’, *Fordham International Law Journal* 30:374–420.

¹¹ CHR-UP focuses on clinical legal work, for example within its Master programmes, but not as an outreach activity. DIHR does not have this focus.

¹² Stakeholder interviews in Belarus, Turkey and Zimbabwe all confirm this.

iii. Other academic activity targeting individuals, including research, study visits and international exchanges

This category includes support for research carried out at the individual level. It includes provision of scholarships and research grants at the national and international level; linking of researchers in programme countries to the global scene and the creation of national and regional/international research environments; coaching of these researchers; and assisting them in publishing internationally and attending academic conferences.¹³

iv. Other institutional support enabling academic and related activity

This sub-method clusters such activities as library establishment/support; book grants; facilitation of opportunities for publishing research; and events such as academic conferences, colloquia, roundtables and public event.¹⁴ These activities serve to support the human rights education and research activities in particular.¹⁵

v. Facilitation of networking in academia

Networking involves bringing scholars and academic staff from partner institutions (and, in some cases, possibly also from other similar institutions in the respective country/region) together. Activities range from *ad hoc* joint events on specific themes to the establishment of ongoing networks or working groups. The focus here is on ensuring a platform through which a larger constituency of partners can be included in, for example, specific capacity development efforts.

vi. Societal dialogue/outreach involving multiple actors

Analysis of the case programmes shows that this sub-method has certain features in common with some of the other areas, in particular the academic networking (v.) and professional training programmes (vii.). The similarity includes bringing individuals from public institutions, the justice sector, academia and civil society together in strategically identified activities, including training programmes as well as seminars and colloquia. The aim is to reach beyond academic circles to enable a broader societal engagement and include, for example, civil society as well as government and public institutions in engaged dialogue and exchange.

vii. Professional training of non-academic actors

This sub-method differs from academic human rights education primarily in terms of the target group, but for the same reason has a strong similarity with the preceding

¹³ CHR-UP and, to a more limited extent, DIHR engage in this activity as well.

¹⁴ Especially the library support and book package donations form an integrated part of the programmes in, for example, Turkey and Zimbabwe, as well as in Belarus. In Belarus, a key programme component is the inclusion and training of librarians as a target audience through joint workshops with students and teachers to improve their services; and the development of a thematic guide on human rights, known as 'LibGuide'.

¹⁵ CHR-UP carries out some of these activities as well, but only in its own institutional context.

sub-method of societal dialogue. Here, similar sources as for the above indicate that the focus is on justice sector professionals in particular, and the institutions dedicated to their training in general,¹⁶ so that it often forms part of broader institutional support to justice sector agencies. Also, in certain cases it involves bring together different actors across sectors in society for such training. It includes a number of activities, including support for dedicated professional training institutions, ToT for lecturers and development of targeted curricula, as well as capacity-building through designed human rights education programmes and activities for these groups. Engaging with national human rights institutions in their respective countries as well as supporting their regional networks also falls under this area when human rights education has been part of such support and engagement.¹⁷

viii. Capacity development of partners in results-based management and other related skills

This sub-method covers the specific dimension of institutional capacity development within the partner institutions. It includes, as an example, such areas as project management and RBM. However, through the portfolio in general,¹⁸ this sub-method appears to a more limited degree among the forms for institutional capacity development.¹⁹

¹⁶ ICJ supports justice sector actors in a number of countries and region, including in Zimbabwe, where activities in support of academic institutions are closely aligned with those of RWI. DIHR also has a strong focus on supporting the justice sector in several countries through capacity development and human rights education. CHR-UP also focuses on justice sector, such as in relation to colloquia and other capacity development. Several other actors also provide training for the justice sector under various bilateral or multilateral arrangements. These include the United Nations Development Programme, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the International Development Law Organization and the International Legal Assistance Consortium.

¹⁷ National human rights institutions (NHRIs) were for a long time a key strategic actor group for RWI, with a specific methodology in place for capacity development support and a separate institutional unit. The latter included as a key resource person a visiting professor recognised as a dominant expert in this field. Support has been provided over the years in particular to the Network of African NHRIs (NANHRI) and the Asia-Pacific Forum of NHRIs. Although the main strategic focus does now seem to have gradually shifted away from focusing institutionally on this actor type, these institutions still play a key role in RWI's international programme support and feature in the current portfolio, although not for any of the case programmes. One example is the Regional Africa Programme, which still includes support to NANHRI.

¹⁸ Programme documentation for Belarus, Turkey and Zimbabwe, supported by interviews with partners and RWI staff.

¹⁹ One difference between RWI and DIHR is that, in the experience of the Evaluation Team, the latter would to a larger extent include such support for partners in this area in its international partner programmes.

3.1.2 Human rights education – relevance

Analysis of the case programmes reveals **academic human rights education (i.)** as a ‘flagship’ sub-method throughout RWI’s international engagement, both in a longitudinal perspective and in terms of the breadth of scope of the current portfolio. The general experience of the Evaluation Team, supported by partner and stakeholder feedback, suggests that, over the decades, RWI-supported programmes have produced hundreds²⁰ of graduates with a specialisation in the human rights field, predominantly in the area of law, and particularly at the post-graduate level. This type of activity is emphasised in most programme documents, including those of the case programmes, as a key and almost unquestionably relevant avenue of support. These documents state that the motivation for this type of engagement is that such higher education programmes will facilitate the development of cadres of qualified human rights professionals throughout countries and regions. These will add value not only to RWI interventions but also to other institutional capacity, and to the promotion and protection of human rights broadly in their respective contexts. Interviews with case country stakeholders, as well as with previous beneficiaries of RWI support in this area, largely substantiated this claim.

From the experience of the Evaluation Team, this is also an area of specialisation where few, if any, similar actors to RWI are as strongly engaged. Whereas individual universities²¹ may, for example, engage in bilateral supportive partnerships with other universities, RWI is one of the few implementing such a broad range of activities in this field, in so many different contexts and with such significant funding. This speaks for the relevance of RWI’s engagement in this area.

With the exception of specialised programmes, for instance in the area of gender (see below), interviews with partners showed that support for general human rights Masters programmes still dominated RWI’s international programme portfolio. However, the Evaluation Team notes from its own experience that levels of professional human rights capacity continue to grow worldwide, including in RWI partner countries. This has led to an increase in the number of domestically sourced Masters programmes focusing specifically on human rights, and landscapes in this area are therefore becoming more complex.²² Engagement in this area therefore necessitates a thorough mapping of already existing activities, including available curricula, resource materials and qualified resources at the local and regional levels,

²⁰ This is an estimate based on the calculations of the Evaluation Team, as no systematic data for this appear to exist.

²¹ As examples, the Universities of Essex, Oslo and Sydney.

²² Over the decades, we have seen a growth in Masters programmes with a regional focus, including, for example, Africa, Asia, Europe and the Middle East, largely driven by an EU initiative in this respect. In addition, human rights is increasingly taught at domestic universities around the world.

in order to ensure not just the relevance but also the effectiveness of these activities. RWI programme documents reflect that such context analysis, including stakeholder mapping linked to programme rationales, is undertaken both in connection with programme development and through the implementation phases.²³

Relevance also relates to the design of course curricula and the selection and development of local and contextually anchored resource materials. The latter entails a language as well as a thematic focus.²⁴ With such an extensive ‘back catalogue’ of programme material available to RWI through long-term engagement in this area, using a modelling approach of simply applying generic material seems tempting. Interviews with RWI staff indicated that, in some cases, a modelling approach had in fact been considered,²⁵ whereby one standard curriculum would be developed for a number of parallel programmes.²⁶ However, the Evaluation Team was not able to establish that such an approach was actually implemented. Interviews with partners indicated that they were the ones who had a main say on the relevance of the programmes, although they draw on RWI resources and experience. All interviewees, including RWI staff, supported the notion that relevance linked to institutional ownership was essential. Such activities are conducted jointly with a number of partners, ensuring efficiency and effectiveness; and, furthermore, contribute towards strengthened networking between partners.²⁷

²³ In Turkey, efforts are now under way to systematically map existing universities’ human rights programme activities across the country. Such mapping, including the development of practical tools for doing so, provides important baselines, allowing for further targeting of efforts to ensure complementarity and coordination of efforts. This includes more targeted identification of programme partners, and serves to assist the partner institutions themselves in linking up for activities and resource- and information-sharing, as a means of providing ownership and sustainability as well as enabling networking within academia (see section on v.).

²⁴ For instance, in Turkey the development of local language textbooks ensures relevance as well as efficiency. In Zimbabwe, relevance is enhanced by using the new Constitution as a central reference point and as informed by international standards. In Belarus, Russian language materials developed for similar contexts, for example for Ukraine, may be applied; here, a challenge seems to be that a strong focus by partner institutions on a domestic perspective necessitates at least the adaption of materials from other contexts.

²⁵ The Final Report Belarus 2010–2014, pp. 37, 39 and 45, refers to ‘*course at BSU [Belarusian State University] is labelled as a model course for other law faculties in Belarus. This course was brought up and approved under the methodological unit at the Law Faculty, BSU, and is approved for the next five years to come.*’ However, RWI staff indicated that partners did not taken on board this approach owing to a lack of ownership, and parallel individual processes of curriculum development therefore later replaced it.

²⁶ In Belarus, relating to model curricula for gender and human rights education.

²⁷ In Zimbabwe, the three partners are at various stages of course development, with a differing focus also, with only some of the institutions establishing programmes in the field of law. In Belarus, the partners strongly rejected the model approach to curriculum development originally proposed by RWI in favour of individual but coordinated processes.

Interviews with implementing partners²⁸ about **CLE (ii.)** emphasised that students gained practical skills relating to various aspects of clinical practice relevant to the strengthening of, in particular, the justice sector.²⁹ This sub-method as implemented by RWI appears to be a relevant medium for networking among, and even beyond, universities, within a single programme as well as across regions and even globally. Deliberately working on the basis of ‘street law’ and its connection to traditional law, as partners indicated was the case, enhances the relevance of CLE.³⁰ One aspect relating to CLE’s relevance, both to the context of RWI programme countries and from a Sida perspective, is that of vulnerable groups. The Evaluation Team reflected, also with other stakeholders and partners,³¹ whether this activity could also be seen as a way of engaging in a shift in emphasis from a civil and political to an economic and social rights focus. However, in the context of this evaluation, the focus is on CLE as a sub-method in general.

The review of evaluations, current documentation and dialogue with multiple stakeholders including RWI and programme partners all showed that programme and partner institution implementation had benefited from **other individual support** in the area of **research (iii.)**. This type of activity takes many different forms, all aimed at developing research capacity at partner universities. One of the more visible entails providing longer- or shorter-duration grants to engage with RWI/Lund University at various levels, including participation in the Masters programme at Lund University. Stakeholder interviews with partners and other stakeholders who had benefited from this support showed this was an effective sub-method for capacity development. Its aim is not just to establish a common understanding of and close familiarity with key human rights aspects, but also to introduce RWI’s institutional aspects, for example its library facilities. Programme partners interviewed who had benefited from this acknowledged the value of this support to research activity for themselves as well as for their institutions.

Granting mechanisms enabling individual research projects represent another key activity in this respect, although a desk review of programme documents provided relatively little detailed information on how these are implemented in practice. However, implementing partners interviewed considered this support valuable, not least because such funding is increasingly difficult to access through other sources. This underpins RWI’s perception, expressed in programme documentation and through staff interviews, that support in this area is often a contributor to successful

²⁸ In Turkey and Zimbabwe.

²⁹ For example in the Zimbabwe programme.

³⁰ In Zimbabwe.

³¹ In Turkey and Belarus.

programme outcomes.³² Review of the case programme documentation and interviews with stakeholders in the various contexts showed that such research products, especially in terms of joint efforts and publications, contributed, in practical terms, to underpinning the relevance of other sub-methods. This is the case both in relation to networking within the academia³³ (see iv.) and as a contribution to broader social dialogue processes (see vii).

In terms of **other institutional support (iv.)**, especially for library and book collections on human rights, partners emphasised the high degree of relevance of this. Other stakeholders also stressed that this was an area where RWI had a strong reputation and that this appeared as a ‘brand’ for the institute. Support in this area comes across, on the basis of our observations and stakeholder dialogue, as valuable when connected to institutions benefiting from support under human rights academic education programmes (i.) and research (iii). Where library support and the training of librarians has been gender mainstreamed as well, this becomes another example of benefits beyond the direct literature support.³⁴

In terms of **academic networking (v.)**, partners interviewed found this to be relevant in a number of programmes, especially when linked to other activities of academic programming and institutional support of universities. Support appears, on this basis, to contribute to efficiency and sustainability; however, the partners, based on their more or less positive experience, also clearly indicated that this depended on the extent of the networking and the form in which it is applied. Factors include the form and degree of formalisation, and need for ongoing facilitation, all aimed at ensuring a consolidated, yet flexible, structure with a likelihood of effectiveness and sustainability (see below).

Societal dialogue/outreach involving multiple actors (vi.) comes across in evaluations as a highly relevant aspect in a number of programmes.³⁵ This is particularly the case where public or justice sector institutions are not (yet) viable

³² Particularly in relation to Turkey, this mechanism also seems to be a discreet means of assisting academics, in the sense that it will provide them with an opportunity for *de facto* continuing their work even in an individual capacity.

³³ Research networking is recognised in the Regional Asia evaluation, as well as the Turkey evaluation, which latter states that the Human Rights Research Network is ‘*one of the clearest accomplishments of the programme*,’ also because of its empowerment of women and cost effectiveness.

³⁴ The Belarus programme references this: ‘*Through the improved capacities of these librarians, the aim is also, in the longer run, to enhance access to human rights resources, research and documentation (also in relation to human rights and gender equality) in general in Belarus.*’

³⁵ Most programme evaluations touch upon this as essential. The Turkey evaluation stresses that this is an important aspect, particularly in relation to, for example, civil society and bar associations – that is, excluding justice agency stakeholders.

programme partners, since such activities allow these actors as well as civil society to be included. Along these lines, interviews with RWI staff indicated that this sub-method could be used to ‘warm up’ to more direct engagement with other actors, including professional training (see vii.).³⁶ However, the stakeholder interviews also stressed that the ‘climate’ in each particular context where RWI operates would have a significant bearing on how this dialogue was enabled.³⁷

Those directly involved as beneficiaries/participants, as well as other stakeholders, pointed to the **professional training of non-academic actors (vii.)** as highly relevant.³⁸ They think it allows direct contribution to achieving outcomes such as strengthened understanding of and respect for human rights in the justice sector in particular.

With respect to **capacity development of partners in Results-Based Management and other related skills (viii.)**, the external programme evaluations stress that RWI seems to focus only to a limited degree of enhancing the institutional capacity of partners in terms of project management and related skills. At the same time, the evaluations stress the need for improvement in the area of RBM as a generally critical aspect.³⁹ Enhanced focus on further development of such partner capacity may strengthen e.g. accountability aspects. This includes also efficiency and sustainability throughout the programme cycle, and in this way of the engagement. Evaluations further note that an efficient use of RWI staff resources would be to have

³⁶ In the case of Zimbabwe, the two aspects of dialogue and capacity development, although programmatically divided into two specific outputs, are in reality implemented as one activity. In Belarus, the focus has been gradually shifted from only targeting academic institutions to including a broader and more interactive outreach role of utilising academic cooperation as a platform for wider engagement with other actors.

³⁷ Taking just the relationship between civil society and state actors, Turkey is an example where exchange, not to mention direct engagement, is more difficult owing to deep-rooted antagonism. In Belarus, some civil society actors are in fact engaged with some of the university partners, but in general the overall pattern of engagement is only slightly better than that of Turkey. In contrast, in Zimbabwe it has been possible to accomplish more constructive engagement between academia, the justice sector and civil society. In the Asia region, the situation will vary from country to country, with examples of positive engagements between at least NHRIs, civil society organisations (CSOs) and academia as well as, in some contexts, public and justice sector institutions.

³⁸ This is the case in Zimbabwe, where interviewees indicated that the platform facilitated cooperation between the academic community, civil society, independent commissions and government institutions around human rights priorities. This reflects the high degree of interaction and mutually beneficial exchange between different sectors during the implementation of the professional training programme. It is worth noting that academia in particular, which previously was to a large extent excluded from other platforms for cross-sectoral cooperation, such as the Universal Periodic Review, is included.

³⁹ As an example, the Regional Africa evaluation.

them engage in direct capacity building support to the partner institution on these aspects.⁴⁰

The evaluations also mention other areas such as strategy development and long-term activity planning⁴¹. The consultancy team's general experience is that academic institutions do tend to benefit from capacity development in this area, including for instance budget control, activity design and project delivery. Such support may be as a means of impacting existing project delivery. In addition, it enhances the partner institutions' position in relation to ensuring funding from other sources as well and in this way contributes to sustainability.

3.1.3 Human rights education - effectiveness

At an overall level and cutting across the sub-methods, with respect to effectiveness⁴², stakeholders consulted including RWI staff and partners stress the fundamental challenge of how to define and measure qualitative effects of human rights education.⁴³ Programme documentation also emphasizes this. As mentioned above and stated in the programme mapping (Annex 6), academic human rights education is strongly represented in the overall past and present RWI portfolio. For this reason, documentation of overall effectiveness is an area where RWI is well placed to develop strong baselines and analysis of data to document effectiveness of support in this area.

In terms of **academic human rights education programmes (i.)**, including in difficult human rights contexts where RWI is engaged, partners indicate that post-graduate specialised human rights programmes seem to continue to attract candidates.⁴⁴ Supporting this assumption would be if employability for graduates from these programmes is higher than for those with an “ordinary” law degree at the same level, and some partners consulted indicated that this is indeed the case.⁴⁵ As

⁴⁰ As an example, the Myanmar evaluation.

⁴¹ The Regional Asia evaluation.

⁴² It should be noted that effectiveness in this respect is considered primarily at output-related level, while noting that this evaluation does not intend to assess results – or performance – as such of RWI programmes, since this is assessed in programme-specific evaluations – but rather work methods to achieve results. There is little available evidence indicating to what extent the different methodologies are effective in terms of attaining high-level results towards actual impact on the human rights situation.

⁴³ Here, the UN Declaration aspect of ‘education for human rights’ is a relevant reference point.

⁴⁴ Partner consultations in Zimbabwe.

⁴⁵ One stakeholder in Zimbabwe indicated that, *‘For law graduates in this country, approximately 90 per cent are unemployed, but for our human rights Masters graduates it is actually the other way around, only approximately 10 per cent are without jobs.’* This can be seen as an indication that this, by the individual candidate, is viewed as an effective method for upgrading competence in human rights.

discussed with partners in this field, a relevant aspect in relation to determining the profiles of students in these programmes is therefore not just to assess their profiles at the time of entry into these programmes (baseline), but also their long- and short-term career trajectory (outcome). As an example, this will reflect the extent to which graduates from dedicated human rights programmes actually embark on a career in e.g. the justice system and apply the human rights knowledge gained⁴⁶.

Interviews with implementing partners in case countries reflect that a large proportion of graduates seem to go to private legal practice and the Bar, but not directly to e.g. the judiciary and prosecution service. In general, though, they indicate that students utilise their degree to achieve higher positions in their respective sector. Here, they might be more able to apply their increased human rights capacity to strengthen their organisation, which could contribute to mainstreaming of human rights across society in general. However, neither the partner institutions interviewed nor RWI track this systematically.

For effectiveness, the education methodology applied is significant as well. Interviews with programme partners, past and current, indicate a shift in this respect. This includes moving from “high profile lecturing” which, according to some stakeholders, tended to be more often the case earlier, towards blended learning as well as capacity development of lecturers to adapt their teaching approaches to more interactive methodology. This shift is also in accordance with the UN Declaration on teaching ‘through human rights’.⁴⁷ RWI recognises the value of this latter approach.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Interviews with implementing partners indicated that, in their experience, candidates usually have working experience from the justice sector, independent commissions or civil society. However, it was also indicated that they to a very high degree mainly continue their career in the private legal sector – that is, not within public justice sector institutions.

⁴⁷ A number of the stakeholders interviewed indicated that they had observed this change as a marked difference from traditional RWI approaches to more relevant and, therefore, effective teaching and learning methodologies applied suitable to the specific context. In the Regional Asia 2010–2015 evaluation, the application of blended learning, in the form of a departure from more traditional lecturing and including preparation and follow-up, for example through alumni networking of graduates, was noted as highly positive. This is also emphasised in the China evaluation. In Zimbabwe, effectiveness in this regard seems to some extent to face the challenge of external conditions, including power and internet instability and lack of access for students to computer facilities. This is less the case in Turkey, where infrastructure is effective, and where efforts are actually invested in gradually enabling, for example, access to lectures online – but here also, traditionalism among faculty members was said to sometimes hamper substantial change in this area and reduce the potential effectiveness of efforts invested for this purpose. With respect to professional training of, for example, justice sector staff, it should be kept in mind that blended learning processes requiring access to high-speed internet or even computers may in fact prevent effective participation by some participants.

⁴⁸ As stated by, for example, a key resource person for the training in Promoting the Equal Status and Human Rights of Women in Southeast Asia (2015), ‘*The Course represents the first full blended learning experience of the RWI, incorporating new technological*

RWI and partners seem to agree that the production of local textbooks provides for effectiveness in terms of allowing students and lecturers to approach ‘real issues’ in their particular society, and to overcome language barriers to allow for equal participation by all regardless of their background.⁴⁹ A final note in this area, brought forward in partner interviews, is that, in several partner countries,⁵⁰ graduates work full time already following their Bachelor degree, and Masters candidates may therefore need to retain their ‘day job’ while pursuing their studies. This means flexibility is required in terms of part-/full-time structures, for example incorporating the use of evening classes, which partners indicated was the case in RWI’s engagement with them.

