This Technical Note (TN) is part of a series of thematic TNs that aims to support Sida staff and partners to apply the human rights-based approach (HRBA). The TN begins with a short introduction to the HRBA and Sida’s PLANET tool. It then explains how human rights norms and standards underpin the thematic area. The TN goes on to demonstrate how PLANET can guide staff in planning, assessing and monitoring of a contribution through a series of guiding questions and examples. Finally, it provides a simple model for empowerment and capacity development analysis and a list of additional resources to explore.

ABOUT HRBA AND PLANET

The HRBA builds on the norms and principles outlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the subsequent legally binding UN treaties, which forms the basis for all development cooperation. Application of the HRBA contributes to effective development cooperation processes and sustainable development outcomes. It challenges unequal power relations and social exclusion that deny people their human rights and often keep them in poverty and oppression. Sweden is committed to the HRBA through the Swedish Policy for Global Development, the EU Consensus on Development agreement, and the UN common understanding of a HRBA.

The HRBA places people living in poverty and oppression (rights holders) at the centre. It is about:

• Empowering rights-holders to enable them to take action to address their situation and to claim their rights individually and collectively.

• Developing capacities and interests of duty-bearers to fulfil their obligations to respect, protect and fulfil human rights.

PLANET is a tool that guides staff on the practical application of the HRBA. It has six elements:

Participation = Do all stakeholders engage actively, in a way which allows rights-holders to contribute meaningfully and influence processes and outcomes?

Links to human rights obligations = How are relevant human rights standards and recommendations from human rights mechanisms identified and used to advance processes, outcomes and objectives?

Accountability = Who are the duty bearers on various levels, and do they have sufficient capacity and interest to be accountable to rights holders?

Non-discrimination = Are rights holders and the root causes of their lack of human rights identified and taken into account, particularly those most subjected to discrimination, marginalisation and vulnerability?

Empowerment and capacity development = How does the intervention contribute to the empowerment of rights holders to claim their rights, as well as capacity development of duty bearers to uphold their responsibilities and of other relevant stakeholders to contribute to positive outcomes?

Transparency = What measures are put in place to ensure that all stakeholders are able to access relevant information and knowledge regarding the contribution?

Learn more about HRBA and PLANET at Human Rights Based Approach – rättighetsperspektiv | Sida and Thematic method support – human-rights-based-approach [sida.se]
DIGITALISATION, DEVELOPMENT AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Digitalisation involves complex and adaptive digital processes, data and systems that drive digital transformation. It is linked to, but also distinct from “digitalisation” which refers to the conversion of information from analogue format to digital format. It is a process that affects all dimensions of poverty – resources, opportunities and choice, power and voice, and human security. Digitalisation impacts the media, business, civic space, government and political processes. It can contribute to economic and social development and help lift people out of poverty, but it can also exacerbate existing social, political and economic divides. It enables human rights, but also poses new threats to human rights. Sida uses digital technology to accelerate development and increase the effectiveness of its assistance. It encourages innovative approaches and aims to ensure that its partners have the tools to manage both the opportunities and threats that arise from digital transformation. An example is digital identity systems. On the one hand such systems can streamline access to social services and grants; but on the other hand, they can enable increased surveillance of citizens by government.1

Another example is Sida’s partnerships focused on digital financial inclusion through various forms of mobile money2. There are many benefits of digital financial inclusion such as access to credit, microinsurance, micropayments, personal control over a safe savings account and many more, but there are also new risks such as fraud or mobile loans with extortionate interest rates.

APPLYING PLANET TO SIDA’S DIGITALISATION WORK

The PLANET letters can be applied in any order that works for the context – both for individual projects or programs and in strategy cycle work [such as operationalization]. The outline below starts with identifying human rights deficits/violations and the usefulness of linking up with human rights commitments to inform programming and enhance outcomes (L). It then discusses how to identify the rights holders concerned, especially the most marginalized (N), how to identify and engage with duty bearers (A), how to ensure meaningful participation (P) and how to communicate and inform stakeholders to give them opportunities to engage (T). Finally, a tool is presented on how to identify possible change makers and their needs for empowerment and capacity development (E).

