

Regional Training Courses on Human Rights in the MENA-region

**Sida Support to the Raoul Wallenberg Institute (RWI)
of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law**

**Anna Collins-Falk
Nicklas Svensson
Jamil Mouawad**

**Department for Democracy
and Social Development**

Regional Training Courses on Human Rights in the MENA-region

**Sida Support to the Raoul Wallenberg Institute (RWI)
of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law**

**Anna Collins-Falk
Nicklas Svensson
Jamil Mouawad**

Sida Evaluation 06/32

**Department for Democracy
and Social Development**

This report is part of *Sida Evaluations*, a series comprising evaluations of Swedish development assistance. Sida's other series concerned with evaluations, Sida Studies in Evaluation, concerns methodologically oriented studies commissioned by Sida. Both series are administered by the Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit, an independent department reporting directly to Sida's Board of Directors.

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

Authors: Anna Collins-Falk, Nicklas Svensson, Jamil Mouawad.

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 Evaluation 06/32

Commissioned by Sida, Department for Democracy and Social Development

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Registration No.: 2006-001504

Date of Final Report: August 2006

Printed by Edita Communication AB, 2006

Art. no. Sida31352en

ISBN 91-586-8398-4

ISSN 1401—0402

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: sida@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	6
1.1 Background.....	6
1.2 Methodology.....	7
2. Programme Relevance.....	8
3. Programme Performance.....	10
3.1 Effectiveness.....	10
3.2 Efficiency	11
3.3 Impact.....	13
4. Sustainability.....	16
5. Conclusions and Lessons Learned	18
6. Recommendations.....	19
General Recommendations	19
Specific Recommendations in Relation to Content and Modalities:.....	20
Annex 1: Terms of Reference	21
Annex 2: List of People Interviewed	25
Annex 3: Documents Consulted	28
Annex 4: Distribution of Participants per Country and Organisation.....	29
Annex 5: E-mail Questionnaire to Participants.....	31

Executive Summary

Sida has provided support to the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (RWI) for their Asia Programme since the 1990's. The Middle East and North Africa (MENA) component was included in the programme proposal for the latest Asia Programme, covering the period September 2003–December 2006. It was originally called the Regional Advanced Programme in Human Rights and later renamed the Development of Regional Training Activity – Promotion of Human Rights in the Middle East and North Africa.

This evaluation thus essentially covers the following six training courses:

- *Human Rights and the Rule of Law*, held in Beirut in March 2004.
- *Equal Status and Human Rights of Women*, held in Beirut, in October 2004, and again in September 2005, and in April 2006.
- *Follow-up Programme and Introduction to Refugee Law*, held in Beirut, August 2005.
- *Human Rights and Good Governance*, held in Beirut, January 2006.

The total budget for the MENA regional training programme is SEK 8 380 000.

According to Sida/DESO, the MENA regional programme of 2003–2006 is to be regarded as a “first phase” in a long-term endeavour of establishing and reinforcing RWI's activities in the area of human rights training in the MENA-region.

In accordance with the ToR the evaluation addresses whether the support was relevant, whether the objectives have been reached, if the programme has had any strategic impact, and whether the results are sustainable. The evaluation also assesses whether the programme has been well-managed and efficient regarding achievements and the use of resources. The evaluation is carried out on a programme level, and only to the specific training courses, or individual sessions.

First, the evaluation team finds that the overall *objective* of the programme, “to contribute to the strengthening of human rights protection, by enhanced awareness of applicable international human rights standards among relevant stakeholders working with the protection of human rights”, has been achieved as a result of the implementation of the planned activities, i.e. the training courses that make up the regional programme.

Second, the overall content of the training programme is *relevant*. It matches the needs and *priorities* identified for the MENA-region by both the UNDP Arab Human Development Report of 2002, and Sida. Ultimately, the target group, i.e. the participants, without exception rated their respective training courses as either “relevant” or “highly relevant” for them as individuals and for the region.