CLE (ii.) was generally praised⁵¹ by stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation. Lecturers in partner institutions stressed that this sub-method was effective for the learning purposes of law students. Through CLE, the students appear to achieve better understanding of the challenges of access to justice and the needs of vulnerable groups, including women. Those interviewed felt that this, in the very long run, might well contribute to increased human rights awareness in the justice sector as a whole. For RWI, this means that it contributes to achieving programme outcomes in this respect.⁵² However, the Evaluation Team notes that this is speculative, as neither RWI nor the partners, or other actors for that matter, seem to have systematically attempted to document the effects of CLE, at least in a developing country context. Partner institution resource persons, as well as RWI staff, indicated that clinics directly supported communities that otherwise would not have access to free legal expertise and counselling, and, in this manner, contributed to educating people in

methodologies in a systematic way for teaching, training, and communicating educative information to the world. Our contribution was no longer confined to a classroom or to a specific place and/or time as we all, participants, staff, and instructors, were separated by enormous distances. Still, one common purpose was shared: ‘to enhance practical implementation of human rights of women and gender equality in the Asia region through effective National Human Rights Institutions and Academic Institutions’, and one common determination united us all: ‘we will make a difference’ (Professor Miriam Estrada-Castillo).

⁴⁹ As mentioned above, in Turkey in particular, this has been an essential contribution because of the language barrier. In Zimbabwe, the book project initiated by the three academic partner institutions was conceived at least by RWI as a project to generate a textbook for human rights learning, but seems currently to be moving more in the direction of an anthology, which is a separate purpose.

⁵⁰ Referred to specifically in the case of Zimbabwe, but realistically this is the case in other countries as well.

⁵¹ As an example, the Turkey evaluation stresses this as being ‘one of the core tools to integrate more and higher quality human rights education in Turkish universities.’

⁵² The Turkey evaluation states that, in principle, efforts to enhance capacity to support CLE could and should be accessible to a larger number of universities than the original partner circle, for example through the establishment of a ‘help desk’ – an activity that is unfortunately not achievable in the current climate in the context, as described below.

these communities on their legal rights and how to access them. However, as discussed with external stakeholders, effectiveness in ensuring substantial access to justice in an equal and non-discriminatory manner reflecting a human rights-based approach (HRBA) depends on the specific context and mandates of the clinics. Also, the Evaluation Team observes that RWI increases the effectiveness of this sub-method by ensuring the sharing of experience across the stakeholders of the various programmes, which should serve to promote effectiveness in this area.

Analysis of programme documents and interviews with RWI staff and partners indicated that support for **research (iii)** seemed to be a core activity, and gaining significance through the portfolio.⁵³ This sub-method underpins education, but also enables, for example, graduate candidates from the human rights education programmes to advance their own academic qualifications and this way contribute to further outreach and influence on policy development.

On the basis of interviews with RWI staff as well as the review of programme documentation,⁵⁴ the evaluation finds that, with respect to individual grants, the new thematic focus of RWI may enable more effective contribution of research towards programme outcomes. Those interviewed stressed that research needed to be thematically focused, actively drawn on and, in general, facilitated in terms of publication. However, in this respect, partners in the local contexts also spoke to the value of such research in reflecting the needs and aspirations of local institutions and individuals. The Evaluation Team has not had the opportunity to compare, for example, calls for proposals or overviews of research grants under the RWI case programmes in order to establish how this balance is struck. However, partner interviews indicated that local interest seemed to dominate.

Furthermore, conversations with RWI management indicated an understanding, that effectiveness required not just supporting research but also links to the development of capacity to the ability for scholars in partner countries to present and publish research.⁵⁵ One practical obstacle lies with the fact that, in the experience of the Evaluation Team, research in many cases is completed and ready for publication only at the end of programme duration. This often means that funding for the publication of the research results, almost regardless of their form, cannot easily be accommodated within the current funding structure. Another positive aspect is that both RWI and programme partners indicated that supporting research within programmes had the advantage of allowing for inclusion of a broader scope of

⁵³ In the Turkey, Belarus and Zimbabwe programmes, and as well figuring as the central aspect in the Regional Asia programme.

⁵⁴ The Regional Asia programme is notable in this respect, as it has as a core aspect of one key programme strategy the generation of knowledge, including “coordinated collaborative thematic studies” engaging scholars in the region e.g. on human rights and the environment.

⁵⁵ Noted in the Asia evaluation.

individuals beyond a narrow circle of programme partners. It contributes in this way towards effectiveness by drawing on the strongest resources at the national and regional levels.⁵⁶

With respect to **library support and book donations (iv.)**, the Evaluation Team notes that the ‘packages’ of literature RWI can put together are comprehensive and cover a broad scope of human rights themes and issues.⁵⁷ From our knowledge of this area, confirming the notion of RWI and supported by information from partner interviews during the evaluation, this means they have the potential to effectively serve students, lecturers and researchers in the contexts in question. A review of the total list of titles provided by RWI shows that almost all titles are in English and fairly ‘global’ in perspective. Programme partners in interviews stated that this filled a gap in terms of access to international literature. However, they also emphasised that true effectiveness as well as relevance would be fully achieved only when these titles were combined with local/regional purchases and, not least, volumes in local language(s).⁵⁸ Dialogue with library and programme managers, supported by partner interviews, indicated that RWI’s approach in this area catered for both aspects.⁵⁹ Key to effectiveness is accessibility, and, as discussed with the partners, this includes ensuring online access to, for example, search facilities and electronic libraries in countries with low levels of IT infrastructure. This again necessitates striking the right balance in terms of prioritisation of online vs. hard copy materials, as well as physical access to the collections.⁶⁰ Finally, evaluations point out that, critical to

⁵⁶ The Regional Africa evaluation has urged, in order to maximise research outcomes, that the strengthened research component in the programme not necessarily be limited to institutional partnerships with specific universities. Finally, this same evaluation also urges for the utilisation of research components as a means of providing support for monitoring progress in other areas, such as by commissioning academic research on court judgements and decisions. It further recognises that working with existing networks or umbrella organisations ‘has been seen as a smart way of reaching a broad target group of institutions with relatively little funding.’ Although this last aspect is a broader recommendation stretching beyond research, it reinforces the notion of broader collaboration among similar stakeholders, not just with an institutional anchoring but also in their individual capacity.

⁵⁷ The total list of literature provided to partners in recent years comprises over 1,000 titles, all in English, covering both general and specific human rights topics and, in some cases, programme country aspects specifically.

⁵⁸ Turkey. The Evaluation Team notes that, as an example, the list of books does not include Russian titles, which, for Belarus, for example, would therefore depend on local purchases. In other RWI partner countries, such as Cambodia and China this would also be an issue for consideration.

⁵⁹ In particular for Belarus and Turkey.

⁶⁰ Universal access is noted as an issue in some cases in Zimbabwe, particularly when books are located in universities with campuses spread across the country, necessitating transport of titles by car on an ongoing basis. The Myanmar evaluation recommends phasing out support to the NHRI library because of its perceived limited use, mainly because of lack of

effectiveness in this area, and in this manner also in relation to, for example, human rights education and research, is ensuring library staff possess the necessary professional capacity in this field as well. Where consulted,⁶¹ partners also acknowledged these aspects as important.

When it comes to **networking among academia (v.)**, this is a core activity throughout the portfolio.⁶² Stakeholders consulted in relation to the various case programmes said this contributed positively to achieving programme outcomes.⁶³ It further contributes to anchoring internal national dialogue. Finally, this sub-method serves as a means for enabling active dissemination of best practice among partners. However, at the same time, various partners emphasised that networking may in fact challenge the involved institutions and participants in terms of workload and type of activity to such an extent that effectiveness is endangered.⁶⁴ Partner interviews pointed towards effectiveness as depending greatly on the ability of RWI, first to assure the most relevant form of governance structure⁶⁵ suitable for the particular context; and second to provide the necessary ongoing active facilitative support. In their experience, this has sometimes worked well and in other cases less so; in the latter cases, this means they have benefited less from the activities.⁶⁶

In terms of **societal dialogue/outreach involving multiple actors (vi.)**, as stated above this came across in the case programme interviews as a highly effective means

accessibility beyond the staff of the institution. In the current context in Turkey, this particular aspect has the downside that individuals without a university position at any level lack access to both physical and online restricted facilities connected to these institutions. To some extent, this has been alleviated by the establishment of a research facility at the RWI office, but this does not detract from the fact that the sustainability of these efforts, at least in this particular context, for the potential beneficiary group is diminished.

⁶¹ Zimbabwe.

⁶² In Belarus, Turkey and Zimbabwe, as well as Regional Asia. CHR-UP also carries out some of these activities.

⁶³ Including Belarus, Turkey and Zimbabwe, particularly in Zimbabwe, where new approaches to collaboration particularly below management levels, *'before we worked in silos, now we cooperate!'*, seem to have been achieved as a direct outcome of the programme.

⁶⁴ One example, albeit not as such representing networking in the RWI portfolio, is the collaboration textbook project in Zimbabwe, which was universally seen by those involved as an almost insurmountably challenging task of coordination and motivation. This is in spite of the significant efforts that RWI staff said they had spent facilitating this.

⁶⁵ Governance, in this respect, includes consideration of, for example, whether to establish a formalised network structure with institutional/individual membership or simply to apply more informal approaches.

⁶⁶ In Turkey, running a formally organised institutional mechanism for the network of young researchers had to be abandoned because of non-functionality under the circumstances. When initiatives have met critical difficulties almost to the point of non-achievement, reasons for this seem to point towards lack of active facilitation by RWI, reflecting recognition that networking does not happen on its own simply by bringing the stakeholders together.

of involving a broad section of stakeholders in key programmatic activity in a flexible manner. In most cases, the academic institutions provide a strong basis for such fact-based dialogue, and serve as a neutral convening platform where the full scope of actors can engage in constructive dialogue even in difficult human rights environments. This aspect exists strongly throughout the portfolio.⁶⁷ In this respect, programme partners as well as external stakeholders clearly stated that RWI acted as ‘an honest broker’ and facilitator. They supported the rationale of RWI that utilising academic partners as a legitimate platform allows for joint exchanges between various human rights actors. The evaluation reflects that this is the case not least when it comes to including civil society in order to include a rights-holder perspective.⁶⁸

Stakeholders similarly emphasised the **professional training of non-academic actors (vii)**, as mentioned above, as a key to the success of RWI’s engagement in a number of partner countries, integrated in programme results frameworks.⁶⁹ However, the intended value of this engagement is to effect change at a deeper institutional level, where the learning obtained leads to more human rights-compliant practice by key justice actors and overall human rights reform within these sectors.⁷⁰ On the basis

⁶⁷ Of the four cases, and following the amendment of the Turkey programme to exclude this specific component originally included, this is now the case only in Zimbabwe, where this activity at output level is conflated with the professional training programme activity. For comparison, DIHR and CHR-UP also operate with a strong focus on bringing a broad selection of societal stakeholders, including academia, public institutions, national human rights and justice sector institutions and civil society, together in dialogue-focused activities.

⁶⁸ The MENA evaluation emphasises that an academic network should be more inclusive of other stakeholders and supporters. More broadly, the Indonesia evaluation recommends broadening the professional training in the field of prisoners’ rights to a wider selection of policy-makers involved in this key issue, even to the extent of including Parliament and civil society, to create a stronger platform for policy-making. The Myanmar evaluation urges RWI to explore in its support to the NHRI how to effectively promote cooperation between that institution and other actors, particularly CSOs. In Turkey, this is a difficult task in the current climate in particular, but also because of the traditional ‘silo’ approach in the country, with civil society in certain cases traditionally refraining from engaging with actors connected to ‘the state including universities. Furthermore, it was clearly indicated that e.g. in relation to research, and in view of a the strongly voluntary nature of the CSO approach, standards of quality for research conducted by civil society seem to fall far below the acceptance level of academia.

⁶⁹ Especially in Zimbabwe – the case context where this has unfolded the most visibly in current cooperation – all stakeholders said this had made a valuable and effective contribution to bridging understanding and promoting joint exchanges as well as learning across the various human rights actors in society. The Regional Asia and, to some extent still, Turkey programmes also include this aspect. The Kenya evaluation reflects that the programme, focusing strongly on this aspect, is held ‘in extremely high regard’ and RWI has contributed enormously to the improvement of human rights this area. The China evaluation also stresses this activity as essential.

⁷⁰ The Theory of Change for the Zimbabwe programme includes that, at an output level,

of the observations of the Evaluation Team, underpinned by discussions with other stakeholders in addition to previous evaluations, a number of key issues appear to be essential for consideration in programme design, including when it comes to relevance. These are areas where the sources consulted indicated that RWI was increasingly performing well:

1. Tailoring the focus of the training programmes closely and specifically to the needs of participants in the context in question, especially in relation to the overall thematic focuses of the programme;⁷¹
2. Structuring the training programmes as a flow of sequenced training events and activities;⁷²
3. Involving as key resource persons trainers/facilitators with a professional background participants can relate to and whom they view as credible and relevant to their own context;⁷³

the programme will lead to *'Increased knowledge and skills among participants on key human rights issues and how to apply standards in human rights their respective fields of operation.'* As a main activity, this includes *'Delivery of training programmes on human rights for representatives of academia, IRCs [independent research centres], CSOs and government institutions, particularly on reform relevant issues and how to apply human rights standards in practice,'* contributing to the achievement of the Overall Objective/Vision of Success as *'Enhanced enjoyment of constitutional rights in Zimbabwe.'* For Turkey, the desired impact of the original programme was *'A more human rights responsive justice system in Turkey.'* Another example is the Kenya programme, which aims *'To support human rights reforms in implementing the new Constitution of Kenya and operationalising key policy priorities and strategies, in line with international standards, as concerns in particular the fair, impartial and efficient administration of justice'* (see Annex 6).

⁷¹ In Zimbabwe, the focus strategy which has been identified in order to bring a broad scope range of representatives from duty-bearer and rights-holder institutions together is to address key national human rights priorities – which, in the context of Zimbabwe, are related to implementation of the 2013 Constitution. Stakeholders agree on this. This is agreed on as relevant by involved stakeholders; also this document also emphasises the rights of e.g. children, youth, elderly persons, persons with disabilities and veterans. The MENA evaluation indicates the importance e.g. in of training for the judiciary with an that emphasis is placed on designing trainings according to participants' needs (including a recognition that lack of capacity is merely one obstacle to lack of human rights- compliant performance) rather than according to available RWI capacity.

⁷² In Zimbabwe, this programme activity, in the form of which also includes training and exchange in Sweden (3 three batches to date) in groups mixing a broad field of state and non-state representatives, seems to have been one of the most successful outcomes. It was clearly stated in stakeholders interviews, clearly stated, in elaborate detail, how that these joint activities have had served to bring individuals together across their institutional affiliations. This has enabled frank and constructive dialogue also on sensitive issues and paves the way for future concrete elaboration of projects, such as e.g. in the area of prisoners' rights. A similar format has also been applied in other programmes. The Myanmar evaluation emphasized emphasises the need, in the context of supporting the NHRI, to reduce the focus on developing capacity for awareness-raising through one-off events, for example for e.g. government representatives.

4. Implementing solid monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks for the training programmes in order to track and measure the results achieved in terms of immediate impact as well as longer-term outcomes;⁷⁴
5. Selecting participants who can act as institutional drivers for change. This includes both individuals placed high enough in the organisational hierarchy to be able to effect effective implementation and anchoring of learning within the institution and those operating on the ground level in a strong interface with members of the community;⁷⁵
6. Finally, considering a move from working with one partner at the implementing institutional level towards engaging instead with a higher-level training institution servicing a number of partners.⁷⁶ As with academic human rights education, an analysis of the portfolio in general shows that this is a central aspect of RWI's work, serving also broader intra-sectoral dialogue.

Where implemented in the case countries, stakeholders thus recognise this sub-method for its value in strengthening the human rights understanding of duty-bearer institutions in particular.⁷⁷

In terms of **capacity development of partners in RBM and other related skills (viii.)**, effectiveness in principle helps enable partners to engage more effectively in the full programme cycle with respect to their own programmes. This is the case both in general and in relation to engagement with RWI, and in this way has a multiplier effect on a number of the examples listed above and below. This was not specifically addressed by the Evaluation Team with partners, but addressed with RWI as an observation for reflection.

⁷³ The China evaluation emphasises the value of drawing on, in this case, prosecutors and other Chinese legal professionals in the Chinese prosecutors training as their experience has more credibility than pure academic training. In Indonesia, when engaging in capacity development through training of the prison service, the choice of international expertise for facilitation was motivated by a lack of local resources with sufficient capacity, as well as the general sensitivity of the issue in the local context. Nevertheless, this evaluation recommends efforts to continue to prioritise local experts, given their better understanding of the context.

⁷⁴ The China evaluation (mid-term of current programme) suggests the use of electronic surveys in training efforts to enhance monitoring in relation to qualitative indicators. This seems still to be an area for further development by RWI.

⁷⁵ This is emphasised in the Kenya evaluation, and seems to be an area reflected now in this specific programme. The programme in Zimbabwe seems to reflect awareness in terms of participant selection along these lines as well.

⁷⁶ This is also a recommendation in the China evaluation. In Turkey, when engaging with the justice sector, key institutions targeted would have included the Justice Academy, the High Council of Judges and Prosecutors and the National Police Academy.

⁷⁷ The programme in Zimbabwe includes this aspect, and it was also envisaged for Turkey; it is not yet the case for the Belarus programme.

3.1.4 Human rights education – efficiency

When it comes to efficiency, in terms of ensuring best ‘value for money’, the evaluation reflects that human rights programming may seem inherently ‘expensive’ in terms of manpower resources invested, at least compared with other forms of development cooperation assistance, such as those involving infrastructure. This is because of the very nature of human rights programmes: capacity development is a relatively labour-intensive nature with high manpower costs and relatively low ‘reimbursable’ expenses compared with some other development cooperation modalities, particularly for a self-implementing organisation such as RWI (see below). A review of RWI budgets for case programmes verifies that the budgeted ‘RWI human resources/personnel costs’ in most cases comprised between 18 and 48 per cent of the total budget of individual programmes in 2016.⁷⁸

As indicated above with respect to **academic human rights education programmes (i.)**, a review of programme documents, supported by partner and RWI programme manager interviews, indicated that the bulk of the activities took place in the partner countries. This may be combined with occasional short-term study visits to Lund for the purposes of, for example, networking and exchange with a broader selection of RWI staff, visits to relevant Swedish institutions or joint activities with partner representatives from other partner countries/programmes. In addition, in the case of curriculum development or teacher training, for example, partners and programme managers confirmed that the approach of conducting joint or parallel processes with several partners at the same time was generally applied.⁷⁹

RWI facilitates visiting lecturers to, for example, Masters programmes supported, and interviews with previous stakeholders and resource persons for programmes, compared with similar consultations with current partners, indicated a shift.⁸⁰ RWI

⁷⁸ The ratio of ‘RWI and human resource costs’ varies between the programmes. For Zimbabwe, out of a total budget of SEK 15,000,000, the total initially budgeted for these costs was SEK 4,863,839 = 32.42 per cent. For Regional Asia, out of a total budget of SEK 75,000,000, these costs were budgeted at SEK 25,379,733 = 33.84 per cent. For Turkey, the total original budget was SEK 84,000,000, and the framework budget simply states that staff costs are included under the activity areas with no separate overall budget provided. However, for the revised programme for 2017, out of an annual budget of SEK 13,545,593, the staff and human resource costs are budgeted at SEK 4,637,069 = 34.23 per cent. For Belarus, out of a total budget of SEK 40,000,000, RWI staff and human resource costs were originally budgeted at SEK 15,718,635 = 39.3 per cent – that is, higher than for the other programmes.

⁷⁹ This overall approach seems to be more or less followed in the case programmes where this activity is included – that is, Belarus, Turkey and Zimbabwe.

⁸⁰ When it comes to the use of an RWI expert resource, the Regional Asia evaluation picks up on feedback from participants in education/training programmes that sometimes regional capacity (because of language and contextual understanding) may be a more suitable choice. In Turkey and Zimbabwe, this seems to be a key contribution to the academic programmes in particular; however, the expertise provided seems to be drawn (almost)

seems to have reduced its earlier practice of primarily sending out costly and high-profile international experts, in favour of increasingly drawing on RWI's own staff or affiliated expertise.⁸¹ The same interviewees indicated that minimising the language challenge for the audience, and enabling interpretation, was one key to efficiency. In terms of teaching methodology, short-term guest lecturing involves high-intensity lecture/workshop modalities, rather than 'slower' learning processes with, for example, a few weekly classes over a full semester, with better opportunities for ongoing and informal interaction between lecturers and students. Availability of locally or regionally based lecturers, who charge a lower fee rate and do not have long distance travelling costs, is also an element that those interviewed felt would contribute to both relevance and efficiency. However, in the same cases, both partners and RWI staff in interviews emphasised that, in some cases, bringing in a 'VIP' lecturer from RWI (or from the region) was in fact preferable, as it served the strategic aim of creating visibility and attracting the engagement of senior faculty staff and the leadership. Particularly in the early stages of cooperation, this, according to partners interviewed, has contributed to increased buy-in from these.

When it comes to **CLE (ii.)**, as mentioned above interviews with programme partners and RWI staff both reflected that this sub-method was generally well anchored within partner institutions as an integrated aspect of legal education. This supports the assumption that, at least in terms of the academic aspect, this is not an area of high programme cost, which makes resource efficiency more implicit compared with for other areas of intervention. The physical infrastructure may, on the other hand, involve a higher level of costs.⁸²

In terms of **other individual support** in the area of **research (iii.)**, cost efficiency is a matter for reflection specifically when it comes to providing individual scholarships involving residence for shorter or longer periods in Lund, Sweden, either at RWI or in Lund University. However, analysis of the case programmes indicates that this is not necessarily the ideal scenario for relevance and effectiveness. This was also reflected in dialogue with programme partners, who mentioned that more local or regional support facilitated more flexible arrangements, which meant the inclusion of researchers with family obligations – in many cases female scholars, which brings in the gender mainstreaming perspective, discussed below. Furthermore, programme

exclusively from within the ranks of RWI's own staff and associates (e.g. visiting scholars). Also, in the case of Zimbabwe, according to a partner in one university, the visiting RWI scholar spent a few days teaching a relatively basic course to a group of fewer than 30 students.