Sida can apply the HRBA in its digitalisation work at two levels: firstly, at an overarching level by integrating PLANET into the implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and further development of its current digital strategy3 and secondly, at the level of specific contributions, partnerships and other initiatives linked to Sida’s digitalisation work.

Sida’s digital strategy commits it to:
1. Understand the digital transformation as part of the contexts in which it works, integrates digital opportunities and risks in its assessments and analyses.
2. Engage in dialogue and partnership to stimulate new digital development initiatives and innovations with the poorest and most vulnerable in focus.
4. Use data strategically and with integrity ensuring that the data is not used for destructive purposes and that digital technologies are used in a way that protects vulnerable individuals’ rights to integrity and to own their own data and to access public data.
5. Automate processes by rationalising activities that take time from its operations by automating manual processes, tasks and functions and assessing opportunities to apply machine learning to its operations.
6. Develop the digital office by using new technologies to increase opportunities to cooperate internally, between embassies and with Sida’s partners.

---

1 For an analysis of how this is playing out in India, read “Big ID, bad idea: busting ID myths that are endangering human rights”, Access Now, October 2021 - https://www.accesnow.org/big-id-endangering-human-rights/
2 Two examples are our support of digital financial inclusion are Better than Cash Alliance (UNCDF) and CGAP.
3 Sida’s Digital Strategy, December 2019
Linking to Human Rights commitments and core obligations (L)

Human rights outcomes are already considered in Sida’s digital development strategy. They cannot however be taken for granted. For example, an initiative to enable a public health data management programme to support access to medicines for individuals living with HIV/AIDS could easily put people’s right to privacy at risk if specific attention to data protection is not taken into account. Sida’s digital development strategy relates to various sectors and subject areas and therefore all UN human rights conventions are of importance. While we know now that digitalisation can amplify surveillance, discrimination and hate speech, thereby limiting freedom of expression and association, there are no shortcuts – as the scope of digitalisation expands, so do the human rights opportunities and risks. Links to human rights commitments can be identified by drawing on three main clusters of resources (for links to these refer to the section at the end of the brief):

- Binding conventions that lie at the heart of the international human rights framework
- Explorations of how these rights apply in the digital age including region-specific resources and resources designed for use at country level, such as the UNESCO Internet Universality Indicators. Decisions that focus on those rights which are most pertinent to Sida’s digital development agenda should be prioritised. These include rights related to data protection and the protection of privacy and require States to take effective measures to prevent the unlawful retention, processing and use of personal data stored by public authorities and business enterprises. The most recent elaboration of this is in the General Assembly Resolution (75/176) on “The right to privacy in the digital age” (2020). A very important right which is evolved over the last few decade is extremely relevant to Sida’s digitalisation work: the right to access to information, particularly to information held by public authorities.
- Interpretations and exploration of the links between human rights and sustainable development.

Using UNESCO’s R O A M – X Internet Universality Indicators to assess links to human rights commitment and obligations

Developed with Sida support, these indicators are designed to help assess how the internet environment complies with specific human rights at national level and whether policy and regulation applies a HRBA. They are organised in five clusters based on UNESCO’s R O A M principles: R – Rights; O – Openness; A – Accessibility to all; M – Multistakeholder and X – Crosscutting. The R—Rights indicators focus on freedom of expression; rights of access to information; freedom of association and the right to take part in public affairs; the right to privacy; and, social and economic rights. The A—Accessibility indicators address equitable access and local content and language and access for disabled people. O—Openness indicators look at market conditions and regulation. The Internet Universality Indicators policy and regulation, and are intended to be used collaboratively by duty bearers, rights holders and other stakeholders involved to conduct national assessments. For each indicator there are guiding questions and sources of verification. These indicators are particularly useful for Sida and its partners in applying the HRBA to national initiatives and doing context analyses.

Guiding questions

The key to applying these guiding questions is to do so based on the specific context of each strategy or initiative under discussion, to look at different types of rights, to always remember that rights are interconnected, to look at intended and unintended impacts – and both at risks to rights, and opportunities for expanding their enjoyment.