Thirdly, the programme has been managed well and organized and implemented in an *efficient* way. Reporting, including financial reporting to Sida has been good, timely and accurate, and reporting by the Foundation of Human and Humanitarian Rights Lebanon (FHHRL) to the RWI has been equally timely and good. The cooperation between the RWI and the FHHRL is found to be good. The FHHRL has fulfilled its obligations according to the agreement with the RWI.

On a different note, Sida needs to consolidate its cooperation with the RWI possibly under one agreement. It is not feasible for the RWI to respond to ad-hoc requests from various departments within Sida on different contracts and agreements, and to be involved in parallel programme planning initiatives.

Fourthly, the MENA Regional Training Programme has contributed to improving both the knowledge and skills of participants as well as to a more limited extent the capacity within the organisations they represent. In regard to more long-term or broader local and institutional capacity development there is limited *impact*.

Fifthly, the results obtained from the programme will not be sustainable in its current form beyond the benefits to the individual participants, and the limited impact on their respective organisations and institutions. There is no clear ownership established for the programme in the region. It is not financially sustainable without donor-support. It has not led to institutional capacity development of any magnitude for the participants' organisations or for the implementing partner.

In conclusion, the RWI together with their cooperating partner the FHHRL have successfully implemented the MENA regional training programme on human rights in line with the agreed objectives.

Furthermore, RWI's training programme is unique in the MENA-region, with its comprehensive approach of focusing on both international human rights standards and women rights in particular, and with the regional dimension. The regional courses have the further benefit of bringing together participants from different countries in the MENA-region with different professional backgrounds, from both civil society and government institutions around the sensitive topic of human rights in a conflict prone region where the opportunities to meet are very rare. Discussions among participants have been very enriching, especially the exchange of experiences between participants from Mashreq and Maghreb regions.

The evaluation team recommends that the RWI prepare a proposal for a second phase, building on the experiences gained and the contacts made in this first phase.

An identification or planning phase should form part of the new programme, where proper stakeholder analysis and context analysis is carried out. The use of LFA or other appropriate planning methodology, tools and frameworks, including setting targets and benchmarks for capacity development and institutional capacity development is recommended.

As part of the planning phase RWI should investigate opportunities for synergies and collaboration with other Swedish and international actors in the region within the same field, in cooperation with Sida or the Embassy in Cairo, also to coordinate possible future support to institutions in the region.

Sida should consolidate its cooperation with the RWI under one agreement and specify its institutional home within Sida. This should be done in close cooperation with the RWI.

Within the timeframe available we have addressed the main issues in the Terms of Reference, and responded to points of emphasis as discussed in briefing sessions at Sida in Stockholm and with the RWI in Lund. Interviews were conducted in Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt and Sweden in June and early July.

A list of all the individuals, institutions and documents consulted is provided in Annex 2 and 3.

The views of all of these stakeholders were crucial in helping the team to formulate its analysis and recommendations. This is an independent report and the conclusions and analyses are not necessarily shared by the stakeholders interviewed.

The evaluation team gratefully acknowledges the efforts made by all of these participants to find the time to share their knowledge and experience with the team.

The team is also grateful for the cooperation and support provided by RWI and the FHHRL in the course of the evaluation.

Any errors of fact and interpretation are our own.

Helsingborg, Stockholm and Beirut, July 7th, 2006

Anna Collins-Falk, Nicklas Svensson and Jamil Mouawad.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Sida has provided support to the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (RWI) for their Asia Programme since the 1990's. The Middle East and North Africa (MENA¹) component was included in the programme proposal for the latest Asia Programme, covering the period September 2003–December 2006. It was originally called the Regional Advanced Programme in Human Rights and later renamed the Development of Regional Training Activity – Promotion of Human Rights in the Middle East and North Africa, (henceforth referred to as the MENA Regional Programme).

Within Sida, the Department for Democracy and Social Development (DESO), in Stockholm, manages the Programme in collaboration with the Asia Department – MENA section, and the Swedish Embassy in Cairo.