⁸¹ Partners in Zimbabwe, for example, felt that, in some cases, the higher-profile international lecturers might in fact be appropriate in terms of their ability to 'attract an audience' and accrue status for the programme.

⁸² Case programme budgets do not distinguish this specific activity from other aspects of the human rights education activity field under which it is operationalised, as stated above.

partners found that supporting research to be carried out in partner countries through relatively modest grants was a cost-efficient way to ensure an inclusive and fact-based platform for various activities, including teaching and policy dialogue initiatives.⁸³

In terms of efficiency in relation to **other institutional support enabling academic and related activity, including libraries (iv.)**, analysis of case programme budgets shows that literature acquisition makes up a very minimal proportion of total budgets. RWI indicates that the size of the package for each partner institution can differ depending on context and a variety of contextual factors, from a very basic package of ten essential human rights volumes, to more comprehensive ones. RWI states that, on average, each title costs between SEK 250 and 300, which does not seem excessive. In terms of resource efficiency, RWI's own in-house library expertise is utilised in this area, for example in identifying titles, compiling lists and undertaking the negotiations with partners.⁸⁴ The process also includes individual selection of books suited to the specific context of the partners, as well as prioritising non-commercial publishers and avoiding costly subscriptions. Resource efficiency should also be viewed in light of the valuable contribution to academic life in partner countries, as stressed by partners and external stakeholders. Over the years, such support has, in their view, become another 'brand' of RWI, not least because it also involves a comprehensive approach to including the capacity development of library staff in addition to physical infrastructure.⁸⁵ However, as also addressed by various stakeholders and partners sustainability remains a challenge in this respect (see below).

With respect to **academic networking (v.)**, cost efficiency is achieved by having partner institutions take responsibility for and host activities at a local level, which reduces expenses to a low level by including only those related to, for example, transport and accommodation. At an institutional level, partner indications confirmed that this was not usually an issue, since RWI covers such costs. However, partners reflected that this was a challenging area at an individual level, owing to difficulties in getting transport costs reimbursed, for example.⁸⁶

⁸³ In Belarus, Turkey and Zimbabwe.

⁸⁴ As an example, the three library partners in Zimbabwe have received three different packages suitable to their individual needs.

⁸⁵ The Regional Asia evaluation finds that the work with libraries has *been 'a quiet revolution within the programme,'* lifting this component and the target group, the librarians, up to be a critical component in enabling the organisation to deliver excellent outputs – not just in relation to human rights, as the programme focus, but also benefiting the broader academic field in the context.

⁸⁶ In Zimbabwe, where the three partner universities can utilise their own facilities for various activities and reduce costs to a minimum, but where individual lecturers travelling between the three universities for joint activities face difficulties in terms of the reimbursement of such

Along the same lines, **societal dialogue/outreach involving multiple actors (vi.)** may also be kept cost-efficient by applying similar approaches to those discussed above in relation to academic networking.

In terms of **professional training of non-academic actors (vii.)**, stakeholders supported the reflection of the Evaluation Team that cost efficiency is ensured to the greatest possible extent by applying blended learning approaches and sequencing of training sessions into a comprehensive flow. This includes conducting the initial and basic parts of the trainings in participants' own country. This can be followed by sessions and exchanges in Sweden, the latter only for essential purposes, including relevant institutional visits for peer learning. Finally, to capitalise fully on these activities, the final stage of the course includes the development of action plans by participants for follow-up.⁸⁷ The implementing partners and participating stakeholders agreed that this strategy worked well.

Finally, with respect to **capacity development of partners in RBM and other related skills (viii.)**, both staff and partners confirmed that RWI adopted a 'non-formalised' approach by incorporating efforts in this area into the ongoing dialogue between partners and programme managers. Costs in this area are negligible.

3.1.5 Human rights education – sustainability

The practices noted through document review and stakeholder consultations in the case programmes relating to **academic human rights education programmes (i.)** provide a strong basis for achieving sustainability. Such practices include an inclusive 'package approach' with capacity development of teachers, identification and development (when necessary) of supporting material and anchoring within partner institutions. Interviews with past and current programme partners illustrated that, once these programmes are established, they continue to run their own course even years and decades later.⁸⁸ Once programme funding is no longer provided, the partner institutions often tend to take this responsibility upon themselves.⁸⁹

With respect to **CLE (ii.)**, interviews with both RWI staff and partner institution representatives indicated that CLE was an area where the partner institutions themselves had strong drive and a sense of ownership. CLE otherwise features similar

costs, since the institutions cannot in many cases shoulder this.

⁸⁷ Particularly in relation to Zimbabwe. RWI stresses that visits to Sweden are otherwise not commonplace in programmes.

⁸⁸ Examples include the Regional Masters at Mahidol and the Chinese Masters at Beida University in Beijing. Programmes in Belarus and Zimbabwe indicate that this may very well in the long run be the case here as well, whereas activities in this field in Turkey have been hampered to such an extent by external factors that this is difficult to foresee.

⁸⁹ As an example, the previous Regional Africa programme support for the Masters programme in Mutare, Zimbabwe, has continued into the current programme, although the direct support for the coordinator's position is no longer provided.

aspects to those noted above related to academic human rights programmes and is, in fact, usually integrated into these. All this contributes towards sustainability.

For **other individual support** in the area of **research (iii.)**, partner interviews indicated that programming reflected the ownership aspect of sustainability. This means that partner input ensures that, for example, calls for proposals include specific themes and other criteria aimed at this. However, in terms of ensuring continuation after programme termination and the discontinuation of RWI engagement, this is one area where sustainability is particularly at risk. As reflected in the interviews with stakeholders, supporting the experience of the Evaluation Team, this owes to the (increased) scarcity of funding available specifically for conducting research, although not necessarily for capacity development in the field, in partner contexts. The Evaluation Team, underpinned by similar reflections by interviewees, feels that this, in return, leads to a high degree of dependency on either donor programmes or national research granting modalities with limited resources and high competition. Many of these efforts relate to the development of research capacity, which in principle and in itself could be maintained regardless of funding, but whose actual application – for example the continued career of individual scholars – may depend on funding possibilities.

When it comes **institutional/library support and book donations (iv.)**, both RWI and partners stated that books were selected with reference to individual preferences and needs. The book packages are thus targeted towards each context. The final selection of titles also depends on availability and cost, as mentioned above. While the materials as such can be maintained at no cost, upgrading comes at a certain cost. Book donations are also seldom stand-alone activities but are combined with other measures, including capacity development for libraries on how to maintain and acquire human rights materials, including at low cost. In terms of post-RWI support, the issue of ongoing maintenance of an updated and relevant collection necessitates buy-in from the university/faculty in question and has significant budgetary implications, at least for continuous upgrading. All of these factors pose a risk to sustainability, which programme partners and RWI staff alike highlight.⁹⁰ As stated in evaluations of previous programmes, sustainability relating to the training of

⁹⁰ In Zimbabwe in particular, the challenge seems to be severe as a result of reduced university budgets in view of the economic crisis. Along the same lines, the Turkey evaluation cautions that the cost implications of maintaining an updated library collection requires that the partner institutions commit themselves to engagement in this field, such as through cost-sharing, for sustainability. At the same time, this evaluation also suggests that the development of a system for better statistics on book loans may be a constructive means to establish a baseline that would allow for, for example, assessing the Theory of Change of this particular aspect.

librarians is similarly vulnerable to the ability of the university institutions to retain them.⁹¹

In relation to **academic networking (v.)**, dialogue with partners reflected that sustainability was a challenge. Stressing that local ownership of such processes was essential, the partners also claimed that the substantial workload of university academics affected sustainability negatively. They emphasised that, for them, the network must be easy to maintain and to draw immediate value from. This, in turn, speaks against the creation of more administratively demanding structures, even though such a network structure may at a glance seem to serve sustainability and institutional anchoring. Concurrently, those consulted stressed that strong recognition of ‘added value’ needed to be present for those participating. In some cases, partners felt this was achieved, in other cases less so. However, when successful, partners and RWI seemed to agree that such activities had every chance of remaining sustainable.⁹²

Along the same lines, on **societal dialogue/outreach involving multiple actors (vi.)**, partners and stakeholders indicated that this depended, in terms of sustainability, on strong local ownership. Although the Evaluation Team registered only a few examples⁹³ of this sub-method in the case programmes, it was an area that partners, participants and external stakeholders pointed to as positive in terms of achieving cross-sectoral dialogue. However, they also recognised that, as much as such an activity in fact responds to, and is driven by, partner priorities and needs, it often depends on external funding to cover the costs involved. Those involved from partner institutions and a broader circle of stakeholders confirmed that outcomes of such processes continued to be drawn on in the local context.

When it comes to **professional training of non-academic actors (vii.)**, stakeholders indicated that their needs and ownership were ensured in particular through ensuring fulfilment of the relevance aspect, as addressed above, specifically in relation to the focus of the activity.⁹⁴ However, as observed in dialogue with the various stakeholders, especially during field visits, the overall societal context, and especially the scope of space for interaction between state and civil society, has a strong bearing on the extent to which achievements prove to be sustainable or not.

⁹¹ The Myanmar evaluation further notes that training only one single librarian meant sustainability was an issue (noting, though, that the supported institution also only had one librarian).

⁹² As stated above, experience is mixed in this area, with some network activity facing difficulties, apparently because of a lack of strong local ownership coupled with potentially insufficient RWI facilitation.

⁹³ For example annual symposia in Zimbabwe.

⁹⁴ Stakeholder participants in Zimbabwe indicated this was very much the case.

The extent to which participants continue to engage in the informal dialogue across actor groups reflects this.⁹⁵

As in relation to a number of the areas above, the Evaluation Team did not observe **capacity development of partners in RBM and other related skills (viii.)** in either the desk review or stakeholder interviews as being sustainable to any significant extent. With respect to post-support sustainability, an obvious risk assessed by the Evaluation Team is that organisations' staff members do not retain their positions. When this happens, capacity is lost and the sustainability of such support is jeopardised. Finally, one critical element of programme development is analysis of risks at context and programme level, and the development of relevant mitigation strategies. Joint engagement between partners and RWI in such processes could be another way of ensuring the likelihood of sustainability of the engagement; however, the Evaluation Team saw little concrete evidence that this happened.

3.2 GENDER MAINSTREAMING

3.2.1 Landscape

In contrast with the section on human rights education, this section is shorter and less elaborated. This is not to be taken as an indication that we take this part of the evaluation less seriously than that of the other two methods. After analysis of the programme documentation, however, the gender aspect of RWI's work methods does seem to be less extensively implemented. This is at least the case when it comes to visibility at the objective and outcome levels of most programmes in the portfolio, and the extent of reflection at the activity level.⁹⁶

The Evaluation Team set out to identify and assess how RWI works with gender mainstreaming, rather than testing a normative framework for gender mainstreaming on RWI. Initially, in our analysis of gender mainstreaming, we intended to cover issues such as quality, process and inter-sectionality. However, we found that the programmatic case material supports such in-depth analysis only to a limited extent. As a consequence, we limited ourselves to assessing emerging trends and approaches in order to capture the organisational 'thinking' and intentions as to how it

⁹⁵ In Turkey, the current context presents challenges for this type of activity. Similarly, in Zimbabwe, the political uncertainty and possible tension leading up to the 2018 elections in particular require increased consideration of risks in this respect. In this programme, however, an original intention to enable this has meant that, following a feasibility study in 2015, the two objectives under the programme, capacity development and societal dialogue, are conflated into one activity field.

⁹⁶ In terms of comparison with other institutions, DIHR operationalises and includes gender under its focus on HRBA. CHR-UP has a strong focus on gender, including specific programmes and a dedicated focal point. ICJ has Women's Human Rights as one of its main themes.

programmes will roll this out and apply it.⁹⁷ RWI defines its approach to gender mainstreaming as a way of working that aims at advancing gender equality. The Evaluation Team found support for this notion in its consultations with external stakeholders. The same sources indicated that RWI was in the process of developing and implementing systems and tools at various levels throughout the programme portfolio.⁹⁸ However, as noted and suggested by Sida, as well as by RWI at various stages through the evaluation process, gender mainstreaming can be further elaborated both at a conceptual level and through the programme portfolio.

In the area of gender mainstreaming, and starting in the case programmes, the evaluation team identified two sub-methods:

i. Mainstreaming of gender in various forms through all aspects of the engagement

Drawing on RWI's own conceptualisation, which forms part of the case programme documentation, gender mainstreaming involves the integration of a gender perspective into the preparation, design, implementation, M&E of actions (projects, programmes, activities, policies, regulatory measures, etc.); taking into account the potential influence of these actions on gender relations; and with a view to promoting gender equality and combating discrimination.⁹⁹

The conceptual documents¹⁰⁰ indicate that this can be facilitated through a systematic process involving Gender Analysis (before planning), Gender Planning (before activity), Implementing and Monitoring (during activity) and Gender Assessment (after activity). This enables the application of gender mainstreaming measures for events and activities aimed at achieving strategic objectives on advancing gender equality. It also includes a process of coding in terms of categorising activities based on the extent to which they can be assessed to be gender-blind/-neutral; gender-integrated to a limited extent; or gender-integrated. Furthermore, it also includes the application of gender-specific indicators with coded targets applied to all outcome and output levels. One example is benchmarking of

⁹⁷ Belarus and Turkey, but Zimbabwe programmes also offer opportunities to do so.

⁹⁸ This has been reflected particularly in the programmes in Belarus and Turkey, and to some extent also in Zimbabwe. In Belarus, mainstreaming gender issues was already a 'key methodological pillar' of the programme in 2011, and has been consistently mainstreamed into programme activities.

⁹⁹ The strongest articulation of gender considerations can be found in the context of two of the programmes (Belarus and Turkey) where specific conceptual documents have been developed: 'Gender Equality Integration in the Belarus Programme' and 'Gender Mainstreaming in Turkey Programme (Pilot Period, 2017)'. The Regional Asia programme has adopted a 'Draft Strategy for Including a Gender Equality Perspective in the RWI Regional Asia Programme 2017-2021'. The Zimbabwe programme has applied a gender mainstreaming approach.

¹⁰⁰ See previous note.

university courses falling in the latter two categories; a 50/50 gender ratio, for example for enrolment in courses of students, teaching staff, enrolment in human rights courses and Masters and PhD graduates at targeted institutions; research conducted and published by female academics; number of female rights-holders assisted by a legal clinic; and participation in collaborative fora within academia as well as involving other stakeholders.¹⁰¹

Analysis of programme documentation for the four cases and interviews with RWI staff and partner consultations show that, in academic human rights education programmes, gender aspects are to a large degree mainstreamed through partner universities' human rights programmes at graduate level. Following the flow of sub-methods for human rights education outlined above, most of them include examples of gender-focused activities. In some cases, this extends even to the development of specifically gender-focused programmes at Masters level.¹⁰² In terms of CLE, the gender dimension takes a naturally strong dimension insofar as many of the clients serviced by the legal clinics are disadvantaged women.¹⁰³ With respect to, for example, research support through national granting schemes funded by the programmes, Call for Proposals documents stress and specific proposals are selected on the strength of their gender-sensitive and/or inclusive aspects. Analysis of the documentation provided by RWI shows that book packages provided through library support include around 50 titles specifically addressing the rights of women and gender-related aspects (e.g. domestic violence and trafficking, as well as trafficking). In terms of academic networking, specific working groups focus on gender aspects¹⁰⁴ and, in the process of designing gender-related curricula with a specifically gendered perspective, researchers and lecturers in this field engage in practical networking and exchange.¹⁰⁵ Societal dialogue/outreach involving multiple actors includes a focus on specific gender aspects.¹⁰⁶ In relation to the professional training of non-academic actors, training programmes include components on the rights of women under the umbrella of addressing people in vulnerable and marginalised situations, and participants are identified and selected to ensure a gender balance.¹⁰⁷ Finally, when

¹⁰¹ 'Gender Mainstreaming in Turkey Programme (Pilot Period), 2017'. Similarly, in the 'Revised Monitoring and Evaluation Plan' for the Zimbabwe programme, indicators reflecting gender aspects have been included as well.

¹⁰² Zimbabwe.

¹⁰³ Indicated by partners in both Turkey and Zimbabwe.

¹⁰⁴ Turkey.

¹⁰⁵ Belarus.

¹⁰⁶ In Zimbabwe, the national symposium on 'Constitutional Interpretation' in 2016, for example, included gender-related aspects in presentations, based on the strong provisions of the 2013 Constitution.

¹⁰⁷ Zimbabwe.

developing appropriate RBM frameworks, the application of HRBA and gender-sensitive indicators may strengthen this aspect in the portfolio.

ii. Specifically designed activities and modalities

Programme documentation review, supported by partner and RWI staff interviews, revealed that some programmes¹⁰⁸ included specific activities directly aimed at ensuring gender parity in programme benefits. Similarly, they include modalities designed with a specific gender-strengthening aspect (implicitly targeting women) for their implementation. The overall common aim of these activities is to ensure women benefit fully from RWI's development engagements with partners.¹⁰⁹

Such examples include targeted gender-aware dialogue, facilitated by a study visit specifically on gender equality in higher education for the top management of universities.¹¹⁰ They have also included trainings on gender and law, feminist approaches in legal education and gender in human rights research, as well as a university course on 'Gender and Law' in relation to CLE.¹¹¹ Furthermore, in addition to conferences and workshops on gender and gender-related issues, research projects granted at the programme level have included a specific gender focus.¹¹²

Another example from programme activity level is the Zimbabwe Human Rights Textbook project, undertaken jointly by the university partners and involving a broad selection of authors. Part of the process has included discussions among the authors on how to mainstream gender in their chapters.¹¹³

Other specific activities that have expanded existing knowledge on gender issues within universities included research on gender stereotypes. Findings from this subsequently encouraged the application of this knowledge through gender-sensitive policies at partner universities, in addition to promoting increased available resources to researchers and decision-makers to enable and allow for translation of gender-related publications.¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁸ See below for examples from Belarus, Turkey and Regional Asia. For Zimbabwe, despite strong 'flagging' in the narrative programme documentation, work plans and reporting for 2016 and 2017 reflect little indication that this has so far materialised into gender-specific activities.

¹⁰⁹ As an example, for the Regional Asia programme, a 'Draft Strategy for Including a Gender Equality Perspective'.

¹¹⁰ Belarus.

¹¹¹ Turkey.

¹¹² Turkey.

¹¹³ Interviews with RWI and implementing partners in Zimbabwe.

¹¹⁴ Gender action plan at the Faculty of International Relations/BSU. RWI's final report of the Belarus Project for 2010–2014 states that the key role in these activities belonged to the Gender Mainstreaming Working Group, ensuring a high degree of local ownership and sustainability for these activities.

Another example at activity level is enhanced knowledge achieved through a ‘Regional Research Initiative on Human Rights and Environment, Climate Change and Gender’ and regional blended learning courses on human rights and environment/climate change, gender and the Sustainable Development Goals.¹¹⁵

Finally, RWI staff stated that every visiting researcher at RWI received a special briefing on gender issues.

3.2.2 Gender mainstreaming – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability

The Evaluation Team believes that anchoring gender-related activities tightly in national and partner institutional agenda and ‘following their lead’ can ensure **relevance**. Partner interviews in the case countries showed that this had largely happened.¹¹⁶ However, interviews with relevant RWI staff, supported by partners’ comments, suggested RWI was striving to place gender higher on the partner institutional agenda by adding expert input into programme design and implementation. In some cases, these same sources stated that this had included assisting partners in resolving misconceptions (e.g. relating to homosexuality and gender empowerment). This has served to ensure both relevance and increased awareness and capacity development.¹¹⁷

When it came to **effectiveness**, interviews with stakeholders in case contexts confirmed that this was an area of perpetual challenge. RWI’s clear and deliberate approach of operationalising this through dedicated capacitated staff should in theory facilitate this engagement with partners. The concept papers developed for specific programmes discussed above serve a key role in this respect.¹¹⁸ Partner interviews, however, indicated that this was only partly the case, with different responses in different case programme contexts.¹¹⁹ Everyone consulted felt that (in principle, not always in reality) it should be simple enough to ensure a gender balance, for example attaining gender parity in numbers of participants for specific activities – and this is most often the case. However, they also agreed among themselves and with RWI staff

¹¹⁵ Regional Asia.

¹¹⁶ In Zimbabwe, some of the partners (e.g. Midlands State University) already have strong capacity in the area of gender.

¹¹⁷ In Belarus, the university partners allegedly suffered from the misconception that to address gender was the same as advocating for homosexuality; once the clarification was made, and in line with the fact that gender equality is already *de facto* stronger in Belarus than in a number of the other partner countries, ownership and, therefore, relevance increased.

¹¹⁸ This is a strong aspect in Turkey and less so in Zimbabwe. Interviews with RWI staff indicated that this was also the case in relation to Belarus and Regional Asia.

¹¹⁹ In Zimbabwe, the existence of the RWI gender focal point seemed largely unknown to the implementing partner responsible for multi-stakeholder capacity development, which includes training programme components addressing this aspect.

that moving beyond this remained a challenge, except when it comes to putting in place a designated gender focus, such as in education programmes, workshops and trainings, as mentioned above.

With respect to **efficiency**, case programme budgets reviewed by the Evaluation Team indicate that mainstreaming implies only limited additional costs for individual programmes. One example is the addition of designated RWI staff members with specific qualifications in this field beyond ordinary programme managers, and the financing of a central gender focal point in the RWI Lund office. However, RWI staff indicated that integrating gender equality properly into an already existing programme could imply changing the latter so fundamentally that there would be significant budgetary implications.