- What civil and political rights relate to the specific strategy or initiative? Starting with rights to individual freedom of expression and opinion, the right to assembly, and the right to privacy is always important. Once broad areas of rights are identified, the conversation can delve more deeply into specific links, such as, for example, the links between digital ID systems and the right to vote.
- Are the specific links to human rights noted and discussed in the strategy or project documents? For example, if gathering, storing and processing of people’s data is involved, what rights apply, e.g. the right to privacy, and the right to information?
- At the country level, is there a national ICT for development vision or digital transformation strategy or even 4th industrial revolution strategy. If there is, does it integrate and link to human rights? If so, how? And to which rights? Consider both positive and negative impacts, and intended and unintended consequences.
• Do the business models being used or developed impact on specific rights and do they do so proportionately? For example, if personal data is collected and retained, is it clear what the purpose is?
• How do specific technologies and tools (such as machine learning and big data analysis) used or developed link to human rights and what measures (such as data governance guidelines and end-to-end encryption, for example) should be built into the initiative to protect and promote these rights?
• Are stakeholders at all levels of the initiative aware of the links to human rights? Do they need awareness or capacity development?

Non-discrimination and equality (N)
Digitalisation features in most contemporary development efforts and holds the potential for increased efficiency and reach. It can also exacerbate existing inequalities and amplify prejudice and discrimination. Non-discrimination has to be context specific, based on analysis of existing power dynamics and differences in individuals and communities degree of access, skills and control in their interaction with digitalisation in general, and in relation to the specific initiative under discussion.

Guiding questions
• Who are the rights holders involved in the initiative? How does discrimination feature in their social, political and economic contexts – both historically and in the present? What are their needs? What rights are they able to enjoy and which do they lack?
• Does the initiative pose risks or opportunities for new forms of discrimination? For example, digitalisation could impact on discrimination based on age as older people often lack the necessary digital literacy skills needed to interact with digitalised systems and processes.

Accountability (A)
Identifying duty bearers and their capacity and interest to be accountable to rights-holders is central to integrating accountability into the contribution. For example, States, as duty-bearers, are required to take measures to make access to ICTs and the internet available to rights holders, to not disrupt such access intentionally through full or partial internet shutdowns, and by respecting and promoting human
rights on the internet. But, because most ICTs, and a free, open and secure internet depend also on the actions of non-state actors, particularly businesses, their roles and responsibilities should also be explored when looking at (A) accountability. For instance, when social media platforms remove political content posted online by individuals for violating the company’s “community standards” they are responsible for limiting freedom of expression. Similarly, by not taking action to address online gender-based violence, these companies may be responsible for limiting the human rights of people affected.

The UN guiding principles for businesses and human rights help with navigating this terrain. They have three pillars: Protect, Respect and Remedy:

- **The state has a duty to protect human rights.** This means that states must: (a) enforce laws that are aimed at requiring business enterprises to respect human rights; (b) ensure that other laws and policies, such as corporate law, do not constrain but enable business respect for human rights; (c) provide effective guidance to business enterprises on how to respect human rights throughout their operations; (d) encourage, and where appropriate require, business enterprises to communicate how they address their human rights impacts.

- **Business has a responsibility to respect human rights.** This means that business must a) avoid causing or contributing to adverse human rights impacts through their own activities and address such impacts when they occur; (b) seek to prevent or mitigate adverse human rights impacts that are linked to their operations. In order to fulfil these responsibilities, businesses need to have in place a) a policy commitment to meet their responsibility to respect human rights; (b) a human rights due diligence process to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for how they address their impacts on human rights; (c) processes to enable the remediation of any adverse human rights impacts they cause or to which they contribute.

- **Access to remedy for business related abuses.** Without proper remedying mechanisms, duties and obligations become vague. Therefore, effective remedying mechanisms play an important role in the state’s duty to protect and the corporate responsibility to respect. States must ensure the effectiveness of domestic judicial mechanisms and facilitate access to effective non-State-based grievance mechanisms dealing with business-related human rights harms. Business must establish or participate in grievance mechanisms for individuals and communities who may be adversely impacted.