The training courses are undertaken by the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law together with their partner organisation, the Lebanese Foundation for Human and Humanitarian Rights (FHHRL). All the training courses have been held in Beirut.

This evaluation thus essentially covers the following six training courses:

- *Human Rights and the Rule of Law*, held in Beirut in March 2004. (Referred to by RWI as MENAHR 04)
- *Equal Status and Human Rights of Women*, held in Beirut, in October 2004, (MENAWO 04), and again in September 2005 (MENAWO 05), and in April 2006 (MENAWO 06)
- *Follow-up Programme and Introduction to Refugee Law*, held in Beirut, August 2005. (MENAFU 05)
- *Human Rights and Good Governance*, held in Beirut, January 2006. (MENAGO 06)

The follow-up course (MENAFU 06) planned for late August this year is not included in this evaluation.

The total budget for the MENA regional training programme is SEK 8 380 000.

According to Sida/DESO, the MENA regional programme of 2003–2006 is to be regarded as a “first phase” in a long-term endeavour of establishing and reinforcing RWI's activities in the area of human rights training in the MENA-region.

The RWI has in addition to the agreement with Sida for the regional programme been contracted for other activities in the MENA-region, financed by other departments at Sida apart from DESO/DESA, such as INEC/KTS and PEO/ITP. These include among others; training courses on human rights of women for the International Training Programmes (ITP) held in Lund and Alexandria, workshops on human rights of women for the Syrian Commission for Family Affairs in Damascus and workshops and seminars for judges, lawyers and journalists in Morocco.

Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to evaluate the impact and results of Sida's support to the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (RWI) and its Development of Regional Training Activity – Promotion of Human Rights in the Middle East and North Africa, for the period

¹ MENA – Middle East and North Africa. According to the definition applied by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (UD) Sweden: the following countries are included in MENA: Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, United Arab Emirates, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Yemen, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Tunisia, and Qatar.

September 2003 to December 2006. The evaluation, together with other documentation and considerations, is, according to Sida, expected to provide information and lessons learnt in order to serve as a basis for decisions on future support. The current agreement for the Asia programme between Sida/DESA and RWI will come to an end in December 2006.

Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions

In accordance with the ToR (see annex 1) the evaluation addresses whether the support was relevant, whether the objectives have been reached, if the programme has had any strategic impact, and whether the results are sustainable. The evaluation also assesses whether the programme has been well-managed and efficient regarding achievements and the use of resources. The evaluation is carried out on a programme level, and only to the specific training courses, or individual sessions.

For ease of reference, the report is structured according to these criteria. Chapter 1 provides the background and context of the programme, chapter 2 provides the evaluation team's analysis of the relevance of the programme, chapter 3 provides the findings as regards programme performance, presented under the headings programme effectiveness, efficiency and impact. Chapter 4 addresses issues of sustainability, and chapter 5 presents conclusions and lessons learned, and chapter 6 provides recommendations on the way forward.

Objective of the Programme

The overall objective of the Programme as defined in the application to Sida/DESO for the MENA component of the RWI Asia Programme is *“to contribute to the strengthening of the respect for human rights in the Arab world, by enhanced awareness of applicable international human rights standards among academics, lawyers, personnel within the judicial systems, NGO representatives and other vital stakeholders for the protection and promotion of human rights.”*

Three training courses a year focusing on the Rule of Law and Human Rights, Human Rights of Women, and a follow-up course including a third human rights issue of regional concern, such as Refugee Law formed the main part of the proposal. For the 2006 training programme the topic of Human Rights and Good Governance was introduced.

1.2 Methodology

The Evaluation Team is comprised of three consultants, *Ms Anna Collins-Falk*, Institute of Public Management, team leader, (MA in International Relations and Development Studies, specialised in women's rights and gender equality), *Mr Nicklas Svensson*, Institute of Public Management, (MA in Law and Diplomacy, Islamic and Middle Eastern studies, specialised in the field of peace and security, as well as human rights). *Mr Jamil Mouawad*, Lebanese Centre for Policy Studies, (MA in Political and Administrative Sciences, specialised in the field of human rights, democracy and good governance).