Finally, findings in relation to **sustainability** remain speculative, as the programme documentation in general does not address this, and as the systematic inclusion of, for example, the concepts for mainstreaming outlined above, is still in progress. Perhaps for this reason the Evaluation Team did not in its consultations come across further reflection on this, at least by the partners. However, when discussing this with stakeholders and partners as well as RWI staff, we agreed that sustainability followed from the successful implementation of the criteria of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. Such sustainability includes anchoring tightly in and drawing on national efforts and the strengths of partner institutions, as well as the development of gender-reflective curricula and the inclusion of relevant literature in libraries. Furthermore, it is achieved through the successful implementation of activities in the case programmes outlined above and through including capacity-development opportunities in academia (e.g. in the form of research grants) and among non-academic stakeholders (e.g. in the training programmes).

3.3 WORKING IN DIFFICULT HUMAN RIGHTS ENVIRONMENTS (WIDHRE)

3.3.1 Landscape

In an international climate where human rights is generally downplayed as a given, and where space is shrinking for critical voices and action that are attempting to address this, the role and responsibility of an institution such as RWI are increasing. This recognition came through clearly in the various discussions the Evaluation Team had with RWI as well as partners and stakeholders.

The Evaluation Team reviewed the documentation for the current RWI programme portfolio based in particular on justifications and rationales for the four case programmes as well as general experience in the field.¹²⁰ In terms of human rights

¹²⁰ In addition to Belarus, Turkey, Zimbabwe and Regional Asia, the landscape from where,

challenges, we observed a variation in terms of intensity, profile and changes over time. However, all cases share characteristics, such as those related to overall high levels of structural and targeted violations of civil and political as well as economic and social rights; and needs for enhanced capacity across the broad scope of actors (public institutions and the justice sector, independent institutions, including NHRIs and ombudspersons as well as academia, and civil society, including political parties, the media and business). This, in the understanding of the Evaluation Team, underpinned by dialogue with RWI, partners and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation, means they all fall well within the typology of ‘difficult human rights environments’.

In addition, as discussed with RWI, partners and external stakeholders, these contexts may at times see a deterioration of the human rights environment into an actual ‘human rights emergency’. Such situations severely affect certain individuals, such as human rights defenders, other segments of the population and, ultimately, society as a whole. They may be temporary scenarios, or, in the long run, consolidate into a more permanent deterioration. In these cases, some of the elements addressed above become particularly relevant and allow RWI to contribute directly towards ensuring that individuals at risk here actually experience the effective protection of their rights.¹²¹

In the area of Widhre, we were able to identify few specific sub-method tools. At the same time, RWI operates within a number of contexts, not just the four case contexts selected for this evaluation. According to evaluations as well as comments by partners and stakeholders supporting RWI’s own claims, RWI manages to generate results in accordance with their respective programmatic results frameworks – so the question is, beyond the application of methods such as human rights education, what makes this possible?

The Evaluation Team interpreted the ToR for this evaluation as including the identification of those key qualities, characteristics and applied approaches that actually enable RWI to be effective in these contexts. We assess that it is precisely these that are central to ensuring that the engagement is designed and implemented in a way that ensures relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, and in this manner also paves the way for sustainability.

The Evaluation Team identified five clusters of qualitative aspects, outlined below, which ‘brand’ RWI as an organisation in the views of the external stakeholders and partners consulted. These aspects were identified and refined throughout the

for example, evaluations are drawn includes Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Kenya and Myanmar, as well as the regions of Africa and MENA.

¹²¹ As an example, RWI staff and management reflect that one way to do so is to provide academic scholarships for education and research purposes to individuals from partner institutions or the general human rights environment in such cases.

evaluation process in light of our observations as well as discussion with programme partners and external stakeholders in support of RWI's own claims. When RWI actively draws on these qualities in the various stages of programming, and they find expression in the documentation, for example, the Evaluation Team formulates them as transforming into 'approaches'.

i. Status

Analysis of RWI's overall institutional and operational profile shows that the institute has the status of an independent academic institution founded in 1984 at the Faculty of Law, University of Lund. In legal terms, the institute is a charitable trust under Swedish private law, governed by a Board of Trustees. Available institutional documentation and interviews with management, staff and external stakeholders show that the institute has in-house and closely affiliated academic research capacity, as well as an extensive track record in academic human rights education, as indicated above. In addition, RWI self-implements¹²² a comprehensive portfolio of partner-based human rights-focused programmes with funding from and in close engagement with Swedish development cooperation authorities. In programme countries and regions, the institute operates with a non-monitoring mandate.

The interviews suggested that the combination of these factors was recognised and in many cases deliberately drawn on in programming efforts in specifically challenging human rights contexts.¹²³ However, with no core funding provided for international programmes or other engagements, the viability of the institute to undertake activities, for example cutting across or extending beyond specifically funded programmes, is severely restricted.

ii. Thematic focus

A review of programme documentation reveals that many programmes have an actor perspective as their basis,¹²⁴ rather than a strict narrow thematic perspective. In principle, the concept of human rights is holistic and indivisible, and this serves as an argument for the assumption that, regardless of 'entry point' into the field, eventually human rights as a whole benefits from any improvement.

As discussed further below, the adoption of RWI's new overall Strategic Plan 2017–2021 (2017) is shifting the focus from an actor to a thematic approach.¹²⁵

¹²² For more on this, see below in relation to partners and presence.

¹²³ In both Zimbabwe and Turkey, partners felt this was a critical aspect and a prerequisite for RWI's ability to navigate either of these challenging contexts.

¹²⁴ For example, working with strengthening human rights capacity in academia or justice sector institutions on a broad theme. These aspects are also illustrated by the Kenya programme, which focuses on cooperation with prisons and probation services. This has inherently led to a thematic focus on international standards on the treatment of prisoners under RWI's thematic justice focus.

¹²⁵ Under the overall institutional Mission (*'to contribute to a wider understanding of and*

However, with the exception of more recently adopted programmes,¹²⁶ this shift has yet to be fully reflected in the programme portfolio.¹²⁷ Current programmes with a broader thematic focus may, however, allow for and incorporate other specific themes.

iii. Context understanding

Analysis of the evaluations of previous programmes and documents for current programmes, as well as interviews with partners and external stakeholders, all verify that this entails the ability of RWI to achieve a level of deep context understanding along both thematic and institutional lines. Such understanding is underpinned by research and analysis that provide the foundation for programming, and in particular ensures that the development engagement is tailored to the context. Finally, it serves to help RWI identify those areas within which a distinctive position can be maintained and impact can be maximised.¹²⁸

iv. Partners and presence

In terms of international programmes, RWI is a self-implementing institution, and does not primarily sub-grant or rely on national or local actors to implement its work. However, an analysis of RWI's programmatic landscape over the long term indicates that programmes are implemented with the involvement of partners in the respective contexts, and that the institution appears to be going for long-term engagement on a multi-stakeholder-based footing. This, according to RWI, involves, for instance, identifying drivers of change at a country and institutional level who may be able to effect critical change within these contexts. Closely connected to this, in a 'chicken/egg' manner, is the need to be able to identify these specific individuals as anchor points within the operational context and establish appropriate relations with them.

However, there is also a need for reflection on how to ensure the most relevant modality for institutional presence,¹²⁹ including formalities¹³⁰ relating to the

respect for human rights and international humanitarian law) and Vision (*'just and inclusive societies with effective realization of human rights for all'*), four thematic priority areas are outlined: Inclusive Societies; People on the Move – protection of refugees and migrants at risk; Fair and Efficient Justice; and Economic Globalisation and Human Rights.

¹²⁶ Among the case programmes, the Regional Asia programme is one such example.

¹²⁷ In comparison with other similar institutions, DIHR has its programmatic focus on a number of main themes in addition to a selection of specific actors, including NHRIs. CHR-UP may be best characterised as taking a functional approach, with a wide array of activities cutting across actors and themes. ICJ has a fundamental focus on the justice sector as well as selected themes under this area.

¹²⁸ DIHR, CHR-UP and ICJ all draw on deep understanding of the national, regional and global contexts relevant to their programmatic work.

¹²⁹ In the case of Zimbabwe, this is achieved through regular and frequent missions, but with no presence on the ground as of yet (considering also the volume of the programme to date). The same is the case with respect to Belarus, albeit for slightly different reasons

establishment of an office and its official registration, as well as funding management.¹³¹

v. Programme development

First and foremost, this aspect relates to the internal organisational dynamics of RWI. Interviews with RWI staff and management clarified that international programmes were for the most part designed in the local context by individual programme managers in close dialogue with partners, and in consultation with, primarily, the RWI director of programmes. Interviewees indicated that a key aspect in this regard related to absorption and circulation of conceptual knowledge and experience relating to the different work methods, including sub-methods and approaches, through deliberately developed internal processes and mechanisms.¹³² In terms of programme design, this includes applying the stages of inception/implementation phasing; developing consistent theories of change and risk analysis for each programme; building programmatic infrastructure in log-frame analysis and relevant donor-applicable formats and in accordance with good RBM principles; and, when relevant, the application of an HRBA.¹³³

3.3.2 Widhre – relevance

In terms of **status (i.)**, partners and stakeholders stated that combining, in particular, academic human rights education and research with a broad international programming portfolio made RWI an obvious partner for other academic institutions in programme countries. This may account for the predominance of academic

relating also to the political environment. In the case of Turkey, this is facilitated through a regular presence with staff attached. In Asia, the programme is run from a regional office in Jakarta, Indonesia, led by a Swede and with local staff. In this manner, the cases illustrate the breadth and scope of the approaches RWI applies to its country and regional engagements.

¹³⁰ These vary from country to country and are in fact a critical factor, as ensuring compliance with domestic legislation in some cases makes this highly challenging.

¹³¹ DIHR specifically applies a Partnership Approach, which emphasises the relevance of working through local institutions. In most cases, this also involves sub-contracting partners and channelling funding to these, including to cover local staff costs. If relevant, this includes the posting of single staff members with partner institutions, but not the establishment of local offices. CHR-UP transfers funding to partners in a few cases, for instance to cover costs under the Regional Master Programme. ICJ works through regional offices, which may be combined with local presence for the management of support to partners.

¹³² RWI states that the institute has recently adopted '*new internal guidelines for the quality assurance of new initiatives and... also, within that framework, streamlined the annual planning cycle.*' Interviews reflected that the previous actor focus included certain structures for absorbing and developing such knowledge, which now have to be developed under the new focus.

¹³³ DIHR and ICJ in particular develop and implement programmes on the basis of partner dialogue, which functions as a means of support to enhancing partner capacity.

partners in the programme portfolio. Similarly, the interviews underpinned the claim, evident in RWI programme documents, that the institute's non-civil society organisation (CSO) status combined with its autonomy made RWI an acceptable collaboration partner for public institutions and justice sector actors (particularly duty-bearer representatives), even (or particularly) in difficult human rights environments. This is supported by RWI's strong in-house and affiliated academic expertise in key human rights fields.

When it comes to **thematic focus (ii.)**, analysis of current programmes documents reflects a broader approach, with a focus on actors and processes rather than on specific themes.¹³⁴ However, the four thematic focus areas outlined in the new strategy, once fully implemented across the international programme portfolio, mark a radical shift. The Evaluation Team considers that fully aligning these with partner as well as Sida priorities may remain a challenge.

In terms of **context understanding (iii.)**, various evaluations comment that RWI seems to be represented in each context by highly qualified staff in terms of such key aspects as professional background and language fluency.¹³⁵ This was backed up in stakeholder interviews. This enables the institute to develop credible knowledge of the institutional landscape in which it is operating in each context. It further ensures RWI is well placed to connect to the complex human rights-specific and institutional landscape in each operational context, to identify the best entry points.

When it comes to making the most appropriate choices in each context with respect to **partners and presence (iv.)**, relevance is tied closely to the ability of the institution to present a credible theory of change for each intervention, which justifies partner identification and selection in terms of thematic and institutional relevance. The institutional rationale and internal RWI processes leading up to the development of each programme facilitate this. A key issue is to assess how most appropriately to ensure presence during programme implementation. This includes deciding on whether or not to establish a permanent presence, such as an office, within a country or sub-region/region. This process includes in particular consideration of partner needs and aspirations, and how to ensure best possible value for money weighed against overhead and administrative costs. The strategic rationale behind such decisions is an area where clarity and consistency could be improved.¹³⁶ Also, the

¹³⁴ For example, the academic cooperation programmes for Belarus, Turkey and Zimbabwe are quite open in terms of thematic focus beyond an emphasis on gender, leaving it to the partners to specify, for instance, themes for human rights education curricula. However, as noted above, certain specific themes may then also be incorporated with such an approach.

¹³⁵ For example, programme managers for Belarus are native Russian speakers.

¹³⁶ This was discussed in relation to the Regional Asia evaluations. In some cases, for instance in relation to Cambodia and China, the evaluations highlight the importance of a permanent presence in the country.

case programme documents the Evaluation Team reviewed could to some extent spell out more clearly the underlying theory of change that forms the basis for design of intervention strategy in this respect. However, interviews with external stakeholders in particular revealed that, in most cases, RWI actually managed to identify and engage with relevant partners in the context, and that, in terms of presence, this seems to be largely well motivated.

Finally, in terms of relevance of **programme development (v.)**, this combines the above-mentioned approaches and considerations in that it reflects all of them through the development of a results framework. Analysis of the programme documentation for the four cases shows that they combine and articulate all of the above, and thereby bring the various dimensions together in a coherent format. However, a number of evaluations still point to this as the area where RWI perhaps has the largest opportunity for improvement.¹³⁷

3.3.3 Widhre – effectiveness

In terms of RWI's **status (i.)**, the evaluations, as well as stakeholder interviews, emphasise its significance as fundamental to RWI's ability to operate and be relevant and effective in these contexts.

When it comes to **thematic focus (ii.)**, as discussed above the Evaluation Team finds the programme portfolio shows traces of a shift in thematic focus from civil and political rights to economic and social rights. Discussions with partners and stakeholders, as well as with RWI staff, reflected that this in some cases makes it easier for RWI to navigate in difficult human rights environments.¹³⁸ The choice of economic and social rights focus in some cases enables partner access and compatibility in a non-confrontational manner. However, it also brings into question RWI's role in terms of legitimacy – for example for civil society and academia, which are experiencing shrinking space and increased restrictions. A few of the interviewees hinted that this latter may be the case and, all in all, the Evaluation Team believes this new approach may challenge RWI's strategic priorities and directions. On the one hand, RWI may wish to choose to work with a specific actor or apply a particular focus, approaches or tools/methods for programme design. On the other hand, in implementing such a strategic approach, RWI may face the need to adapt the

¹³⁷ Examples include the evaluations for Turkey, MENA and Regional Africa. In the case of the latter, the evaluation stresses the need to enhance such capacity specifically within the partner institutions.

¹³⁸ This is one particular aspect that surfaced through the field visits to both Turkey and Zimbabwe. For instance, in Turkey, this enables collaboration with one partner university, which is clearly reaping the benefit of this less 'state-hostile' approach to gain operational freedom, funding, etc. In Zimbabwe, it is also recognised that a focus on vulnerable groups, equality and social aspects, for example for women, children and those with a disability, is a 'safe' focus that allows state partners an easier opportunity to participate in the programme.

implementation strategy, even to the extent of ceasing to work with specific institutional partners.¹³⁹ The adoption of thematic focus areas may facilitate broader anchoring, beyond single partner institutions, which also appears to have been one of RWI's considerations in this respect.

Closely connected to effectiveness is **context understanding (iii.)**. In evaluations as well as stakeholder interviews, partners generally praise RWI for having achieved and maintaining deep context knowledge and understanding. This not only applies to specific programme elements, such as mapping human rights challenges and actor fields, but also relates to the overall political, societal and cultural context. This also entails an ongoing reflection on how far to go: for instance, when it comes to being so 'elastic' in approach that almost 'anything goes', irrelevance is a risk. Furthermore, in these contexts, analysis of risks and assumptions and the development of mitigation strategies appear to be particularly essential.

A key point of reflection for RWI is its choice of **partners and presence (iv.)**. The programme documentation review shows an overall pattern of favouring multi-partner engagements. By engaging with a broad platform of partners and facilitating their interaction, as discussed above in relation to human rights education, RWI seems to be able to effectively and efficiently reach more of their designated target group, such as for trainings. The interviews also revealed that this allowed for stronger policy engagement. Finally, this enables RWI to shift partnerships more flexibly, such as in a changed climate, without losing all ability to interact with the constituency of previous partners.¹⁴⁰

In terms of presence, , the Evaluation Team in stakeholder dialogues addressed the question of whether physical permanent presence served as a prerequisite for deep and updated context understanding. This includes the ability to engage with and support partners to the greatest and most appropriate extent. In the most developed form, such presence involves registering a national or regionally based legal entity, with official status, an office space, a bank account and several staff members, many of whom are local. A drawback to this approach is that it embodies the risk that partner ownership and drive as well as accountability are less highly prioritised. Interviews with partners and external stakeholders revealed that the different solutions applied by RWI¹⁴¹ made sense in each particular case and enabled effective programme implementation.

¹³⁹ The discontinuation of the engagement with the justice sector in Turkey is a key example of this.

¹⁴⁰ As mentioned above, in Turkey the engagements with state/justice institutions, which originally formed a key element of the programme, have been discontinued. In Zimbabwe, this is also the case, albeit to a lesser extent, in favour of a more initial dialogue-oriented approach.

¹⁴¹ A presence in Turkey, a regional office in Asia and frequent visits by RWI staff to Belarus

Finally, in terms of **programme development (v.)**, the Evaluation Team reflects that this is an area where RWI can develop further. This finding is based on the document review of case programmes and is substantiated by several evaluations. Effectiveness in this respect ties to the development of consistent results frameworks, including mechanisms for monitoring that are actually applied and serve to ensure there is evidence to demonstrate the results achieved by the intervention. For example, this includes the development of similar frameworks for the theory of change, risks and assumptions and their ongoing management. Effectiveness in this respect also includes ensuring that handover between project managers is facilitated when necessary, including transfer of knowledge and maintenance of momentum in implementation. Although the Evaluation Team notes that, as far as we can see, the institute lacks systematic internal mechanisms for systematic knowledge-sharing, these must exist since programme implementation continues. Partners also stated that their interaction with RWI included interaction with several staff members, which helps ensure effectiveness in this respect.

3.3.4 Widhre – efficiency

As mentioned above, RWI's **status (i.)**, enhanced through long-term experience and a credible track record, is what enables the institution to act as a bridge-builder and facilitator of dialogue between different actors. This opens doors and allows the institution to engage, for example with high-level stakeholders, more easily. In terms of efficiency, this is likely to have a positive effect on the time and effort invested by RWI staff in achieving programme objectives and outcomes.

In terms of **thematic focus (ii.)**, as well as **context understanding (iii.)**, a similar reflection by the Evaluation Team is that efficiency can be measured in the manner in which RWI draws on local ownership and commitment to the engagement. In other words, choosing the most informed strategy by identifying those areas and interventions where RWI can achieve the desired outcomes most economically is how the institute can preserve and direct its resources in the most appropriate manner. Overall impressions from the interview process with partners seem to support this to some extent.

One area that the Evaluation Team picked up as significant in this respect is the question of **partners and presence (iv.)**. As stated above, RWI is a self-implementing organisation and works directly where change is intended to take place, rather than through, for instance, sub-granting mechanisms. This means that, in some cases, all programming costs, including staff fees, become proportionally higher than if the work involved simply related to the administration of transfers to partners. On this note, the Evaluation Team, through interviews with RWI staff as well as partners, detected a strong ambition to avoid to the greatest possible extent the risk of

and Zimbabwe.

mismanagement of funding. Interviews with different RWI members revealed some inconsistency as to whether RWI implements a ‘policy’ in this respect of not transferring funds to state institutions, or whether it funds staff in partner organisations. A budget review of case programmes and interviews with RWI staff and partners showed that some programmes actually provide fees for staff from partner institutions and other key stakeholders whereas others do not.¹⁴²

On another dimension of efficiency, interviews with stakeholders indicated that RWI tends to operate more on its own, rather than collaborating closely with other international actors in the same field,¹⁴³ except in cases where alignment on how to support the same partner is necessary.¹⁴⁴ In theory, based on the general experience of the Evaluation, permanent or at least regular presence by a self-implementing institution such as RWI is the most effective in terms of facilitating coordination and alignment with other stakeholders. With respect to the case countries, however, interviews with external stakeholders indicated that RWI actually manages to ensure such regular coordination and dialogue regardless of how the institute ensures its presence.

Speaking against the establishment of a country/regional office, several stakeholders as well as RWI staff put forward that this embodies an investment in terms of funding. This reduces flexibility in terms of, for instance, being able to pull out rapidly with minimal losses if a critical situation escalates in such a manner that RWI can no longer operate effectively on the ground – a scenario of volatility that characterises difficult human rights environments *per se*.

In terms of presence, partner interviews revealed that, at least in some cases, lack of a permanent nationally based focal point for programme implementation poses some challenges. However, the same sources and external stakeholders also testified to the ability of RWI to ensure ongoing interaction with partners on the ground as well as with other international and national stakeholders. Based on review of the programme documentation and budgets, the Evaluation Team wonders whether higher salary costs for Swedish staff in Lund than in partner countries for financial management mean less cost efficiency – at least in those cases when a suitable partner on the ground can be identified. The case examples show that RWI chooses different

¹⁴² For example, the Belarus programme provides honoraria for coordinators and various resource persons at various stages and in relation to different aspects of programme implementation, including coordination, through direct transfers to individuals from Lund. In contrast, the programme in Zimbabwe is managed without any regular support provided to staff at either of the institutions.