**Guiding questions**

- In the specific context, who are the duty bearers?
  - In the case of Sida working with partners, there are likely to be several duty bearers. What other actors have some form of responsibility for human rights in the concerned initiative?

- Are duty bearers and others with responsibilities for respecting rights aware of their obligations and have a plan on how to meet them? This question needs to be considered at the level of the institutions [e.g. a government department] AND at the level of individuals involved in implementation of the concerned initiative.

- To what extent do duty bearers have the capacity (authority, administrative framework, knowledge, resources) and interest to meet these obligations? What are the key gaps?

- Do duty bearers integrate accountability mechanisms into their digitalisation policy and plans? In particular, do they plan for holding private sector entities involved accountable?

- Is there a monitoring system for compliance with human rights by duty bearers and other role players, as well as indicators of progress and penalties for non-compliance to commitments?

- Have the duty bearers created an enabling environment where individuals, civil society and human rights defenders are able to advocate for rights and demand accountability for violations? Are whistle blowers protected?

- Is there an effective complaint mechanism for the public with legal capacity to act? Is this mechanism known and accessible also at local level and to marginalised groups?

- Does Sida have a strategy for how to respond when role players in a Sida-supported digital development initiative does acknowledge its accountability?

---

4 This is very clearly expressed in the African Commission on Human and People’s Rights’ Declaration of Principles on Freedom of Expression of 2019: “States shall recognise that universal, equitable, affordable and meaningful access to the internet is necessary for the realisation of freedom of expression, access to information and the exercise of other human rights.” (Principle 37.2)

5 The term commonly used by social media platforms for their rules on what content is allowed or not allowed.
Participation (P)
Digitalisation for development efforts should actively include the participation of affected people and communities if these initiatives are to produce sustainable human rights outcomes. Affected people and communities are not only target beneficiaries. They include those who are responsible for implementation and maintenance of the initiative. Because digitalisation often involves change in how things are done, they can be challenging, and disruptive. People often feel threatened by digitalisation. Individuals who are expected to play a role in implementation might fear they could lose their jobs as a result of the initiative. The “Principles for Digital Development” supported by Sida address this directly through its emphasis on “Design with the user” and “Understanding the existing ecosystem”. Participation must take place throughout the life cycle of an initiative, not just at the planning phase.

Guiding questions:
• Who are the affected individuals, institutions, and communities? Adopt a holistic approach in identifying them by asking questions such as: Who will benefit? Who might not want the digitalisation process to go ahead? Who are involved in implementing and sustaining the effort, including service providers, vendors, trainers? Whose political will is necessary to ensure it has the support it needs?
• What are the context-specific power dynamics that might impact participation, e.g. with regard to gender, age, class, culture, identity and language?
• Is the purpose and scope of participation clearly framed? For example, if a decision has already been made to proceed with a digitalisation initiative this should be made clear to participants.
• At what stage of the contribution is participation initiated? Is it at the design phase, or the implementation phase? The earlier participation starts the better.
• Are the spaces for participation, consultation and co-design safe, sensitive to power dynamics and social norms, for example norms that can affect the participation of women or young people? This question should also be used to assess whether these spaces are safe and secure for CSOs and human rights defenders as well as environmental defenders and women human rights defenders.
• Do all role players involved have the resources and skills to participate effectively in a participative design, and or implementation process? For example, how to do stakeholder analysis and consultative co-design among project partners?

Transparency (T)
Transparency is not only warranted in how the duty bearer implements digitalisation, but is also needed from non-state actors such as the private sector, funders, development agencies and civil society organisations involved in the process. Transparency must be built in by design at every step along the way while making sure that sensitive and personal information, especially in dangerous situations is not compromised.

The policies and monitoring mechanisms should be clearly communicated and explained so that local duty bearers and concerned citizens can make informed decisions on if/how to participate in and benefit from the contribution. Who is gaining what? Who is losing what? Who is responsible for what? Here too the Digital Participation Principles are valuable to look at, in particular the principle on using open standards, open data, open source and open innovation.