The team has assessed reports and other relevant documentation such as Sida Decision Memoranda, Sida/UD strategy and Position papers, progress reports, and documentation and training material used in the training courses. (See list of references in annex 3).

Interviews have been held with relevant stakeholders in Sweden, Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon. These include Sida staff in Stockholm (DESA, INEC/KTS, PEO/ITP), staff at the Swedish Embassy in Cairo, RWI staff in Lund, Director and Manager of the FHHRL in Beirut, lecturers, as well as beneficiaries, i.e. the participants of the training programmes.

The selection of countries for the evaluation team field visits (Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon) was made in consultation with Sida/DESO and the RWI, based on a combination of the following criteria;

- reflecting the number of participants who have attended the training courses,

- countries of relevance for future Swedish cooperation (i.e. part of the five focus countries in the new MENA strategy),
- countries where RWI may continue to work and develop institutional partnerships, and
- countries that could be visited without major security concerns or visa problems. (This eliminated Iraq, as well as Syria, and the Palestinian Occupied Territories –West Bank and Gaza.)

The participants selected for interviews represent a cross-section of government agencies, Human Rights or Women's Councils and Commissions, University and/or research institutes, and NGOs. Whenever relevant and where possible, the leadership and management of the organisations and institutions where the participants work were also interviewed. The interviews were semi-structured and were held individually and in groups.

31 participants from 11 countries (Tunisia, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestinian Territories, Iraq, Iran, Libya, Yemen, Egypt, and Syria) also responded to the e-mail questionnaire distributed to all participants of all courses (total of 104), except for the participants already interviewed.

2. Programme Relevance

The evaluation team finds the overall content of the training programme relevant. It matches the *needs* and *priorities* identified for the MENA-region by Arab intellectuals and researchers documented in for example the UNDP Arab Human Development Report of 2002², which identifies three obstacles to human development: the lack of human rights and democratic governance; lack of human rights for women and gender inequality; and lack of quality in education. It is also in line with Sida's Position Paper on Development Cooperation with the MENA region, published in 2002, which states that Sida's work in the region should primarily depart from insufficiencies in democracy, human rights, good governance, rule of law and gender equality.³ The new strategy for the MENA region for 2006–2008, which will only be in effect for the last six months of the programme further supports this. Ultimately, the target group, i.e. the participants, without exception rated their respective training courses as either "relevant" or "highly relevant" for them as individuals and for the region.

There are other forms of training in human rights in the region through other actors such as local and international NGOs, as well as multilateral organizations such as UNDP. However, the NGOs mainly focus on a narrow area within the field of human rights, which does not make it useful for general human rights organizations, such as human rights councils with broad mandates, and UNDP does not offer a training programme, which is available to a wide range of stakeholders. The managers interviewed from the participants' organizations also commented on the low quality of human rights education at university level, which consequently increases the demand for comprehensive training programmes in human rights.

Because of the different focus of the courses, the target groups vary to a certain extent. For the courses on Human Rights and the Rule of Law (MENHR) and Human Rights and Good Governance (MENAGO) target groups include personnel in the judicial system, i.e. judges, prosecutors and lawyers, but also representatives from civil society and non-governmental organizations, academics as well as relevant government officials. For the courses on Equal Status and Human Rights of Women (MENAWO), the target group includes representatives from women's organizations and from govern-

² UNDP, Arab Human Development Report 2002: Creating Opportunities for Future Generations, 2002.

³ Sida, Förhållningssätt: Utvecklingssamarbetet med Mellanöstern och Nordafrika, 2002.

mental agencies responsible for gender equality issues and researchers involved in promoting the rights of women. For the Follow-up Programme and Introduction to Refugee Law (MENAFU) the target group includes participants from the first and second training courses.