¹⁴³ Criticised, for example in the Myanmar and MENA evaluations. However, in Zimbabwe RWI has close collaboration with ICJ.

¹⁴⁴ A positive example of this is the joint Nordic engagement in China with respect to bringing together teachers from different universities for joint annual trainings.

strategies, including drawing on Lund staff as well as using designated local focal points for the reimbursement of local costs to academic partners depending on whether a local or regional office is in place, with different outcomes.¹⁴⁵ However, another key factor stressed during interviews with RWI staff and management, supported by the views of external stakeholders and partners in case programme contexts, is that keeping a low profile and engaging through local institutions minimises the risk of seeing the programme discredited on the basis of ‘foreign interference’. However, even transferring funding to partner institutions may in particularly difficult human rights environments be construed as interference as well.

In relation to **programme development (v.)**, an overall reflection of the evaluation team is that an essential factor is the apparent absence of systematic internal RWI vehicles for absorbing and circulating learning in relation to the various methods. We find this to be critical, since project managers shoulder significant individual responsibility in terms of programme development. Our assessment is that, without any systematic guidance on institutional best practice and lessons learnt, there is a real risk that programme development processes are not fully informed by ‘lessons learnt’ from previous or parallel engagements. This in the long run has a detrimental effect on the operationalisation of the various methods, sub-methods and approaches. As mentioned above in relation to, for example gender focal points, we note that this also has budgetary implications, which may pose a challenge to accommodate within a programme-funding-based institutional economy.

3.3.5 Widhre – sustainability

In terms of RWI’s **status (i.)**, dialogue with partners and external stakeholders strongly reflected that the institute has managed to create a strong global network of individuals who anchor programmatic activity around the world in targeted contexts. This owes not least, as indicated above, to the reputation of RWI as a long-renowned institution in its field, which facilitates long-term engagement in the respective contexts. Sustainability is in this way achieved by ensuring that individuals continue their engagement with the institute, ideally by anchoring in more comprehensive engagement between RWI and their own context and organisational affiliation.

As also mentioned above, RWI appears to combine this networking with accurate identification of **thematic focus (ii.)** in terms of addressing those areas where it is possible to most significantly affect and contribute to long-term outcomes. When deep **context understanding (iii.)** further underpins this, as seems to be the case, sustainability is more likely.

¹⁴⁵ In Turkey, there is capacity to administer the programme. In Belarus, a focal point at the partner institution level is designated to ensure programme implementation. The Jakarta office oversees implementation of the regional Asia programme for the entire region. In Zimbabwe, programme management is carried out from Lund.

When it comes to **partners and presence (iv.)**, in terms of the first of these, and regardless of whether RWI maintains a permanent presence, challenges may still arise in relation to partner collaboration and, ultimately, possible withdrawal from a partner engagement. As reflected in discussions with RWI staff and external stakeholders, and supported by the general experience of the Evaluation Team, changing partners between different phases of a long-term engagement is one way of ensuring flexibility and sustainability. However, the same sources also pointed out the clear risk of losing key partner commitment, built over a longer period of interaction and serving as the basis for mutual trust.¹⁴⁶

Finally, in relation to **programme development (v.)**, the Evaluation Team finds that, in principle, sustainability includes the development of transparent and foreseeable strategies for ongoing learning and reflection processes within the partner institutions. This should include exit strategies that will allow the partner institutions to eventually take over programmatic aspects themselves. However, a review of the case programme documentation shows that, in general, clearly defined exit strategies are absent. The Evaluation Team also finds that, in engaging with partners, the aim should be to anchor skills within and across the partner institutions, to enable them to utilise them effectively on their own beyond the duration of RWI's engagement. This may be achieved, if not through targeted activities of systematic capacity development, then at least through ongoing interaction with capable RWI staff in relation to all stages of the programme management cycle. The review of programme documentation as well as dialogue with partners echoed what was heard in interviews with RWI staff: that programme frameworks do not always include specific efforts to develop the capacity of partner institutions. However, according to the same sources, ongoing and implicit capacity development efforts, carried out by RWI staff in their interactions with partners, in fact serve this purpose. Some of the evaluations also point out this feature, recommending that efforts be enhanced by ensuring RWI staff members are capable of undertaking this.

¹⁴⁶ For example, in the case of Turkey (originally, although abandoned later), Belarus (tentatively) and China, initial academic cooperation has paved the way for including a focus on justice sector institutions, as well as for engagement with other actors under a more thematic umbrella.

4 Conclusions

4.1 HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION

On the basis of the findings, this evaluation concludes that the methods applied by RWI in the area of human rights education are overall relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable. At the same time, we observe a number of challenges to the fulfilment of these criteria, both at a general level and in relation to specific sub-methods.

In terms of *strengths*, at an overall level, academically based human rights education as applied in RWI programming through the identified sub-methods is a ‘flagship’ of RWI. Over the decades, this has emerged as a comprehensive area that seems to have added value to the global human rights environment, through the development of cadres of professionally qualified graduates specialised in this field. RWI’s partnerships with academic institutions reflect a successful approach to strengthening institutional human rights capacity. RWI possesses a number of organisational qualities that enable it to develop partnerships with academic institutions. These include academic legitimacy through RWI’s own teaching and research experience; access to global academic networks of scholars in relevant fields of human rights; and a track record of navigating these, not least in difficult human rights environments (see below). The academic partnerships provide a platform within the countries from which to access key individuals within academic settings, such as teachers, researchers, librarians and students, and beyond in different sectors of society. This offers RWI opportunities to collaborate closely faculties of law and social science and relevant departments at universities to design and implement different activities under human rights education.

The various sub-methods applied by RWI, as identified and categorised by the Evaluation Team, all embody different strengths and challenges. At the same time, they combine into one comprehensive methodological framework.

Specifically, **human rights education programmes** have proven their relevance, effectiveness and sustainability by contributing to the production of skilled professionals to be absorbed into the general human rights environments in partner countries and regions.

Notably, **clinical legal education** comes across as an overall successful sub-method for education on human rights, as it aims to strengthen practical and social justice aspects of legal education and to produce law graduates with relevant legal skills, knowledge and values to address these. In addition, efforts in this area serve to broaden understandings of social challenges in environments where they are implemented. As operationalised by RWI, CLE has the potential for developing into a firmer conceptualised sub-method in itself, and allows for the exchange of knowledge and experience across programmes in different regions.

RWI's efforts to support **research** pave the way to ground human rights education in a robust understanding of context-specific human rights issues. Furthermore, it also provides a knowledge base for national dialogue- and policy-making and thus proves to be of broader relevance. RWI is strongly positioned for human rights research through its ability to draw on networks in the Global South as well as the Global North, as well as its own presence worldwide. This includes the facility in Lund, where researchers and students from programme countries, facilitated through scholarships and grants, can spend time on studies and research accessing a highly specialised library. An additional value added by RWI in this respect lies in assisting researchers in their efforts to publish their research (in particular those from partner programme countries and regions where such possibilities are often lacking) through the most appropriate means.

Institutional support to **libraries** at partner institutions by RWI provides researchers and educators with access to essential international and local resource materials. Its relevance therefore lies in the manner in which such support effectively underpins the efforts of the other sub-methods and contributes to their effectiveness.

RWI's support for **networking among academia** is a successful sub-method as it reinforces linking and promotes synergy between individual universities and their staff in partner countries and regions. In addition to providing relevance and added value, it further serves to maximise efficiency and sustainability, for instance in relation to capacity development of partner institutions.

With respect to **societal dialogue/outreach involving multiple actors**, through support by RWI in this area, the academic institutions appear well positioned to serve as relevant and effective platforms for broader stakeholder networking and exchange across sectors.

Similarly, the **professional training programmes** come across as a particularly useful sub-method to bring together key stakeholders from within academic institutions with those from the justice sector, public institutions and CSOs and other key human rights stakeholders. As stated above, academic human rights education constitutes the principal method RWI employs at the individual level through increased knowledge on human rights law and gender equality and at the institutional level through higher quality in teaching and training. This then provides RWI with a certain level of credibility and hence a platform to engage with government institutions. Professional training can complement other sub-methods of human rights education by contributing to informal engagement and dialogue between different stakeholders on perspectives and issues essential for the promotion and protection of human rights and gender equality.

Finally, in terms of **programming development processes**, RWI has considerable broad and comparative experience in developing relevant frameworks addressing human rights through education and institutional capacity development. This entails familiarity and fluency among key staff to develop such documentation in accordance with, for instance, Sida requirements.

However, the Evaluation Team also observes a number of *challenges*, both of a more general nature and in relation to the various sub-methods. These form the basis for concrete recommendations.

At an overall level, RWI's degree of influence in partner programme contexts depends on a number of factors. These include the local political context; the degree of commitment shown by the local academic institutions to stay engaged and take ownership of the development process; levels of trust between RWI and partners; and transparency around the intentions and project goals. It also depends on RWI's own organisational capacity to identify relevant academic institutions, and key and committed individuals within these at all levels, as well as within justice sector and public institutions, who can advocate for and promote the partnership as well as human rights change. In all this, RWI's staff members are crucial to building and developing personal relationships through trustful dialogue and support to academic institutions to strengthen their institutional human rights capacity. There is plenty of knowledge and experience among RWI staff in terms of such engagement, but it seems that formal mechanisms for sharing knowledge and experience within the organisation and across programmes are lacking (**see recommendation 1**).

To be able to fully measure the effects of academic human rights education in the long term and beyond individuals, there is a need for more systematic and solid baselines at an institutional as well as an individual level, including on qualitative aspects. This would entail, for instance, ongoing tracking of graduate career trajectories (**see recommendation 2**).

In terms of **programming development processes**, a challenge to effectiveness remains as a result of the lack of systematic institutional sharing of experience within RWI on the application of the various methods mentioned above. This, in combination with the fact that the main responsibility for programme drafting rests with individual RWI managers in respective contexts, means the resulting results frameworks are comparatively uneven in nature. Also, when it comes to, for example, defining realistic outcomes and developing strong theories of change, RWI programming illustrates well the complexity of the human rights field. Programme frameworks need to better accommodate this. This will also necessitate dialogue for a common understanding on this between Sida and RWI (**see recommendation 3**).

In terms of **academic human rights education programmes**, RWI, in order to remain relevant, should consider when to move beyond basic and general programmes to tailored and more specific ones. Future focus might be on supporting human rights education at the post-graduate level, and on less general and more narrowly focused courses. This should include consideration of in-depth specialisation in particular areas that are key within the context. Furthermore, RWI should further draw on capacity already in place within the partner institutions, including in terms of the identification of resource persons (**see recommendation 4**).

Successful implementation of **clinical legal education** is best ensured when it is integrated into legal and human rights education. This means that the activities are conducted under the supervision of qualified academic staff, drawing on experienced law clinicians and legal practitioners, and incorporated into curricula and materials. The success of CLE programmes rests on partner institutions' faculties and therefore also relies on financial and administrative commitment, including staff allocation. Whereas RWI has made progress in the area of integrating CLE into human rights education, further strengthening the already ongoing RWI and partner-based

exchange of experience and concept development would increase the effectiveness of such efforts (**see recommendation 5**).

In terms of **research support**, for effectiveness and efficiency it is desirable that individual researchers from overseas come under the ongoing supervision or mentorship of senior RWI researchers, or equivalent associated expertise, to help them further develop professionally. This requires RWI to maintain a strong base of high-level research capacity, in-house as well as through institutional networks in partner countries and regions. Furthermore, as the publication of research from programme contexts increases, as a result of enhanced capacity among academia there, this area faces significant resource constraints, is time consuming and is often associated with a high risk of delay. This type of support may therefore be difficult to reconcile with traditional programme modalities. For this reason, the development of more long-term publication strategies and funding modalities for research is essential (**see recommendation 6**).

With respect to **library support**, documenting further effects for instance through systematic tracking of the usage of literature and materials enables the provision of a fact-base that substantiates and qualifies effectiveness and relevance, including when it comes to subjects and language of publications. Commitment to ensure the maintenance of materials and facilities needs to be secured to promote further sustainability (**see recommendation 7**).

A serious challenge observed in relation to effectiveness of **networking among academia** relates to careful facilitation and regular follow-up. As many professionals have busy calendars and struggle to deliver on their different commitments, networking in the form of systematic experience exchange and learning may not be prioritised, and important interfaces with other members of academia are neglected and risk slowly vanishing. Thus, RWI would be wise, when necessary, to strengthen its role as a facilitator and to develop feasible and realistic plans with strong buy-in from stakeholders to gradually transfer the ownership of networking to partners. This does not in all cases seem to be the reality today, and RWI still needs to develop and nurture existing platforms with careful attention to risks and assumptions in the context, ensuring the most appropriate solution in each case (**see recommendation 8**).

With respect to **societal dialogue and outreach**, maintaining close dialogue with all stakeholder groups and seeking to explore, on an ongoing basis, possibilities for finding common ground on specific topics is one way for RWI to contribute to bringing such groups closer to one another. Similarly, RWI's partnerships with academic institutions, although they do not automatically translate into a ticket for RWI to access other key stakeholders, enable platforms for discussion and promote the further strengthening of human rights and gender equality. In terms of challenges, the societal human rights climate and, in particular, the general relationship between state and non-state actors may make it very difficult to achieve constructive results in this area. RWI has an opportunity to facilitate constructive dialogue on a factual basis, drawing in particular on research capacity and findings in key areas of common interest (**see recommendation 9**).

4.2 GENDER MAINSTREAMING

On the basis of the findings above, the Evaluation Team finds that RWI's application of gender mainstreaming in programming is still developing, but existing methods have proven successful where operationalised. In the four case programmes, successful gender mainstreaming has been achieved, to varying degrees, with concept papers developed for three of them. This also includes, in some instances, the incorporation of gender indicators into results frameworks and/or M&E plans. In terms of relevance, this seems to be assured in all four cases. In terms of effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability it is still too early to make definitive conclusions beyond individual programmes, although indications are that the methods, if they are further developed and applied systematically in a consolidated manner, may well ensure this.

In terms of *strengths*, the programmes reflect strong intentions and relevant approaches, including, as a minimum, the development and implementation of M&E frameworks that incorporate gender aspects. One reason behind successful gender mainstreaming seems to be the ambition to follow a structured approach, but also to '*address human rights and gender equality together, concentrating on their common and complimentary aspects*'¹⁴⁷ (RWI). The success probably owes to the application of gender mainstreaming (*working with all gender of all ages*) all along the programme cycle. In this area, RWI is in the process of further developing the necessary tools in the form of guides and checklists, as indicated by programme concept papers and reflections by the Evaluation Team on the overall work, so it can implement these effectively in each phase of programming.

The RWI staff dimension has proven itself to be of importance, since programmes where core staff has a high degree of gender capacity are the ones where efforts seem to have materialised most consistently. In these cases, gender mainstreaming is well reflected in programme design and M&E. In addition, these programmes also seem to be the ones where the RWI-designated gender focal point based in Lund has been most strongly and systematically involved, from planning and design to implementation.

One possible approach to maximise effectiveness is to further link gender equality with human rights education, which also allows for the increasing use of research products on human rights and gender equality for public policy dialogue.

When it comes to *challenges*, there is a clear need to further integrate the gender dimension in all relevant types of analyses. For this purpose, retaining the institutional focal point on gender will be essential (see recommendation 10).

¹⁴⁷ RWI. 2017. 'Promoting Gender Equality. Methods, results and lessons learned'. <http://rwi.lu.se/app/uploads/2017/06/Gender-Equality-Brief.pdf>

Another element of RWI's structured approach is the design of gender-based indicators and its investment in baselines. This includes the development of questionnaires for participants in various capacity development processes to use in monitoring and assessing implementation. It is too early to say whether the design of indicators and baselines in the various programmes is sufficiently tailored to meet the intended purposes. Regardless, this provides opportunities for learning, provided there is enough time for strategic reflection. It will be important to be able to systematically capture lessons learnt from what has so far been developed in this area, so as to be able to take the work to the next level (**see recommendation 11**).

Research and analysis must focus on context, actors and power structures to identify gender inequalities and develop measures to redress these. It needs to be further strengthened by ensuring sufficient in-house capacity for this purpose, while existing and other research needs to better integrate a gender equality perspective. Also, contextual relevance needs to be assured, and research in this area cannot be limited to desk studies, considering that in some cases access to data and information may be possible only through fieldwork in one form or another. RWI research funding modalities should continue to support this (**see recommendation 12**).

A final factor that drives success in gender mainstreaming is the existence of an active and committed environment in partner institutions that focus on gender equality, ideally with appropriate gender balance and gender focal point representation in programme/partner steering committees or similar programme implementation mechanisms. This is considered a crucial component in ensuring gender mainstreaming (**see recommendation 13**).

4.3 WORKING IN DIFFICULT HUMAN RIGHTS ENVIRONMENTS

Navigating in authoritarian states where people live under oppression is what RWI needs to do both strategically and on a daily basis in its operations. The analysis above demonstrates that RWI has well documented its ability to work in such difficult human rights environments, generating results and contributing to outcomes in the human rights field that are relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable.

In terms of *strengths*, one key factor relates to the organisational **status**, in particular the fact that RWI is an independent institution firmly based in an academic setting and operating in a non-monitoring manner. RWI's work is admittedly rather technical, in terms of enhancing the institutional human rights capacity and gender equality of academic institutions and government institutions as well as other organisations. However, it is precisely this quality that has proven effective as an entry point for engagement in these contexts. At the same time, remaining effective means investing significant efforts in establishing and maintaining relations with these actors, not least those in government. RWI, by virtue of the institute's distinct combination of status and organisational qualities, appears to have the strong credibility needed to establish and maintain such relations. The overall experience of the Evaluation Team in the human rights field shows that RWI through these

combined aspects has a status comparable to relatively few other institutions globally. This does not imply that other institutions in Sweden or globally do not share some of the same traits – but the specific combination that characterises RWI is not, in the view of the Evaluation Team, like that of any other institutions in the human rights field.

In terms of **thematic focus**, RWI is shifting its focus in two ways. One aspect is the implementation of its current (2017–2021) Strategic Plan, which, in the long run, should imply a shift overall from an actor/activity focus to a thematic one (without compromising on necessary human rights institutional capacity elements required programmatically). It is too early at this stage to assess how this may affect the relevance aspects of programmes. The other, less tangible, tendency observed during the evaluation, in cases where the space for direct engagement on civil and political rights is diminishing, is to shift focus away from these when pragmatically relevant to do so. This appears to be closely connected to availability of partners and based on stakeholder dialogue as well as context understanding.

When it comes to **context understanding**, RWI's work in difficult human rights environments is carried out against a background where the socio-political context and dynamics consistently interfere with human rights development. This complexity means that RWI, in order to be both relevant and effective, needs to operate with considerable skill and understanding. Our analysis shows that this is the case. Engagement with the human rights education and research environment, continuous progressive work on gender equality and the application of non-confrontational methods appear to be crucial elements in building platforms for dialogue and outreach for work in difficult contexts. In many cases, long-term engagement and on-site presence further ensure this. This also reflects the capacity of RWI to maintain a body of highly skilled and experienced staff.

In terms of **partners and presence**, RWI is primarily a self-implementing organisation and works directly where change is intended to take place rather than through, for instance, sub-granting mechanisms. This sets it apart from many other pure development organisations, especially international organisations with cooperation agreements with international donors or governments, which in many cases work by forwarding funds to regional, national and/or local partners for them to implement programmes aimed at achieving their organisational objectives.

Our analysis testifies to the fact that the general approach of RWI is marked by a strategy of multiple as well as long-term partner engagement. This appears to be a successful approach for ensuring both effectiveness and sustainability in particular. The choice to engage primarily with academia in each specific context opens doors for RWI to engage with other actors as well, including those at state level. Conversely, RWI has in the past often not focused on engaging specifically with civil society beyond including such actors in multi-stakeholder activity. Choice of the most relevant modality for presence in each context (i.e. management of programme implementation from Lund; from a regional office; or from in-country permanent presence) seems to be driven to a large extent by considerations of relevance for partner engagement as well as effectiveness aspects, in terms of operational flexibility

especially in volatile contexts. In addition, each solution seems also to reflect considerations of efficiency.

With respect to **programmatic development**, all of the elements above need, as mentioned throughout this report, to be more strongly reflected in documentation within a subtle yet substantiated theory of change for each programme and intervention. This includes the presentation of strong rationales for choices of partner and focus, as well as credible reflections on risks and assumptions. This is to some extent the case for most of the programmes reviewed.

In terms of *challenges*, when it comes to **status** RWI falls in its own category institutionally, being neither a non-governmental organisation nor a public institution, and operates solely on a programme funding basis without any core support. It is a challenge to reconcile with the current funding structure the need for a strong institutional anchoring, with in-house expertise and mechanisms for knowledge-sharing across programmes, operating in the field of institutional capacity development through partnership-related processes (**see recommendation 14**).

With respect to **thematic focus**, most current programmes funded by Sida, including three of the case programmes, were designed prior to adoption of the new RWI institutional strategy. This means that, in order to support programme implementation, RWI needs to implement the new strategy with due flexibility to encompass the current portfolio. At the same time, this includes developing the current portfolio to meet strategic objectives, ensuring in all cases that programmes are sufficiently and appropriately institutionally anchored and supported (**see recommendation 15**).

In terms of **context understanding**, RWI needs to ensure this is organisationally grounded, specifically by ensuring that responsible programme managers and staff in charge of regional or national offices deliberately transfer their knowledge to colleagues to ensure continuity (**see recommendation 16**).

On **partners and presence**, and specifically in contexts where state actors contribute to shrinking space for civil society, RWI must consider its strategy for partnerships with state institutions very carefully, and translate the cooperation into effective ways to deepen their commitment to human rights and gender equality. This includes constantly seeking out the most effective means of bringing duty-bearer and rights-holder representatives together in constructive dialogue, actively using academic institutions as legitimate platforms for this.