Guiding questions are:
• Is information about the initiative communicated openly and in accessible formats/channels to the concerned duty bearers and rights holders (e.g. using local languages, community radio, sign language etc.). If not, how can this be supported?
• Are the contracts with investors, vendors or other service providers made public in terms of their commitments towards the population? If not, how can this be supported?
• Is the source of funding known? Are procurement processes transparent and open?
Are regional and bilateral agreements between public and private entities involved known to duty bearers and rights holders, so that they can engage in monitoring for compliance?

Are there human rights/environmental and social impact assessments being made public and presented in an available way (language, content etc.)?

What data or evidence was used in the design and strategy of the contribution?

Are there mechanisms for seeking answers and demanding change in the design of the project or policy?

Is information about the initiative available in an accessible place which is easy to find?

Do role players understand the potential burden, or even risks, that accompany transparency? Has a risk assessment been done for the initiative that considers the impact of transparency and the relationship between confidentiality and transparency?

Empowerment and capacity development (E)

Sustainable development and human rights outcomes rests on rights holders and duty bearers having the power, capacity and interest to bring about change where it is needed. Identifying the root causes of disempowerment, and understanding where empowerment and capacity development is needed is vital to an effective HRBA based contribution. People intended to benefit from digitisation in general, or a specific ICT4D initiative, must be able to understand the technology and tools they are becoming exposed to and learn how to address challenges along the way. Start with a stakeholder analysis that identifies all relevant stakeholders – building on the rights holders and duty bearers identified through (L) and (A) above – and how they are positioned in relation to the initiative’s desired outcomes. This is sometimes done in Sida’s multidimensional poverty analysis (MDPA), but also needs to be specific to each contribution. Key questions to be addressed in a stakeholder analysis include:

Who are the current stakeholders?

Are they rights holders (RH), duty bearers (DB), or others [including UN agencies, businesses, CSOs, religious organisations, bilateral donors, humanitarian actors]?

What is their current power or capacity to improve human right/s?

What is their current interest in improving human right/s?

Example: Big Data for Small Farmers in Tanzania

Context: Small scale farmers throughout Tanzania are increasingly challenged in two primary ways: (a) changes in rainfall patterns which has made it harder for them to plan when to plough, sow and plant their crops (mainly vegetables), and, (b) imports of pre-packaged vegetables from Zambia and South Africa by South African super market chains. Local consumers generally prefer using outdoor markets, and buying and eating local produce, but the inconsistency of availability, and the lack of diversity is resulting in more people opting for buying imported produce. For example, the most common locally grown tomato variety in recent years is Tenguru 2010. The supermarkets are importing other varieties, such as Sun Gold cherry tomatoes from Zambia and South Africa. Supermarkets also only buy crops grown that are standard in size and appearance which is usually not the case for the locally grown crops by small scale farmers. The result is that small scale farmers have lost revenue.

Goal: The goal of this initiative is to gather and analyse three different data sets for the period from 2016 to 2020:

- rainfall patterns in three different districts in Tanzania and in the tomato-growing regions of North-East South Africa and in East Zambia. Tomatoes require lots of water when growing, but a lot of rain close to harvesting will damage yield
- tomato crop yields in these regions using data made available by ZZ2 a company that grows tomatoes in South Africa and Zambia and by the East African Tomato Growers Network (EATGNET)
- consumer preferences for tomato varieties in Tanzania using data gathered by the Tanzanian Agricultural Research Institute (TARI) and the East African Tomato Growers Network (EATNET)

This data will be analysed to help establish:

- optimal planting and harvesting times for Tanzanian crops in the three districts included
- availability and cost of imported tomatoes
- availability and cost of locally grown tomatoes
- local consumer preferences

---

This example is fictional and was developed for the purpose of illustrating how to use the stakeholder analysis.
Empowered with this data which will be analysed and validated in partnership with farmers themselves, small scale farmers should be able to make better decisions about when to plan what variety of tomato and how to price them in order to compete more effectively with the imported tomatoes sold in supermarkets. Human rights outcomes are economic and social and link to ECSR obligations.