The participants are all from the MENA-region and they share many issues in common within the fields of human rights, women's rights and good governance. They represent a wide range of countries but also quite diverse professional backgrounds. Their needs therefore obviously differ from each other.

There are very few opportunities for people to meet in this region, which is often mentioned as one of the main positive achievements of the regional programme. The participants reported that they appreciated the diversity represented in the group as it added value to the experience. A participant from Lebanon exclaimed: *"I spent three hours talking to an Iranian jurist on human rights, something I never expected possible!"* It also enabled them to understand human rights issues facing other stakeholders, which contributed to a more holistic understanding of context and priorities in the field of human rights. Others argued that it assisted them in making insightful arguments in the course of their work.

For the first time government officials and civil society activists sat together and discussed human rights issues, as was the case with the Syrian participants in one course. This would not have been possible for them in Syria they claimed. In other cases however, it was noted that participants were restrained in their comments, taking into account the official stand of their respective governments.

Although relevant topics have been selected, the usefulness of both the general and the region-specific topics of the training programme to a large extent depend on the professional knowledge, communication skills and attitudes of the lecturers. All lecturers were viewed as highly competent and experienced in their field but a significant number of participants criticized lecturers for having poor communication and presentation skills. They were not varied in their use of communication tools, were not dynamic, did not respond to the experience in the group, and did not open up for questions and discussions. This was reported as a problem especially among some of the lecturers contracted from the region. Other lecturers received overwhelming praise. The added value of the regional dimension is very easily lost if there is not sufficient interaction and sharing of experience. For the same reason, the assignments have been highly appreciated, providing good entry points for discussions. The key learning moment, according to most participants, is the discussion between the participants contributing to new ideas and approaches in solving problems.

The evaluation team would therefore like to emphasize the need among participants on how to apply the newly gained knowledge in the field of human rights. For instance, more of tools for advocacy, lobbying, working with pressure groups, and the role of media, applied on human rights issues. The needs from a practical perspective differ however among the participants. There are nevertheless some commonalities around the 'how'-question. For this reason a future Sida funded programme in this field should have a more concerted focus on institutional capacity development.

The issue of balancing the amount of *lecturing* on the theoretical frameworks of international human rights standards, and more *interactive* forms of applying those standards was often raised by the participants. Especially participants from NGOs and the human rights activists pushed more for implementation issues. These participants would in particular gain from learning how their organizations can be better at promoting human rights in the region. For participants working with advocacy of human rights, it is vital to know how one can influence policy work and national legislation. How human rights organization can be better at achieving their goals? There is a general feeling that participants' organizations need to be better at implementing human rights projects, and it would therefore be useful if the training programme includes a component to tackle this issue.

For instance, the participants reported that they appreciated the workshops, case studies, and the role play, and they think it should be expanded as it increases both the understanding of, and the application

of the pertinent topics. However, it would be useful to gain further skills on how to be a researcher in human rights in order to make it useful and applicable to training purposes, advocacy, or protection work? Participants request to learn more about Internet for researching on human rights issues.

Other suggestions included structuring the training courses into working groups, according to the target groups of the participants' home organizations. Thus, the training programme would be better linked to participants' own needs and have more of an impact.

As reported above, the assignments are highly appreciated. However, these risk overlapping and becoming repetitive, especially if there are several participants from the same country in the same field. A more even distribution of nationalities among participants from the region, or if the participants write their assignments from the perspective of their position in their organization, not country or sector level, would avoid this problem.

3. Programme Performance

3.1 Effectiveness

It is generally difficult to measure effectiveness of human rights programmes and effectiveness at the output level is still no guarantee for effectiveness in terms of impact.

RWI's overall objective for this programme was to “*contribute to the strengthening of human rights protection, by enhanced awareness of applicable international human rights standards among relevant stakeholders working with the protection of human rights.*”⁴ In this regard the evaluation team finds that the overall objective of the programme has been achieved as a result of the implementation of the planned activities, i.e. the training courses that make up the regional programme.