An ambition that RWI needs to carefully follow up and assess is the involvement and commitment of the key partners at management level, including through programme steering committees. Where such mechanisms exist, they can be very good for ensuring local ownership and supporting management of activities, also facilitating an atmosphere of increased openness and transparency. This then additionally enables a climate where risks can be discussed and helps inform and guide ‘what can be done and what can’t be done’ in the respective context. This promotes alignment with the intervention strategy developed together with the partners. RWI recognises rightly that its operations are in some cases vulnerable to risks of individuals within the partner organisations being replaced or leaving their

positions. Further institutional anchoring combined with acknowledging the importance of these individual ‘drivers’ is essential.

Specifically on engaging partners in handling programme funds, RWI approaches this with caution and from a risk management perspective. In certain cases, the approach in this area needs to be carefully considered in relation to potential efficiency gains, balanced with risks (**see recommendation 17**).

In terms of **programme development**, the Evaluation Team observes that the depth of risk analysis does differ among programmes, and that programme documentation should more explicitly link and manage risks at the macro (national) and micro (intervention) level. This speaks to the need for greater alignment of a clearly spelled out theory of change, and related frameworks. In addition, exit strategies tend to be absent from programme documents. In line with everything mentioned above, RWI stresses the importance of being flexible in its programming. This means that activities or even objectives may have to change as a result of socio-political changes. In several cases, the dialogue with Sida has been supportive, enabling RWI to be flexible in order to align with changes that have a critical impact on programming. However, further efforts of developing programme frameworks that are specifically tailored to implementation in difficult human rights contexts, including theories of change and risk analysis and mitigation, within the framework of Sida requirements and in dialogue with Sida and partners, seems essential (**see recommendation 18**).

5 Recommendations

In this section, the Evaluation Team presents the recommendations, drawing on the conclusions. These aim to enhance the effectiveness, quality or efficiency of methods employed by RWI.

Human rights education

1. RWI should develop and implement an *internal mechanism for anchoring knowledge and experience on human rights education* within the organisation and across programmes. This includes the designation of focal point(s) within the institution for this purpose. The aim should be to ensure systematic learning is anchored throughout the entire organisation; reflected in the engagement with programme partners for ongoing capacity development; and fully utilised in all stages of the project management cycle.
2. RWI should strengthen *internal mechanisms for RBM and programme development*, drawing on institutional mechanisms addressed in Recommendation 1. RWI should in particular strengthen the application of systematic and consistent procedures and routines for planning, monitoring and evaluation. This includes and requires elaboration of an explicit ‘theory of change’ at the programme level, with assumptions and risks that can be monitored to make it possible to inform programme implementation on necessary changes in relation to activities, partners, thematic areas and/or strategic objectives. Furthermore, this includes the institutionalisation of such capacity across the organisation, in order to ensure staff at all levels can engage with partners in such a way that they can support them to enhance the quality of RBM while managing development processes, in particular planning and reporting processes.
3. RWI should further develop and implement tools for *mapping and baselining* key aspects of human rights education, including the career trajectories of academic programme graduates, to put in place a fact-base to document the longer-term effects of academic human rights education programmes.
4. RWI should consider, in dialogue with partners and when relevant, moving beyond basic and general academic human rights education programmes, towards *providing for graduate- and post-graduate-level in-depth specialisation in key human rights areas*.

5. RWI should ensure and systematise the development of methodologies and concepts on *clinical legal education*. RWI should also promote exchanges of experience between partners and internally, and ensure partner ownership and institutional commitment to CLE for sustainability.
6. RWI should strengthen internal and associated *research capacity*. The aim should be to enhance linking between research and the international programmes, in order to effectively design evidence-based local interventions. This should include drawing on thematic and geographic networks and on research capacity already developed through programmes and in partner contexts. Furthermore, as addressed under Recommendation 1 on institutional learning, RWI should develop good practice from programme experience on how to support and develop local and regional research capacity. Finally, efforts in this area should cover the publication of research, including strategic and funding mechanism enabling this.
7. RWI should continue to consider how best to *support library development* and ensure sustainability with partner institutions by ensuring their commitment to maintaining all aspects of these facilities. This includes developing and implementing tools to assess the usage of materials to better evaluate long-term effects.
8. RWI should continue to support *academic networking* and identify ways to ensure more effective facilitation and the durability of networking platforms.
9. RWI should continue to support *societal dialogue/outreach involving multiple actors*, utilising academia as well as institutional qualities to bring rights-holder and duty-bearer representatives together. This also includes the development and implementation of measures for the systematic use of research findings and capacity to ensure such dialogue is fact-based.

Gender mainstreaming

10. RWI should maintain and further support an internal institutional *gender focal point*.
11. RWI should continue and strengthen efforts to develop and implement *tools and methods* for ensuring gender mainstreaming throughout the portfolio in light of lessons learnt from programme implementation in this area.
12. RWI should strengthen *in-house research capacity on gender equality* and consider supporting, also as part of programme activity and in collaboration with partners, the further development of *field-based research on gender equality aspects* relating to human rights.

13. RWI should continue and systematically engage in dialogue with partners on how to ensure the presence of active and committed *gender focal points within their institutions* (at appropriate levels) and how to engage them in all aspects of the programme management cycle.

Working in difficult human rights environments

14. RWI should actively draw on its *distinct status* in programme engagements. Furthermore, RWI should continue and critically and speedily examine how to ensure institutional anchoring and support of current as well as future programmes under its current Strategic Plan and organisational structure. This includes engaging with Sida on how to flexibly adapt, if necessary, current results frameworks.
15. RWI should, in close dialogue with Sida, identify various ways *to support cross-programmatic and institutional anchoring of lessons learnt* for continued efficiency in terms of applying methods and approaches. This includes, in particular, maintaining designated and internal focal points and internal learning processes, as addressed in the recommendations above.
16. RWI should continue and strengthen efforts to *institutionalise context understanding* beyond that of individuals, especially at the level of country- and region-specific programme management and offices.
17. RWI should increase efforts to *implement programmes through a further strengthened partnership approach*, which, when relevant and possible, could also transfer increased responsibility for the management of funds to partner institutions, including through an increased presence of accountability mechanisms.
18. RWI should increase efforts to develop *programme frameworks* as addressed above in Recommendations 1 and 2, which are specifically tailored to implementation in difficult human rights contexts. This should include the development of specified and credible theories of change and risk analysis and mitigation, within the framework of Sida requirements and in dialogue with Sida and partners.

Recommendations for Sida

19. Sida should consider using this report as a tool for the operationalization of “Strategi för Sveriges utvecklingssamarbete avseende arbetet med de mänskliga rättigheterna, demokrati och rättstatens principer 2018-2022”. For the purpose of effective implementation of the strategy in engagement with stakeholders including RWI in countries where Sida operates, the presentation of findings in this report allows Sida to learn about working methods for developing institutional human rights and gender equality capacity. The report

- provides an innovative break-down of these overarching working methods and approaches into specific sub-methods for developing institutional human rights and gender equality capacity. Each of these should be considered on their own or in combination with each other, given the intervention objective and context. In this way the report provides specific insight into and understanding of how each sub-method should be applied and adapted to the particular context where Sida is engaged. Sida should therefore use this report as an overall reference for supporting interventions within the field of human rights, democracy and rule of law, including assessing proposals also in relation to other stakeholders than RWI and for partner dialogue during the follow up phase in fulfilment of the objectives of the above-mentioned strategy.
20. Sida should circulate the evaluation report *among programme managers* responsible for Sida's support to RWI, as well as to relevant policy specialists on human rights, democracy and rule of law.
 21. Sida should consider the sensitive challenge for RWI and similar stakeholders to facilitate cooperation between different governmental actors and non-governmental organisations due to shrinking space for civil society and potentially tense relations between actors when it comes to human rights issues. Sida should, given the local context and underlying dynamic in difficult human rights environment, prompt partners in developing comprehensive risk management systems to enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of their work. This should include documented capacity and processes for identifying, assessing and addressing risks at the intervention level and in relation to direct and indirect stakeholders. Sida should prompt partner organisations to increase risk awareness reflected at headquarter and field levels.
 22. Sida should ensure, as far as possible, a highly conflict-sensitive and flexible approach to RWI's programmes, by recognizing any existing and potential risks for both project implementation and achievement of results, and allowing for necessary adaptation. Sida should therefore carry out its own conflict sensitivity assessment of RWI's programmes and other partners working in difficult human rights environments to prompt learning and accountability to ensure conflict-sensitive programming.

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Global Review of Programme Work Methods of the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law

Background

The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (RWI) is a charitable trust and a non-profit organisation, founded in 1984. The Institute is an independent academic institution, with a mission to contribute to a wider understanding of and respect for human rights and international humanitarian law. The Institute engages in research and academic education, as well as in institutional capacity development programmes, in Sweden, and abroad in some ten countries and regions. RWI has an agreement of cooperation with Lund University and is closely affiliated with the University, in particular the Faculty of Law.

Since 2015, RWI has undergone an organisational reform process, which has included adopting four thematic focus areas to guide the Institute's work overall and a new organisational structure accordingly. In early 2017, a new five-year RWI strategic plan was also adopted.

In 2016, the RWI budget for international programmes with Sida funding amounted to around MSEK 68. Sida is the largest donor to RWI, contributing to approximately 82 percent of its total budget in 2016. Sida and RWI have cooperated since the early 1990s, presently covering bilateral and regional programmes in Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Eastern Europe. RWI's programme partners have mainly been National Human Rights Institutions, academic institutions and justice sector institutions. The funding is not provided as a global core contribution, but as separate funding by Embassies or Sida-HQ to country and/or regional RWI programmes when Sida has assessed that RWI has a comparative advantage. Sida's contributions are regulated by an overall "Agreement on General Conditions" (2013-2017), as well as funding-wise by sub-agreements for the specific programme contributions.

Evaluations and reviews have been carried out over the last five years of practically all individual RWI country or regional programmes, initiated either by Sida or RWI (see enclosed list of external evaluations and reviews), but no review has been done to look at aspects which substance-wise and methodologically cut across the programmes in the different countries and/or regions.

To further support the cooperation between Sida and RWI, it has been decided to carry out a global review regarding RWI's Sida-financed programmes in order to strengthen learning, at both RWI and Sida, with regard to work methods used in RWI's international programmes. As such, the review would have a strong focus on utility, and serve to help improving RWI programmes further and in this way also facilitate Sida appraisals of ongoing and future such programmes. The review is also

expected to feed into discussions, as appropriate, between Sida and RWI regarding the development of a new General Agreement to regulate the cooperation overall.

Sida and RWI are the principal stakeholders of the review. RWI programme partners and beneficiaries are additional stakeholders.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this review is to provide inputs for improving conditions for positive results achievement in RWI (Sida-financed) programmes aimed at developing institutional human rights capacity. The focus of the review is work methods relating to RWI's programmes. The review is expected to strengthen learning within RWI, as well as with Sida, when it comes to positive results achievement of work methods used in RWI international programmes.

The review will have a focus on the methodology used by RWI in programmes in relation to: a) human rights education; b) gender mainstreaming; c) working in difficult human rights environments, in relation to human rights institutional capacity development (assessing also the comparative advantages of RWI in this respect).

In view of this, the objectives of the evaluation of the RWI are to:

Establish the relevance of the work methods used by RWI, and how effective they are for achieving intended institutional human rights capacity development results of sustainable nature, identifying areas of particularly strong performance as well as those in need of being enhanced

Provide recommendations, on the basis of lessons drawn from the above findings, in terms of suggestions for relevant improvements of work methods for future positive results achievement in the areas assessed and for improving learning within RWI of positive as well as negative experiences of work methods used.

The results of the review are primarily to be used by RWI in future programmes, but Sida is also expected to be able to use the results in relation to RWI, and other, programmes. The review should provide recommendations to RWI which can feed into the preparation of new programme proposals from 2017 and onwards and into the continued strategic and organisational development of the Institute, taking into account the organisational reform process and current strategic priorities of RWI. The review is however not limited to new programmes. Relevant findings should where possible also contribute to the development of ongoing activities.

In addition, the recommendations will provide input to Sida's country/region teams when considering a possible continuation of current, or starting up new, funding of RWI programmes. Also, the review is expected to feed into discussions, as appropriate, between Sida and RWI regarding the development of a new General Agreement, as from 2018, to regulate the cooperation overall. RWI programme partners are additional expected users of the review results in relation to future cooperation with RWI and for their own programmes. Additionally, other donors and institutions working with these methods are also expected to benefit from the results of the review for their work in the areas under review.

Scope and Limitations

The review shall be limited to the work methods mentioned in the previous section and cover their use in RWI Sida-financed international programmes during the time period 2013-2016.

The review shall be global in nature, i.e. not focusing on a specific RWI programme, but the application of the work methods in question across all RWI programmes. However, to ensure a manageable scope of the review, it shall have a particular focus on maximum four programmes, two in-depth through field visits and two by way of desk study. In this respect, the scope will serve to ensure that it is representative covering programmes marked by mixed developmental and political conditions, as well as in relation to the particular application of the methods in focus, also ensuring geographical variation.¹⁴⁸

The review will not assess results – or performance – as such of RWI programmes since this is assessed in programme-specific evaluations, but work methods to achieve results.

The review will focus on the quality of RWI's work and methods, in relation to achieving expected results, and will not specifically assess efficiency aspects relating to RWI programmes overall.

The review shall not duplicate what has already been assessed in previous evaluations, reviews and audits of RWI programmes carried out during the period 2011-2016, but rather complement, add value to and draw on these.

Organisation, Management and Stakeholders

Sida is responsible for the review, and as such a principal stakeholder. In addition, RWI is a principal stakeholder as the primary object of the review. Sida and RWI will cooperate in the performance of all phases of the review. RWI's partners are also stakeholders and are to be closely involved in the review.

RWI are the primary users of the conclusions of the review, while also Sida and RWI partners are additional implementers of possible recommendations. It is however expected that the conclusions of the evaluation and recommendations put forward would be useful also to other parties with similar interests. In the performance of the review, the evaluators shall at all times remain in close contact and consult with Sida and RWI for purposes of relaying the work done and receiving feedback and input on the ongoing work.

It is important that the review focuses on aspects of organisation and management contributing to the usefulness of findings and recommendations. This implies a strong emphasis on learning on the part of the principal stakeholders through on-going discussion regarding the review, to which the stakeholders are expected to provide important contributions, including in relation to tentative findings.

¹⁴⁸ For field visits, logistics, in particular with a view to the travel time between the selected countries given the limited time available for the review, and security, i.e. selecting countries where access and travel opportunities are not severely restricted by security concerns, are additional factors in relation to the scope of the review.

Sida is responsible for disseminating the report from the review, whereas RWI is responsible for disseminating findings internally within its organisation and to programme partners.

The evaluators shall for the carrying out of the review further specify how quality assurance will be handled by them, by drawing on the participation in the review of the principal stakeholders and their contributions in this respect. The review must be an inclusive process, involving principal stakeholders.

With regard to the organisation and management of the review in relation to reporting, timeframes and deliverables applicable, etc., please see relevant sections below.

Review Criteria and Questions

In order to achieve its purpose and objectives, the review shall be guided by, but not necessarily limited to, certain review questions as follows:

Relevance

Assess the relevance of the methods employed by RWI to develop institutional human rights capacity; are the methods, as used by RWI, adequate in relation to the main results RWI programmes seek to achieve as well as the needs and situation of intended beneficiaries and programme partners?

Effectiveness

Assess the effectiveness of the methods as used by RWI; to what extent have these methods influenced positive achievement of expected results (qualitatively and quantitatively); what are the main factors (including the use of RBM) that have affected positive results achievement, and which have affected non-achievement of results?

Efficiency

Assess the cost effectiveness of the different methods used; have measures been/are measures taken during planning and implementation to ensure that resources are efficiently used for implementation of the methods; could the methods employed be implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results; and could the methods be employed differently using the same amount of resources to achieve more and better results?

Sustainability

Assess sustainability aspects of the methods used; to what extent are the methods consistent with partners' priorities; to what extent is there a local/regional ownership of the methods and in what ways do the methods contribute to such ownership of programmes; and to what extent do the methods used provide for mechanisms for, as and when appropriate, exiting or transitioning from interventions?

As the review is not directly concerned with assessing or establishing the effects as such of RWI programmes, impact is not a criterion in focus for the review.

The review should also provide recommendations as to how the methods may be developed in order to enhance their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, and, how RWI can improve monitoring, evaluation and learning in the organisation as to the usage of the methods (positive as well as negative experiences).

Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

Well-informed analytical and reliable conclusions shall be provided as a result of the review in relation to the review questions. The conclusions, together with suggestions for future development of the methods, on the basis of lessons learned, shall enable primarily RWI to improve conditions for positive results achievement in RWI programmes aimed at developing institutional human rights capacity through enhanced use of the methods. The conclusions and recommendations are also expected to be able to influence RWI, as well as Sida and other relevant parties, with regard to planning and decision-making processes in relation to future programming. This presumes close consultation on behalf of the evaluators with RWI, and Sida, as to the rationale and feasibility of any recommendations made.

Approach, Methodology and Process

The review shall be carried out according to an inclusive and participatory approach. Thus, this shall comprise a design that draws on and mobilises the knowledge and experiences of RWI regarding the use of the methods.

The review shall accordingly depart from an overview, and good understanding, of the contexts in which RWI programmes – and the methods assessed – operate and the nature of support they seek to provide. Such an overview shall form a background for subsequently addressing the objectives of the review and the review questions.

The review will consist of desk studies, consultations and field visits, during the following three phases of the review:

The first phase will comprise a preparatory desk study to review key documentation relevant to the assessment of the methods in focus and for the drafting of an inception report which will further outline the methodology to be applied by the evaluators (see further in section 9 below regarding the content of this report). The first phase shall moreover involve a close dialogue between Sida, RWI and the evaluators regarding the approach and methodology to be used, in accordance with these Terms of Reference.

The second phase will include information and data collection through interviews/consultations with key informants and relevant stakeholders as well as in-depth review of relevant documentation.

The in-depth review of documentation shall include, but not be limited to, relevant RWI programme documents; RWI annual work plans and budgets; activity reports and other relevant activity documentation; checklists, guidelines, earlier evaluations of RWI's projects/programmes etc., regarding the methods reviewed; key related documents of partners; relevant Sida strategies and policies; and RWI programme progress reports.

For the purpose of interviews/consultations, the evaluators are expected to hold face-to-face meetings with concerned individuals to the greatest extent possible. Anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants shall be protected when requested or as needed.

This includes consultations at RWI's office in Lund and with Sida in Stockholm. Other resource persons may be identified by the team, in consultation with principal stakeholders.

Field visits to RWI programmes shall be undertaken in **Zimbabwe** and **Turkey**. The field visits would include meetings and interviews with RWI staff, Sida staff,

RWI partners and beneficiaries as well as other relevant stakeholders, to be identified by the evaluators in consultation with RWI. Telephone/Skype interviews could also be conducted when necessary to complement face-to-face interviews. RWI will facilitate the planning and implementation of the field visits, while the evaluators will be responsible for making all practical arrangements in this respect.

The field visits will be complemented by desk studies of two additional programmes to ensure an appropriate coverage of the methods reviewed.

The third phase will consist of preparation of a draft report and incorporation of comments in the final report after the presentation of the draft version to RWI as well as all Sida departments and officers responsible for RWI-funded programmes (see further below in section 9). As part of the assignment, the evaluators shall organise a presentation at Sida in Stockholm of the final results of the review at a joint seminar with representatives from RWI and Sida as well as potentially representatives of the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

The review must be stakeholder inclusive in order to make an informed assessment in relation to its purpose and objectives. Such an assessment can only take place if the review recognises and takes into account the specific capacity development strategies that the RWI programmes involve.

The review shall, in all relevant parts, conform to OECD/DAC's quality standards.

Time Schedule

The review and its first phase are expected to start in September 2017. The final evaluation report is expected to be submitted to Sida at the mid of November 2017.

Reporting and Communication

The evaluators are expected to deliver an inception report in accordance with an outline agreed with Sida and RWI providing for the format and structure of the report.

In the inception report, the consultant/s shall clearly describe how the review will be carried out to present findings consisting of reliable information and analysis in relation to the review purpose, objectives and questions, so as to arrive at lessons learned to underpin the recommendations the review is expected to put forward. In the inception report, review questions may be further elaborated, with indicators that will help provide information in relation to/answer the review questions also stating sources of information and methods to be used to obtain the information.

Furthermore, the consultant/s shall in the inception report suggest the RWI programmes to be in particular focus for the review.

The inception report shall clearly demonstrate the evaluators understanding of what a successful completion of the assignment entails, with reference to the requirements in these Terms of Reference. In addition, the inception report shall, in brief, list the risks that may be faced during the review process and the assumptions which may have an impact on the review process, and propose alternatives for facing those risks.

The inception report shall be submitted to Sida and RWI for stakeholder comments, and, subsequently, Sida's approval.

Following data collection, processing and analysis, as well as a meeting with Sida and RWI to present tentative conclusions and recommendations, a draft review report

shall be prepared and submitted to Sida and RWI, based on a report template made available by Sida providing for the format and structure of the report.

The aim of preparing a draft report is to make it possible for primarily Sida and RWI to comment on any factual errors and misunderstandings, and for them to assess if the draft has reached an acceptable standard in relation to the Terms of Reference and accurately provides information in relation to the purpose and objectives of the review. Comments on the draft review report prepared shall be provided to the evaluators within seven days of submission, whereupon the final report shall be submitted to Sida and RWI within two weeks.

The final report must be presented in a way that enables possible publication without further editing, which includes having been proof read. It shall be made available in hard and soft copy.