Participating farmers need to understand how the data was gathered and how it is being analysed and how it relates to their own localised experience and records. They need to understand how they can access the data through a mobile app which is being developed by one of the project partners, The Tanzanian Commission for Science and Technology (COSTECH) with the Dar es Salaam Innovation Hub and Spider. The intention is for this data analysis to take place every two years with the farmers being able to access the analysis directly.

Farmers need to feel that the plans developed have been put in place to address their needs, that they are not passive participants in the change and are able to influence the design of the contribution and that the participating research institutions understand their context and are willing to listen to them. They also need to feel that change in farming practices proposed by the analysis of the data will be feasible for them and that they will have access to training and financing should it be necessary. Many of the farmers who grow tomatoes in the parts of Tanzania covered by the project are women. In early 2000s Tanzanian Women Farmers for Action (TanWomFa) was formed by small scale women farmers to enable them to advocate for their rights – in relation to government, but also to defend their interests at local level where their interests were often not taken seriously by existing local farmer associations. Sida invited TanWomFa to join the project to play a role in ensuring that women farmers can participate and benefit.

Partners: Sida is the primary financing partner. Co-funding is provided by the Tanzanian Ministry of Agriculture. Other partners include TARI, COSTECH, EATGNET, Wageningen University and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Sida’s technology partner, Spider working with the Dar es Salaam Innovation Hub are also part of the project. Primary beneficiaries are small scale farmers and their associations in the three districts. TanWomFa are included to promote and protect interests of women farmers but they have tended to be skeptical of tech-related projects.

Below is a sample stakeholder analysis (there are more stakeholders than are included below) that can be used to reflect, in graphical form, how much power/capacity different stakeholders have to influence or fulfill human rights outcomes – and how much interest (political will, commitment etc.) they have in these human rights outcomes. The contribution needs to be clear on how it will support or influence the key stakeholders to move towards increased power, capacity or interest. This should be visible in the Theory

| Example outcome: Rights to food and to work of small scale farmers in Tanzania are enhanced – equally for men and women farmers – through increased and stable revenue from more effective growing and marketing of tomatoes |
|---|---|---|---|
| Who are the stakeholders? | Are they rights holders, duty bearers or Other? | What is their current power or capacity to engage (1-6)? | Current interest in improving the issue (1-6)? |
| Small scale farmers | Right Holders | 3 | 6 |
| Local farmer associations | Rights Holders | 3 | 3 |
| Tanzanian Ministry of Agriculture | Duty Bearers | 3 | 3 |
| Tanzanian Agricultural Research Institute – TARI | Duty bearers | 4 | 5 |
| East African Tomato Growers Network – EATGNET | Other | 3 | 5 |
| ZZ2 | Other | 6 | 2 |
| COSTECH / Dar Hub | Other | 4 | 4 |
| Spider | Other | 6 | 6 |
| TanWomFa | Other | 3 | 3 |
of Change. Moving the key stakeholders towards more interest, capacity and power, will lead to transformative changes. To facilitate the overview of each stakeholder, an assessment of their current power and capacity to engage as well as their willingness and interest to contribute to change has been made by rating this for each stakeholder, using a scale of 0=negative 1=nonexistent, 2= very low, 3=low, 4=moderate, 5=high 6=very high. Please note that some elements are made up for the purpose of the example and not all stakeholders (e.g. donors) are included.

A visualisation of this analysis provides an overview that can assist with planning the contribution.

Working with a HRBA entails contributing to changes in stakeholders’ powers, capacities and interests in a way that advances human rights outcomes. Such changes are referred to as “transformative”. Actors in squares B and D normally have a high interest in realising the desired HRBA outcome. Actors in D could need empowerment to be able to engage in a way that influences the outcome. The key for a successful contribution is to engage effectively with the duty bearers identified in A as they are responsible for achieving the desired change, also through intermediaries if direct engagement is not possible. Actors in square C may or may not be worth the effort to involve since they currently have both low interest and power/capacity to contribute to the desired change.