The training courses have been carried out in a timely and professional way, and whenever postponed or cancelled this was due to factors outside the control of the RWI or the FHHRL.

The findings clearly show that participants have found the training programme to be successful in offering them greater knowledge and awareness of international human rights standards. It also broadened their thinking and understanding of human rights issues, women's rights and good governance. Overall the regional dimension was seen as advantageous and local issues and perspectives were explored and experiences shared among the participants. However, several participants mentioned the need for stressing the local/regional context even further. (See further discussion on this under the section on *impact* below).

A surprising number of participants commented on the difficulties for participants to use English, in particular for participants from the French-speaking Arab countries, who prefer Arabic or French. Language has the unfortunate consequence that it can alienate those who do not follow and understand what is being communicated and discussed during the training sessions. This is obviously a serious issue as the training programme will have limited effectiveness to reach its objective or a positive impact on the environment in the MENA-region. As a result, it will be important for RWI to ensure that participants have sufficient knowledge of English to actively participate in the training sessions or to explore possibilities for holding the programme in Arabic. This is however not an option for participants from Iran, and limits the participation of international lecturers.

⁴ Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law, Kursbeskrivningar – komplement till RWI:s MENA-ansökan 2003–2006.

A majority of the respondents to the survey preferred English as they also wanted to be more acquainted with the international human rights terminology (However it may be likely that the respondents who did not reply to the questionnaire in English are also the ones that would have preferred Arabic).

The human rights specialists and lecturers from the region all stressed the need for holding the courses in Arabic. The evaluation team finds that a combination of Arabic and English may be preferred and that in order to make the lectures more interactive and dynamic, and to promote exchange of experience, Arabic should be used to a larger extent. Material in English should also be made available, and interpreters should be budgeted for and used when necessary.

3.2 Efficiency

There is no programme document apart from the application to Sida. For example, no LFA was used to facilitate the process and the actual application to Sida does not bear much resemblance to the level of detail of for example objectives, measurable indicators, and expected outputs and risk analysis which by now has become the norm for most Sida-funded programmes. Acknowledging that the MENA programme is only one part of the overall Asia programme application submitted by RWI, it still falls short of the level of analysis that could be expected for a development cooperation programme of just over 8.3 million SEK. This is of course as much the fault of Sida as of the RWI. For these reasons it is also more difficult to follow-up and to evaluate the programme. This is also the likely root of the problem of limited institutional capacity development elements of the programme.

The formulation process actually appears to have been remarkably informal, based on personal contacts, with the initiative taken by Sida officials as much as by the RWI. The main basis, or according to the documentation, the only basis, for the programme are joint study visits to the region by Sida and RWI Professors, and the analysis provided in the UNDP Arab Human Development Report, 2002. No stakeholder analysis or other stakeholder involvement at institutional level formed part of the process, beyond the study visits.

Although RWI already had considerable experience of organising and providing advanced human rights training courses for Sida, both for the International Training Programmes also at a regional level in South-East Asia, the MENA region was relatively new to the RWI in 2003, and even Sida had limited experience working in the MENA region, especially at a regional level.

In the future, Sida will need to consolidate its cooperation with the RWI possibly under one agreement. It is not feasible for the RWI to respond to ad-hoc requests from various departments within Sida on different contracts and agreements, and to be involved in parallel programme planning initiatives with for example the Division of Contract Financed Technical Cooperation (KTS), as well as with DESO/DESA and Asia/MENA. Their institutional home at Sida for any future programme should logically be DESO/DESA relating to the content of the cooperation, or directly with the regional co-ordinator at the Embassy in Cairo, which would enable a constructive dialogue between Sida staff and the RWI.

Sida DESO/DESA initially reported that there was, relatively limited communication between Sida and the RWI compared to the flow of communication with other Swedish actors, but now finds that this is no longer the case, and both parties claim a good working relationship. Sida is not well-coordinated in their cooperation with the RWI in the MENA region, and it is not always clear to the RWI who they should be communicating with. As reported above, the RWI interact with different sections at Sida for this agreement, including DESO, Asia/MENA, and the Sida regional coordinator in Cairo.