During the course of the performance of the review, the evaluators shall at all relevant times remain in close contact and consult with Sida and RWI for relaying the work and receiving feedback and input on the ongoing work. The evaluators shall at all times quickly respond and relate to comments made by stakeholders regarding the process and findings of the review. For reporting purposes, close consultation with RWI in particular as to the rationale and feasibility of recommendations made is moreover required.

The evaluators shall, in relevant parts, adhere to the terminology of the OECD/DAC Glossary on Evaluation and Results-Based Management, unless otherwise agreed with Sida.

The methodology used must be clearly described and well explained in the final report. The scope and limitations of the review indicated in section 3 above shall be made explicit and shall be clearly reflected in the report.

English should be the language of all written communication including, e-mails, drafts and final versions of the review report.

All reporting shall consider the strong emphasis of the review on learning on the part of the principal stakeholders and therefore be prepared in such way that promotes learning and discussion on future relevant approaches.

Expected deliverables in English language accordingly include:

Inception Report at the end of the first phase describing the methodology and key issues to be addressed in the data collection process.

Draft Review Report including preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Final Review Report (maximum 25 pages, excluding annexes)

Annexes, at minimum, should include:

Terms of Reference;

Data gathering instruments (observation guides, interview questionnaires, etc.);

Names and contact information of stakeholders met/interviewed (to the extent it does not violate considerations of confidentiality).

References

Aid Management Guidelines

Other relevant policy documents to be found at www.sida.se, including the “Policy Aid Platform”

Looking Back, Moving Forward”, Sida Evaluation Manual, 2nd revised edition. Sida. Stefan Molund, Göran Schill. 2007.

DAC Principles of Evaluating Development Assistance, 12
www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork

Appendices

ToR Appendix 1 - External Reviews and Evaluations of Raoul Wallenberg Institute Programmes 2012-2016

ToR Appendix 2 - Overview of RWI International Programmes 2017

Annex 2: Evaluation matrix and methodology applied

Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation criteria	Evaluation questions	Indicators	Data collection instruments	Sources of information	Data analysis
Relevance	Are the methods, as used by RWI, adequate in relation to the main results RWI programmes seek to achieve as well as the needs and situation of intended beneficiaries and programme partners?	<p>Methods are grounded in specific context analysis.</p> <p>A method is conceptualised and formulated in concrete terms in a concept paper/programme document, e.g. on how to gender mainstream.</p> <p>Methods are responsive to the partnership (individual capability and institutional capacity).</p> <p>RWI demonstrates a participatory approach to PME, and risk awareness.</p>	<p>Interviews with key individuals in the programme countries. Field visits to Turkey and Zimbabwe.</p> <p>Desk studies of Belarus, Turkey, Zimbabwe and Regional Asia.</p> <p>Desk studies of the 11 evaluations (meta study) and the consultations/comparisons with other institutions e.g. DIHR etc.</p> <p>Follow up interviews per skype with key individuals in relation to programmes for Belarus and Regional Asia.</p> <p>Interviews with RWI staff in Lund and in relevant country offices.</p>	<p>People suggested by RWI in the four programme countries.</p> <p>Documentation made available by RWI, Sida and other relevant publications on human rights education, gender mainstreaming and working in difficult human rights environments.</p>	<p>Triangulation by interviewing several key individuals.</p> <p>Contrasting and comparing findings from different programmes.</p> <p>Contrasting and comparing findings with 'thinking' among other similar institutions.</p>
Effectiveness	<p>To what extent have these methods influenced positive achievement of expected results (qualitatively and quantitatively)?</p> <p>What are the main factors (including the use of RBM) that</p>	There is evidenced and documented linkage between outcomes and methods, describing how, with whom and why the outcomes were	<p>Interviews with key individuals in the programme countries. Field visits to Turkey and Zimbabwe.</p> <p>Desk studies of Belarus, Turkey, Zimbabwe and Regional Asia.</p>	<p>People suggested by RWI in the four programme countries.</p> <p>Documentation made available by RWI, Sida and other relevant publications on</p>	<p>Triangulation by interviewing several key individuals.</p> <p>Contrasting and comparing findings</p>

ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX AND METHODOLOGY APPLIED

	<p>have affected positive results achievement?</p> <p>Which have affected non-achievement of results?</p>	<p>achieved.</p> <p>RWI's methods are recognized by key individuals among stakeholders to contribute to programme achievement.</p> <p>Gender mainstreaming is reflected in results, objectives, and methods. There is a monitoring plan for gender mainstreaming.</p>	<p>Desk studies of the 11 evaluations (meta study), and the consultations/comparisons with other institutions e.g. DIHR etc.</p> <p>Follow up interviews per skype with key individuals in relation to programmes for Belarus and Regional Asia.</p> <p>Interviews with RWI staff in Lund and in relevant country offices.</p>	<p>human rights education, gender mainstreaming and working in difficult human rights environments.</p>	<p>from different programmes.</p> <p>Contrasting and comparing findings with 'thinking' among other similar institutions.</p>
Efficiency	<p>Have measures been/are measures taken during planning and implementation to ensure that resources are efficiently used for implementation of the methods?</p> <p>Could the methods employed be implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results?</p> <p>Could the methods be employed differently using the same amount of resources to achieve more and better results?</p>	<p>RWI demonstrates well-functioning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - programme structure and perception of efficiency among staff. - Clarity in roles, functions and responsibilities. - Overall efficiency of the programme – i.e. the degree to which programme activities have <i>transformed</i> available resources into intended outputs (quantity, quality and time). - Existence of systematic work processes, including quality assurance. 	<p>Interviews with key individuals in the programme countries. Field visits to Turkey and Zimbabwe.</p> <p>Desk studies of Belarus, Turkey, Zimbabwe and Regional Asia.</p> <p>Desk studies of the 11 evaluations (meta study), and the consultations/comparisons with other institutions e.g. DIHR etc.</p> <p>Follow up interviews per skype with key individuals in relation to programmes for Belarus and Regional Asia.</p> <p>Interviews with RWI staff in Lund and in relevant country offices.</p>	<p>People suggested by RWI in the four programme countries.</p> <p>Documentation made available by RWI, Sida and other relevant publications on human rights education, gender mainstreaming and working in difficult human rights environments.</p>	<p>Triangulation by interviewing several key individuals.</p> <p>Contrasting and comparing findings from different programmes.</p> <p>Contrasting and comparing findings with 'thinking' among other similar institutions.</p>
Sustainability	<p>To what extent are the methods consistent with partners'</p>	<p>RWI demonstrates</p>	<p>Interviews with key individuals in the programme countries. Field</p>	<p>People suggested by RWI in</p>	<p>Triangulation by interviewing several</p>

ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX AND METHODOLOGY APPLIED

	priorities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Measures have been put in place – throughout programme design and implementation – to promote sustainability of achievements. - Local stakeholders indicate a sense of ownership of the programme and its achievements. - Existence of local initiatives aimed at continuing or building on programme achievements. 	<p>visits to Turkey and Zimbabwe.</p> <p>Desk studies of Belarus, Turkey, Zimbabwe and Regional Asia.</p> <p>Desk studies of the 11 evaluations (meta study), and the consultations/comparisons with other institutions e.g. DIHR etc.</p> <p>Follow up interviews per skype with key individuals in relation to programmes for Belarus and Regional Asia.</p>	<p>the four programme countries.</p> <p>Documentation made available by RWI, Sida and other relevant publications on human rights education, gender mainstreaming and working in difficult human rights environments.</p>	<p>key individuals.</p> <p>Contrasting and comparing findings from different programmes.</p> <p>Contrasting and comparing findings with 'thinking' among other similar institutions.</p>
	<p>To what extent is there a local/regional ownership of the methods and in what ways do the methods contribute to such ownership of programmes?</p> <p>To what extent do the methods used provide for mechanisms for, as and when appropriate, exiting or transitioning from interventions?</p>				

1. Methodology applied

Overall approach

Most prominently our approach is utilisation focused to enhance the likely use of the evaluation by the affected stakeholders as indicated above. The overall approach for this evaluation therefore embodies strong elements of dialogue, collaboration, reflection and learning.

In order to ensure a global applicability of evaluation findings, as requested by Sida the evaluation team conducted a mapping and analysis of RWI's Sida funded programmes. This included, particular, the breaking down of the overall method of human rights education into so-called "sub-methods", i.e. specific aspects of human rights education as identified in the RWI programme portfolio. The outcome of this, concluding the Inception Phase of the evaluation, was an overall structural framework of analysis for the next step of the evaluation. (See Annex 6)

In accordance with the ToR, the evaluation is structured along the three tracks – human rights education, gender mainstreaming and working in difficult human rights environments – and involves systematic analysis of each these, drawing forward the findings in each area and providing the basis for one set of recommendations.

The evaluation team applied a mixed method approach setting out with a desk-based analysis drawing on data and examples from the four programme cases, and including as well, when relevant examples from evaluations of a broader scope of programmes in other countries and regions as well. In addition, interviews were carried out with key stakeholders in a manner dedicated to triangulate the findings for greater reliability (see Section 3.3. on data collection below).

The findings in relation to methods and sub-methods outline whether a specific method was more or less relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable, and exemplifies on its application by RWI. In some ways the evaluation also includes elements of contribution analysis by assessing the performance of a method towards outcomes. This is relevant since RWI, like many other development organisations, make assumptions about what can possibly work in a certain context to achieve programme objectives. In the cases where evaluations of programmes exist, e.g. Turkey and Regional Asia, the evaluation team has drawn on their conclusions about the effectiveness by focusing on questions that explore to what extent observed results (whether positive or negative) are the consequence of a specific method. In addition, the evaluation has sought to identify those factors which would be critical for consideration in relation to specific methods and approaches, i.e. contributing to "lessons learned" in this area.

The framework of analysis in relation to human rights education has been the instrument which is highlighted by RWI themselves as their foundational outset,

namely the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training¹⁴⁹, which emphasizes education about, through and for human rights as essential for the promotion of universal respect for and observance of all human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

The initial mapping of methods during the inception phase identified a number of other work methods/tools which go beyond the three aspects, which relate to RWI's work with partners on project management and result-based management (RBM). In addition, the Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA)¹⁵⁰ provides an additional perspective of analysis supplementing the ones already mentioned, to see whether it added value to the various analyses conducted throughout this evaluation. Working in difficult human rights environments presents considerations around the challenges and risks for RWI, partners and target groups. In many of RWI contexts, including the case contexts identified, a conflict sensitive approach is needed, as well as awareness of the impact of transition e.g. at the political level.

2. Selection and application of evaluation criteria

The ToR includes the evaluation criteria relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. As noted in the ToR, the evaluation does not include the criteria for "impact". The Evaluation Matrix is presented above

3. Data collection

The data collection is predominately based on two main sources:

Document review includes evaluations and reviews of RWI programmes during the period 2012-2016; RWI programme documents from the four cases including e.g. progress and annual reports from 2013; international publications and other relevant documentation. The assessment of Belarus and Regional Asia was limited to desk studies. Annex 4 outlines a list of documents reviewed.

¹⁴⁹ The Declaration emphasizes the need for, in various ways, the institutionalisation of human rights education, which is a core aspect of the RWI engagements, as discussed below. Its definition of scope is broad, including "all educational, training, information, awareness-raising and learning activities"; however, only through a significant "stretch" does it seem to include all of the key elements of RWI's programme portfolio's engagements in the HRE field. One important aspect is thus support for research and research-related activity, and in order not to exclude these elements, the defined scope in the Declaration is viewed as an inspirational backdrop for analysis rather than prescriptive or limiting.

[https://documents-dds-](https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/467/04/PDF/N1146704.pdf?OpenElement)

[ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/467/04/PDF/N1146704.pdf?OpenElement](https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/467/04/PDF/N1146704.pdf?OpenElement).

¹⁵⁰ Including the application of human rights principles (including non-discrimination, and a focus on poverty alleviation) in all stages of development programming; definition of results based on human rights norms; and a focus on identifying rights holder as well as duty bearers in the given context, as well as a critical analysis of their respective capacities in terms of contributing to the realisation of these norms.

In-depth interviews with management and staff for RWI in Lund and in the field and/or on Skype; past and present stakeholders and beneficiaries in the field; as well as relevant Sida officers. The evaluation team met key informants in Turkey and Zimbabwe. RWI had identified key individuals in both countries with knowledge of and involvement in the RWI cooperation programme in Turkey and Zimbabwe in order to be able to arrive at well-informed opinions and conclusions regarding work methods used in RWI programmes. In addition, representatives of other institutions working with similar methods and approaches as RWI have been consulted as well for a comparative perspective. Annex 5 outlines a list of people to be interviewed for this evaluation.

The evaluation team held mostly conduct semi-structured interviews to consult with the stakeholders, taking our outset in the questions identified as most relevant for each respondent, based on the evaluation criteria. We believe that the semi-structured interviews were most suited for the purpose to flexibly adapt questions to the different roles of key individuals and their relationship with RWI. This allowed for more reflective conversations with RWI staff and RWI's partners about key issues related to the evaluation questions.

The interviews aimed to understand to what, how and why certain methods were more relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable than others in specific contexts and in relation to different objectives and partners. We used prompts/sub-questions to make sure we cover different elements of methods employed by RWI in follow up questions if it did not come to the fore automatically.

4. Process of analysis and developing conclusions

A principle guiding our analysis is to attempt to understand in what way the methods have influenced positive achievement of expected results as well as the main factors that have affected positive results, i.e. contributed to effectiveness, relevance and efficiency in the programme implementation, and sustainability thereof. Our methodology allowed us to basically analyse the data in two ways in order to validate what has worked and what has not worked.

First, as outlined above, our outset for the evaluation was the initial mappings and findings developed through the Inception Phase. The Inception Report provided a presentation of the key methods for human rights education, gender mainstreaming and working in difficult human rights environments. The initial systematic review of 11 evaluations during the inception phase was in a way a meta-study providing important data on the overall profile of RWI's international engagements. This exercise contributed to the evaluation team's understanding of RWI and its programmatic portfolio including applied methods, and in this manner contributed to evaluation findings and conclusions. The preliminary mapping of methods served to

seek out explicit strengths and weaknesses, as well as assumptions underpinning the methods and associated intervention strategies driving and inhibiting internal¹⁵¹ and external¹⁵² factors enabling an effective application of the methods. The findings on methods have been contrasted against observations across the programmes, which has allowed for the achieved level of comparative analysis. This approach takes into account methods and sub-methods as conceptualised and applied by RWI regardless of positive or negative outcomes. Furthermore, the findings are also compared and contrasted by information from other institutions globally embodying the same core institutional characteristics as RWI. The following institutions have therefore been consulted: the Danish Institute for Human Rights, the Centre for Human Rights, University of Pretoria, as well as the International Commission of Jurists (ICJ).¹⁵³

Second, all of the above opened up also for assessing the linkage between programme outcomes, as they are described in the evaluations and programme reporting, and methods, by tracing outcomes backwards and identify in what way applied methods influenced or contributed to the outcomes. This methodological approach allowed us to describe any potential confluence of factors contributing to positive results. This was done by assessing the evaluation of the programme outcomes, identifying any particular enabling and inhibiting factors that are described in the evaluations or in the progress reports, and assessing whether any specific method could be attributed to the outcomes. This was tested and validated by interviews with key individuals in relation to the specific programmes.

¹⁵¹ Factors that are related to the organisational capacity of RWI and/or partners.

¹⁵² Factors that are related to the operational context of RWI.

¹⁵³ All of the three institutions/organisations share traits common with those of RWI, but only to some extent: The Danish Institute for Human Rights (DIHR; www.humanrights.dk) is a public institution with a mandate and activities in relation to e.g. human rights education, research and international programmes financed by Danida and other donors in countries identical or similar to those of RWI including presently in Belarus and several Asian countries, and previously in Zimbabwe and Turkey. However, DIHR does not have academic institutions as a primary focus, or a strong university affiliation, and currently academic human rights education does not feature in the portfolio. Centre for Human Rights, University of Pretoria (CHR-UP; www.chr.up.ac.za) is embedded within a university structure, carries out research and education aimed at a broad selection of stakeholders (including state institutions and civil society). The Centre has a strong focus on academic collaboration and manages funding from international donors. However, the Centre does not carry out partnership-based capacity development programmes in other countries beyond its own network for Master in human rights, which does not include Zimbabwe. The International Commission of Jurists (ICJ; www.icj.org) is an international human rights non-governmental organisation, with a global focus and national affiliates in over 70 countries, and implementing its mandate of policy and advocacy work aimed at strengthening the role of lawyers and judges in protecting and promoting human rights and the rule of law, supported by multiple sources of donor funding. The ICJ is e.g. active in Zimbabwe.

The evaluation team applied the approach of not using pre-defined criteria for what is a good method, or variations thereof. As noted above, a principle guiding the analysis is whether the used method can seem to demonstrate sufficient evidence in documentation and interviews to have contributed to positive programme results. This was partly problematized by contrasting findings on different methods employed by RWI, but also by other institutions of similar kind as RWI.

The evaluation gave considerable consideration to the style of presentation of the findings, weighing the need for substantiation of claims and reflections in concrete examples for credibility against producing a text so heavy in references that it would run the risk of disrupting the flow of the text. For this reason we have settled for an extensive use of footnotes, ensuring that the main text can be read uninterruptedly.

The conclusions of each sub-method are aggregated on the general analysis and further supported on the basis of the findings from all four cases being examined for this evaluation. The conclusion states the general applicability of each sub-method and method. In addition it stresses which underlying assumptions seem to form necessary conditions to effectively contribute to achievement of programme outcomes. Recommendations per method are based on the conclusions, and directed explicitly towards RWI and Sida.

5. Ethics and participation

The evaluation team is aware of biases, and in order to compensate or eliminate for biases we used triangulation of findings from several data sources to reach a possible convergence. We acquired multiple and diverse opinions and we balanced opinions and voices to reflect any diverse views. The principal is that cross referencing of different interviews assisted us in verifying factual information, and solved any difference of opinions between interviewees about certain issues. In those rare cases when differences of opinions occurred, we sought additional information, which in addition to referencing such examples in the reporting.

The evaluation team feels confident about the credibility of the collected information to answer evaluation questions set out in the ToR. We have had continuous frank discussions and assessed through internal meetings along data collection and analysis phase. The confidence about findings is confirmed by a pattern by the interviewees in their answers, which have been triangulated by data from other sources such as reporting, literature or other interviewees. Working in teams of two and three consultants helped us to challenge each other's observations, impressions and findings.

Joint ownership of the evaluation process was ensured and promoted through trustful relationship with all stakeholders and an open climate in meetings in conversations. This was enabled to a large extent by deliberately choosing not to use direct quotes from interviews. The team strived for generative dialogues with stakeholders rather than formal interviews, and while semi-structured protocols as an outset (see Annex 3) was used to ensure a degree of coherence across interviews, a high level of flexibility and openness to the ideas and interests of informants were maintained in conversations.

6. Limitations

The data collection in the field work, as a minimum, was carried out with extensive attention to the safety of respondents, especially when undertaking interviews with e.g. the academic sector. As mentioned above, confidentiality in terms of sourcing from interviews and attribution of findings to individuals served this purpose well. In some cases the sensitive nature of the situation in the respective context meant that access to specific stakeholders was not facilitated.¹⁵⁴ These was mitigated through a respectful and sensitive process of dialogue – and, not least, by allowing for a high degree of respect for the confidentiality of the findings, against which reliability and verification of findings will have to be balanced, especially when it comes to publication of the final report. The team aims to maintain a close and honest dialogue with RWI, at headquarter and regional/country offices on how to best handle this aspect.

In addition, certain concepts and methods currently under development by RWI and (tentatively) applied also in international programming have been deemed by the evaluation team as falling outside the scope of this evaluation. This includes specifically the concept of Human Rights Cities.¹⁵⁵

The evaluation does not provide an in-depth evaluation of all interventions within RWI's global portfolio. We are aware that there might be programmes and projects outside of the four examined cases which in the past and in the current form might challenge some of our findings and conclusions, but we hope that this global evaluation on the basis of the available and accessible data and our analysis provides useful inputs for discussions for RWI and with its partners. The focus for this evaluation has consistently been on learning.

We are also aware of the limitation in terms of relying on the assistance of RWI in terms of providing us with key contacts and, more importantly, documents relating to the institutional aspects (e.g. internal policies). For this reason we do not claim to have a complete understanding of RWI as an institution nor a full understanding of its entire catalogue of methods applied – but simply draw our findings and conclusions on the basis of the material available to us.

This report was initially limited to not exceed 25 pages, which is always difficult to achieve while feeling there is a need to write much more. The page limit was increased to 30 pages, which we are very grateful for. We have done our best to keep this report as succinct as possible.

¹⁵⁴ This includes in particular former partners in the justice sector in Turkey.

¹⁵⁵ This is an aspect of the Regional Asia Programme, and features also as a tentative approach in Turkey.

Annex 3: Data collection instruments

As stated in the Inception Report, “There will be a continuous adaptation of interview guides for the following groups”:

- RWI staff
- RWI senior management
- RWI board members
- RWI staff in the field
- RWI’s partners and key individuals
- Other institutions with similar operational focus as RWI

A) General (FOR ALL)

A.1 Your name, position?

A.2 Length of your time with organisation in general?

A.3 Form/function and length of your engagement with RWI?

B) Specifically on RWI’s methods (FOR ALL)

B.1 Which of RWI’s methods have you encountered? How, in what capacity?

B.2 Specifically for each method you have personal experience with; from your encounter with them, how do you rate them in terms of:

- **i. Relevance**

D. Are the methods used by RWI, which you have encountered, adequate in relation to the main results RWI programmes seek to achieve develop institutional human rights capacity; as well as the needs and situation of intended beneficiaries and programme partners?

- **ii. Effectiveness**

E. To what extent have these methods, in your opinion, influenced positive achievement of expected results, or to unforeseen ones (qualitatively and quantitatively)? What has been their impact? And on what basis do you assess this?