**Guiding Questions**

- What outcomes are being sought in terms of empowerment? Among who?
- What is their existing context and what are their needs, from their perspective? Does the role they play in the planned contribution give them sufficient agency throughout its life cycle? Are the solutions proposed sustainable and relevant to them? Are the duty-bearers involved in the solution development?
- How could empowerment of identified key rights holders’ advance outcomes? Has the contribution considered support to capacity development of associations representing rights holders e.g. farmers, workers, women, persons with disabilities to enable them to engage with market development processes and to access new markets?
- Who are the actors needed to sustain the contribution over time, for example through providing technical support, training, maintenance or content and services? Consider this with respect to all stakeholder groups, government, civil society, business, technical actors as well as social movements. Always consider that none of these stakeholder groups are homogeneous.
- Do stakeholders at local level have the capacity for effective decision-making related to procurement of service providers, vendors, equipment, and applications and other solutions? These decisions need to be made with consideration of factors such as the availability of reliable power, climate, security of premises, long term cost of license renewal, and needed skills for successful deployment – both technical and management skills.
- How will the contribution strengthen female and male micro-enterprises and smallholders to access markets and negotiate fair conditions and prices? What specific barriers limit empowerment in the context being worked in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. High power/capacity (score 4-6), Low interest (1-3)</th>
<th>B. High power/capacity (score 4-6), High interest (score 4-6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ZZ2
Ministry of Agriculture                               | TARI
COSTECH / Dar Hub                                       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Low power/capacity (score 1-3), Low interest (score 1-3)</th>
<th>D. Low power/capacity (score 1-3), High interest (score 4-6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local farmer associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TanWomFa</td>
<td>Small scale farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARI</td>
<td>EATGNET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Influence directly or via intermediaries

Scope for capacity building
• Do participants in the project feel that they have influence over its outcome and design? Will they be able to coordinate, manage and control the initiative over time? If not, how can this be remedied?

• Will they gain the skills necessary that would make them less dependent on other external actors? Is this reflected in the Theory of Change?

• How could capacity building of key duty bearers advance outcomes? Has the contribution considered capacity development of authorities, investors and businesses to monitor and adhere to legal and voluntary human rights instruments?

• How could stakeholders’ interest in advancing the outcome be increased? Has the contribution considered the use of incentives to change policies or practices of stakeholders?

• Finally, it cannot be over-emphasized that there are risks of doing harm when working to change power, capacity and interest dynamics. Identifying those risks and including key stakeholders with knowledge and experience on conflict prevention and mitigation in the context from the very start can make a difference.

USEFUL LINKS AND REFERENCES (IN ADDITION TO THOSE QUOTED ABOVE)

International Human Rights Conventions

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966)

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966)

Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women (1979)


Web page where these treaties can be monitored http://uhri.ohchr.org/en/

Resources on the Sustainable Development Goals and Digitalisation

The Declaration on the Right to Development (1986) is a good starting point. More recently there are many tools and resources which focus on the Sustainable Development Goals, linking them to specific human rights.

A table that links the Sustainable Development Goals to specific human rights, developed by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

The Human Rights Guide to the Sustainable Development Goals developed by the Danish Institute for Human Rights

Principles for Digital Development developed by the Digital Impact Alliance

Resources from the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)

The right to privacy in the digital age: report (2021)


Human Rights Council (HRC) Resolutions and Reports from Special Rapporteurs

Resolution on "The promotion, protection and enjoyment of human rights on the Internet" (2012)

HRC Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression and Opinion reports on: the right to freedom of expression on the internet (2011); online content regulation (2018); online freedom of assembly (2019); online surveillance (2019); online hate speech (2019) and disinformation online (2021).

HRC Special Rapporteur on Privacy reports on: privacy and COVID-19 (2020)

Other Relevant Declarations, Commitments, Principles or Guidelines


The European Commission’s Digital Services Act (2021)

Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (2011)


Rights to access to information, particularly to information held by public authorities which is described in a range of decisions by regional bodies and which links to freedom of expression and opinion.

Resources on the HRBA

OHCHR Human Rights Based Approach Frequently Asked Questions

The UN Statement of Common Understanding on Human Rights-Based Approaches to Development Cooperation and Programming (the Common Understanding) adopted by the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) in 2003