F. What are the main factors (including the use of RBM) that in your view have affected positive results achievement, and which have affected non-achievement of results?

G. How do you view the connection between the method and the programme objective and context? In terms of structure, and in terms of results actually achieved?

- **iii. Efficiency**

H. Have measures been/taken during planning and implementation to ensure that resources are efficiently used for implementation of the methods? Have these processes involved you/your colleagues, and in which manner (if relevant)?

I. Could the methods employed, in your opinion, be implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results?

J. Could the methods be employed differently using the same amount of resources to achieve more and better results?

- **iv. Sustainability**

K. To what extent do you see that the methods are consistent with partners' priorities?

L. To what extent is there, in your opinion, a local/regional ownership of the methods and in what ways do the methods contribute to such ownership of programmes?;

M. To what extent do the methods used, in your opinion, provide for mechanisms for, as and when appropriate, exiting or transitioning from interventions?

B.3 Other reflections and recommendations that you wish to share in relation to RWI methods?

C.) Specific for each target group: 1) Internal RWI; 2) RWI partner; 3) External stakeholder – to the extent that they have not already been covered by the questions under A and B

C.1. Internal RWI

i. How do you view the method from your perspective? Do you understand it, and its rationale, and is it sufficiently identified/described for you to be operational in your work? How does the organisation support you (e.g. by instruction/sparring, and absorption of lessons learned)

ii. How do you see it working in practice, and do you feel that you can adapt it as necessary in order to be relevant, effective and efficient, as well as contributing to sustainability? What guides you in this?

C.2. RWI partner

i. Does the method make sense to you? How do you view the qualities (identifiable/definable; general applicability; elasticity; and balance reflexive/normative) of the method?

ii. Are certain aspects captured more or less well in your case?

iii. And, not least, how do you from your position experience that this has generated outcomes (desired/expected and additional) that lead to improvement in the targeted field?

C.3 External stakeholder

i. Does the method make sense to you? How do you view the qualities (identifiable/definable; general applicability; elasticity; and balance reflexive/normative) of the method?

Do you recognise the aspects of the methods as something they, in principle, would wish/be able to operationalise as well? Are you (already) applying same or similar methods, and with which lessons learned and outcomes?

What are your reflections of applying the method in question, generally as well as in the context?

Annex 4: Documentation

RWI	Final Strategic Plan with organogram 2017-2021	Adopted 170301
RWI	Evaluation of China programme 1996-2011	2011 submission of the evaluation
RWI	Evaluation of Indonesia project 2010-2013	2013
RWI	Evaluation of the MENA regional programme 2009-2012	2012
RWI	Evaluation of Myanmar programme 2012-2016	2014
RWI	Evaluation of Turkey programme 2011-2014	2014/2015
RWI	Evaluation of Regional Africa programme 2011-2015	2015/2016
RWI	Evaluation of Regional Asia programme 2010-2015	2015
RWI	Review of China programme 2014-2016	2015
RWI	Review of Kenya Programme 2012-2014	2014
RWI	Review of Cambodia programme 2013-2017	2016
RWI	Mid-term Review of Belarus Project promoting democracy in Belarus through human rights capacity building 2010-2014	2013-08-20
RWI	Review of Results in RWI's Belarus Programme 2010-2014	2015-02-28
RWI	System-Based Audit	2014
RWI	Project Proposal Academic Cooperation on Human Rights in Belarus, 2015-2019 with annexes	2014-10-03
RWI	Sub-agreement between Sida and RWI for Belarus Programme	2014-12-14
RWI	Annual Work Plan and Budget 2014 Belarus project	2014-01-15
RWI	Annual Work Plan & Budget 2015 Belarus project	2015-02-06
RWI	Annual Work Plan & Budget 2016 Belarus project	2016-02-01
RWI	Annual Work Plan & Budget 2017 Belarus project	2017-01-14
RWI	Final project report Belarus December 2010-February 2015 - promoting democracy in Belarus through human rights capacity building 2010-2014	2015-08-31
RWI	Progress Report Belarus January – December 2016	2017-08-14
RWI	Budget 2015-2019 Belarus Programme	2014-10-11
RWI	Gender equality integration in the Belarus programme	2017-09-03
RWI	Baseline Study, Human Rights Education and Research at Targeted Academic Institutions, Master Questionnaire Polotsk State University, Faculty of Law	2015
RWI	Human Rights and Gender Higher Education Course syllabus for students in the specialties	2017
RWI	Elective Course Legal Foundations of Gender Policies in the Republic of Belarus Explanatory Note to the Course	2017
RWI	Course Social, Legal and Criminological Aspects of Gender Explanatory Note to the Course	2017
RWI	GENDER AND LAW Syllabus of a Higher Educational Establishment for a Training Course in Major, International Law	2017
RWI	Gender and Law, Higher Education Course Syllabus for students in the specialties, "Enterprise Economics and	2017

	Management"	
RWI	CONTEMPORARY THEORIES OF GENDER, Syllabus of a Higher Educational Establishment for a Course in Majors: <u>Social Science and Psychology</u>	2017
RWI	GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS, Explanatory Note to the Course	2017
RWI	Legal Guarantees of Gender Equality, Programme of the institution of higher education for an optional academic discipline for the students of branches of studies: "Jurisprudence", "Economic Law", "Political Science	2017
RWI	Amendment to sub-agreement between Sida and RWI on Turkey programme	2014-12-14
RWI	Programme Proposal 2011-2014 Turkey Human Rights Capacity Programme	2011-01-14
RWI	Work Plan and Budget 2017 Turkey Programme	2017-01-15
RWI	Revised Work Plan and Budget 2017 Turkey Programme	2017-09-12
RWI	Narrative Report 2015 - RWI Turkey Human Rights Capacity Development Programme	2016-08-31
RWI	Narrative Report 2016 - RWI Turkey Human Rights Capacity Development Programme	2017-08-31
RWI	Gender Mainstreaming in Turkey Programme (Pilot period)	2017
RWI	Activities schedule 2017	2017
Sida	Beslut om insats, RWI Cap dev within human rights 2015-2020	
RWI	Signed sub-agreement RWI Zimbabwe Human Rights Capacity Development Programme 2016-2018	2014-12-14
RWI	Proposal - RWI Zimbabwe Human Rights Capacity Development Programme 2016-2018	2015-11-02
RWI	Feasibility Study Report - future Swedish-Zimbabwean cooperation carried out by the Raoul Wallenberg Institute and the Institute of Peace, Leadership and Governance	2015-02-27
RWI	Inception Phase Report from Feb.-June 2016 - RWI Zimbabwe Human Rights Capacity Development Programme	2016-09-09
RWI	Narrative Report February-December 2016, RWI Zimbabwe Human Rights Capacity Development	2017-08-31
RWI	Work Plan and Budget Inception Phase Jan-April 2016 - RWI Zimbabwe Programme	2016-04-xx
RWI	Work Plan and Budget July-December 2016 - RWI Zimbabwe Human Rights Capacity Development Programme	2016-06-30
RWI	Work Plan and Budget Jan-Dec 2017 - Zimbabwe Human Rights Capacity Development Programme	2017-01-15
Sida	Decision on Contribution (52120080) Zimbabwe	
RWI	Zimbabwe Human Rights Capacity Development Programme 2016-2018 Training Workshop on Human Rights and the Declaration of Rights in the Constitution of Zimbabwe	
RWI	Zimbabwe Human Rights Capacity Development Programme 2016-2018 Training Workshop on Human Rights and People in Vulnerable and Marginalised Situations (Vulnerable and Marginalised Groups)	
RWI	Zimbabwe Human Rights Capacity Development Programme 2016-2018 Training Workshop on Human Rights and the Declaration of Rights in the Constitution of Zimbabwe	

Justice Alfred Mavedzenge	Learning from others: An insight into the experiences in the enforcement of ESC rights in comparative foreign and international law jurisdictions	
RWI	Programme Proposal - Regional Asia Programme Sub-Agreement with annexes	2017-05-12
RWI	Regional Asia Programme 2010-2015	2010-04-xx
RWI	Narrative Report January 2010-December 2016, Regional Asia Human Rights Capacity Development	2016-04-30
RWI	Promoting the Equal Status and Human Rights of Women in Southeast Asia	2014
RWI	Regional blended learning course for NHRIs in Asia: Human Rights Library and Information Management Course Syllabus	2014
RWI	Regional blended learning course 2014 THE EQUAL STATUS AND HUMAN RIGHTS OF WOMEN IN SOUTHEAST ASIA Course Syllabus	2014
RWI	Course Syllabus Human Rights and Environment in the framework of Agenda 2030	2017
RWI	Cambodia Programme 2012-2017	Sep 2012
RWI	China Programme 2014-2016	Apr 2014
RWI	Indonesia project 2010-2013	2009
RWI	Kenya Programme 2012-2014	Nov 2011
RWI	MENA Programme Document 2009-2013	May 2009
RWI	Myanmar Project Proposal 2012-2016	Aug 2012
RWI	Regional Africa Programme 2011-2015	Jun 2010
RWI	Gender equality education as an aspect of Human Rights Education	
RWI	Overview of titles in book packages (RWI library)	Nov 2017
RWI	Information Note on Gender-Specific Interventions under RWI Turkey Programme	Dec 2017
Grossman, George S Journal of Legal Education	Clinical Legal Education: History and Diagnosis	1974
Maisel, Peggy 30 Fordham Int'l L.J. 374	Expanding and Sustaining Clinical Legal Education in Developing Countries: What We Can Learn from South Africa	2006-2007
RWI	Promoting Gender Equality. Methods, results and lessons learned	2017

Annex 5: List of interviewees

Name	Position	Organisation	Date of interview
Alacaoğlu, Ismail	Senior Programme Advisor	RWI	October 16 2017
Alp, Seda	Senior Programme Advisor	RWI	October 16 2017
Bergenholtz, Tomas	Counsellor Swedish-Turkish Cooperation	Sida	November 13 2017
Bezbozhna, Olga	Programme officer Belarus Programme	RWI	September 29, 2017; October 2 2017; November 13-14 2017
Chishakwe, Nyasha	Executive Director	Centre for Applied Legal Research, Harare, Zimbabwe	October 25 2017
Cronjé, Pieter	Independent Human Rights Consultant	Trainer of security staff, RWI programmes	November 27
Chiweshe, Farai	Independent Human Rights Consultant	Associated with the RWI programme	October 21 2017
Eile, Johannes	Director of Programmes	RWI	September 18 2017; October 2 and 12 2017; November 16 2017
Fitzpatrick, Kieren	Director	Asian Pacific Forum	November 16 2017
Fredriksson, Gabriella	Team leader, Inclusive Societies	RWI	October 2 2017
Fuentes, Alejandro	Senior Researcher	RWI	November 15 2017
Gammeltoft-Hansen, Thomas	Research Director, Professor	RWI	November 16 2017
Genneby, Nina	Programme Manager/Specialist, Advisor Peace and Security	Sida	November 27 2017
Gombera, Yvonne	Legal Officer	Centre for Applied Legal Research, Harare, Zimbabwe	October 25 2017
Jekemu, Wonder	Programme Officer	Sida	October 26 2017
Johansson, Mikael	Senior Policy Advisor, Anti-Corruption and Human Rights, Interim Team leader, Justice Team, also involved in the	RWI	October 2 2017; November 16 2017

ANNEX 5: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

	Zimbabwe programme		
Johnsson, Hanna	Senior Programme Officer (Cambodia)	RWI	November 15 2017
Kalem, Seda	Assistant professor	Bilgi University, (Istanbul), Law Faculty	October 18 2017
Katsande, Rosalie	Lecturer	Faculty of Law, Midlands State University (MSU), Gweru, Zimbabwe	October 23 2017
Kenis, Sebnem	Programme Advisor	RWI	October 16 2017
Kırık, Hikmet	Assistant professor	Istanbul University, (Istanbul), Public Administration and Political Science department	October 16 2017
Kjaerum, Morten	Director	RWI	October 2 2017; November 16 2017
Klementiva, Evguenia Jane	Programme Manager, Belarus	DIHR	November 10 2017
Köybaşı, Serkan	Assistant constitutional law professor	Bahçeşehir University, (Istanbul), Law Faculty	October 16 2017
Ljunggren, Börje	Board member	RWI	October 4 2017
Machakanja, Dr. Pamela	Prof., Interim Deputy Vice Chancellor and Dean for the College of Business, Peace, Leadership and Governance	Africa University	October 24 2017
Melander Borg, Emma	Head of Gender Equality	RWI	September 29 2017; October 2 2017; November 15 2017
Moyo, Dr. Admark	Lecturer	Herbert Chitepo School of Law, Great Zimbabwe University (GZU), Masvingo, Zimbabwe	October 19 2017
Msika, Mabel	Director of Policy and Research Department	Ministry of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs, Zimbabwe	October 23 2017
Mukutiri, Eric	Deputy Executive Secretary - Programs	Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission	November 23 2017
Mutangi, Dr. Tarisai	Lecturer	Faculty of Law, Midlands State University (MSU), Gweru, Zimbabwe	October 23 2017
Nkiwane, Dr. Victor	Dean	Herbert Chitepo School of Law, Great Zimbabwe University (GZU), Masvingo, Zimbabwe	October 20 2017
Olsson, Helena	Director Regional Office in Jakarta	RWI	November 7 2017

ANNEX 5: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Olsson, Ilhami Alkan	Chief Advisor Turkey	RWI	15-16 October 2017
Penduka, Brian	Legal consultant	International Commission of Jurists (ICJ)	October 26 2017
Petcharamesree, Dr. Sriprapha	Professor	Mahidol University	November 14 2017
Ring, Rolf	Deputy Director, Head of the Department for Administration and Finance	RWI	November 16 2017
Ronkina, Alexandra	Programme Officer	RWI	November 20 2017
Sarışen, Gamze Rezan	Senior Programme Advisor	RWI	October 16 2017
Selin, Maria	Counsellor, Deputy Head of Mission, Head of Development Cooperation	Sida	December 8 2017
Şenesen, Gülay Günlük	Prof. Dr.	Istanbul University, (Istanbul), Public Administration and Political Science Department	October 16 2017
Shonhai, Kenias	Human Rights Lawyer	Zimbabwe Human Rights NGO Forum, Zimbabwe	October 23 2017
Sällfors, Amelie	Director of Europe Office	RWI	November 16 2017
Tarisayi, Eustinah	Researcher, Research & Documentation Unit	Zimbabwe Human Rights NGO Forum	November 21, 2017
Tiderman, Karl Adam	Librarian	RWI	November 15 2017
Turanli, Kivilcim	PhD, Assistant professor	Anadolu University Law Faculty	October 18 2017
Viljoen, Frans	Director	Centre for Human Rights, University of Pretoria, South Africa	November 20 2017
Yılmaz, Volkan	Assistant professor	Boğaziçi University, (Istanbul), Social Policy and the Director of Social Policy Forum Research Centre	October 17 2017

Annex 6: Overview of RWI's Sida funded programmes, past and present: thematic focus, partner types, approaches and methods

Note: Programme and time periods referred to in relation to the different programmes/engagements listed here concern the periods reviewed by the evaluation team and it is acknowledged that the for the countries/regions listed there have also been other programmes and periods during the full time of RWI's engagement in the countries/regions.

	Turkey	Zimbabwe	Belarus	Regional Asia	Cambodia	China	Kenya	Myanmar	Regional Africa	MENA	Indonesia
	2011-2014 2015-2017	2016-2018	2010-2014 2015-2019	2010-2015 2017-2021	2013-2017 2018-2019	1999-2011 2014-2017 2017-2018	2012-2014; 2015-2017	2012-2017	2011-2015 2017-2021	1999-2012	2010-2013
1) Basic data Status	Ongoing, extension for 2018	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing, extension granted	Ongoing	Ongoing, extension under preparation	Ended, new programme rejected	Ongoing, inception phase (2017-2018) for new programme (2017-2021) granted	Ended (with direct funding from Sida. RWI engagement in MENA continues with funding support from the International Legal Assistance Consortium (ILAC))	Ended (with direct Sida funding, whereas RWI engagement in Indonesia has continued with support from other donors)

ANNEX 6: OVERVIEW OF RWI'S SIDA FUNDED PROGRAMMES, PAST AND PRESENT

Overall objective													
1.b Partners (actors)	Justice sector, including judiciary, prosecution, police and prisons, as well as dedicated professional training institutions	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
	Academia, incl. lecturers, students, researchers, and networks of these	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	
	National human rights institutions	(x)	(x)		x					x	x		
	Bar/lawyer associations/ institutes	x				x				x			
	Civil society		x		x		x			x		x	
	Corporate sector				x								
	Regional mechanisms				x					x			
Overall objective: "To strengthen performance with legal education and justice sector institutions, as well as other state implementation and monitoring bodies, in removing barriers to citizens' equal access to justice and expediting reform of the Turkish justice system, consistent with international human rights standards and the rule of law"													
Overall objective: "To contribute to enhanced enjoyment of constitutional rights in Zimbabwe through legislation, policies, practices and decision-making being increasingly informed by international human rights standards and principles"													
Overall objective: "Strengthen the capacities in the human rights (including gender equality) among Belarusian Academic Institutions and students through enhanced access to education and research in human rights and strengthen their involvement in with other actors in society on human rights"													
Overall objective: "To contribute to a just, inclusive and sustainable development in the region through mutually reinforcing protection of human rights, gender equality and the environment"													
Overall objective: "Strengthen the environment for human rights promotion and protection in Cambodia"													
Overall Objective (2014-2017): "To strengthen institutions and networks for the promotion and protection of human rights in China"													
Overall objective: "To support human rights reforms in implementing the new Constitution of Kenya and operationalising key policy priorities and strategies, in line with international standards, as concerns in particular the fair, impartial and efficient administration of justice"													
Objective: "To strengthen the Myanmar Human Rights Commission, and its key partners, to more effectively implement their mandates to promote and protect human rights in Myanmar"													
"Overall objective (2017-2021): "To strengthen implementation of human rights commitments in the region cooperation"													
Main objective: "To increase the ability of academic and professional training institutions in the MENA region to provide more adequate resources for institutions and individuals in Arab societies to promote and protect human rights"													
Overall objective: "To build sustainable capacity to promote and/or protect human rights among targeted institutions and organisations in Indonesia through research, training and education".													

ANNEX 6: OVERVIEW OF RWI'S SIDA FUNDED PROGRAMMES, PAST AND PRESENT

1.c Thematic focus (including references to substance of four new strategic directions)	<i>HR, general (no thematic limitation)</i>	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	<i>Fair trial general, access to justice and rule of law, treatment of prisoners</i>	x			x	x	x	x		x		x
	<i>Juvenile justice</i>				x		x					x
	<i>Disability, social rights</i>						x					
	<i>Environment</i>				x							
1.d Our evaluation focus areas (specific reference)	<i>Human rights education</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	<i>Gender mainstreaming</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		yes		
	<i>Working in difficult human rights environments</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	Yes
4) Methods and approaches applied (programme documents and evaluation reports)												
4.a Approaches												
	<i>Phasing (Inception – implementation)</i>		yes		yes	yes				yes		
	<i>RWI's ongoing presence/ registration</i>	(yes)			yes	yes	yes	yes			yes	yes
	<i>RWI's extensive institutional capacity in terms of experience</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	<i>RWI's deep context understanding</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
4. b Methods applied												
HRE and HRE-related	<i>HRE, academic (Master programme established; curriculum development; international resource persons; ToT for lecturers; textbook translation)</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		yes	yes	yes	
	<i>Other academic, individual (incl. research) (Scholarships national. Scholarships international (Lund).</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		yes	yes		

ANNEX 6: OVERVIEW OF RWI'S SIDA FUNDED PROGRAMMES, PAST AND PRESENT

	<i>Small research grants</i>											
	<i>Other academic, institutional (Library support. Book grants; colloquia and events)</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		yes ¹⁵⁶	yes		
	<i>Facilitation of networking among partners</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	<i>Distance/e-/blended learning</i>	yes			yes		yes			(being explored)/yes		
	<i>Clinical legal education</i>	yes	yes	yes		yes						
	<i>Professional training, e.g. justice sector actors</i>	yes	yes		yes	yes	yes	yes		yes	yes	yes
Gender	<i>Mainstreaming</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	<i>Specific</i>		yes	yes	yes							
Other	<i>Specific project management support as part of institutional development (PM, RBM etc.).</i>	yes		yes		yes	yes	yes		yes		
	<i>Supporting partner salary and other costs/forwarding of funds</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes			yes		
	<i>Awareness-raising, as part of institutional support</i>								yes	yes		
	<i>Study visits</i>	yes	yes	yes		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		yes
	<i>Human Rights Cities</i>	yes			yes					yes		

¹⁵⁶ Specific recommendation to end library support

ANNEX 6: OVERVIEW OF RWI'S SIDA FUNDED PROGRAMMES, PAST AND PRESENT

	<i>Multi-stakeholder facilitation, e.g. platforms</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
--	---------------------------------------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--



Evaluation of Programme Work Methods of The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law

This evaluation of The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (RWI)'s work methods was commissioned by Sida and carried out during September to December 2017. The rationale and purpose was a shared desire by Sida and RWI to critically review the overall work methods RWI apply in its international partner-based programmes and projects, in order to improve conditions for positive results from international programmatic activity aimed at institutional human rights capacity development.

The evaluation focuses on the work methods RWI uses in programmes related to three key areas: human rights education; gender mainstreaming; and working in difficult human rights environments. It was guided by, but not limited to, questions on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of RWI's approach. The evaluation has a global scope, and findings, conclusions and recommendations are informed by four case studies relevant to the methods in the three areas.

The evaluation draws concrete conclusions and provides action-oriented recommendations that RWI can apply globally. These can also feed into the preparation of new programme proposals and RWI's continued strategic and organisational development.

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