There has been a high turnover of staff at RWI among those responsible for the programme, three people in 3 years, and at Sida effectively all the main people responsible for the programme, both at DESO and Asia/MENA are leaving their present positions in July (and the replacement will also be on

leave from September). The contract for the regional coordinator in Cairo also expires at the end of the year. Needless to say, any institutional memory is at risk of being lost.

The logistics surrounding the selection of participants, information and communication, visas, tickets, travel, etc provided by the RWI has been complimented by all concerned. The implementation of the training courses by the FHHRL and the facilities and accommodation in Beirut and the support to the participants is reported to have been very well-managed and commendable.

The selection of participants is carried out by the RWI in collaboration with the FHHRL, based on a detailed formal written application. The applications are assessed based on the applicants' qualifications, and the relevance of the course in relation to their present responsibilities and position. Necessary English language skills are a requirement. RWI staff follow-up and assess the applications in detail and go to great lengths in ensuring a fair distribution both among the different countries but also a suitable group composition with representatives from NGOs, government agencies, etc, and a balanced representation of women and men.

More publicity in the MENA region for the Programme is called for by the organisers and participants. The number of applications has increased over the years, but this would open up possibilities for people to take the initiative on their own to apply, and not only wait to be recommended or nominated by their employers.

The issue of human rights in the MENA-region is a delicate subject considering the political environment and lack of historical experience in the field. Civil and political rights are restricted in many of the countries. According to a human rights specialist in Beirut: *"Lebanon offers a unique opportunity to discuss such issues as human rights due to the ability to the hold open and lively discussion without state interference."*

The selection of Beirut as the venue is also understandable from a practical perspective since the RWI has chosen to cooperate with the FHHRL. Beirut was also considered suitable as there are suitable organisations and places for study visits. It was also possible for most participants to obtain visas to Lebanon.

From a cost-effectiveness point of view, the training courses are expensive when considering the number of participants and their relatively short length, even if compared to Sida's International Training Programmes, but since the evaluation team has not investigated this in any detail, this remains an observation. The FHHRL also raised this issue, and recommended that the venue be changed from a hotel to a Human Rights Centre they are in the process of establishing. However, this would need careful consideration and be considered only after choice of cooperating partner, country for courses etc.

The evaluation team concludes that the quality of technical assistance as regards the management and administration is very good. The quality of the technical assistance relating to the lecturers and the content of the training is discussed under the sections relevance and *impact*.

The evaluation team finds that the programme has been managed well and organized and implemented in an efficient way. Reporting, including financial reporting to Sida has been good, timely and accurate, and reporting by the FHHRL to the RWI has been equally timely and good.

The cooperation between the RWI and the FHHRL is found to be good. The FHHRL has fulfilled its obligations according to the agreement with the RWI. They have met with the expectations of RWI and the participants, although initially the FHHRL found it difficult to live up to their part of the agreement in finding suitable lecturers.

3.3 Impact

When assessing the impact, understood as the totality and long-term effects brought about through the programme the evaluation team finds that the MENA Regional Training Programme has contributed to improving both the knowledge and skills of participants as well as to a more limited extent the capacity within the organisations they represent. For instance, the assignment included in the programme combined with the exercises improved many participants ability and professionalism to develop and formulate legal arguments in the field of human rights. Both the knowledge acquired and the material received during the programme has been important for the participants and their organisations and institutions when preparing their own training seminars or workshops for local NGOs, or lectures at academic institutions (depending on their organisational home).

However, in regard to more long-term or broader local and institutional capacity development there is limited impact. In this respect the evaluation team would like to maintain realistic expectations of the possible impact of ten-day training programmes on human rights and women's rights. Although highly desirable, the potential impact of capacity development both on an individual and institutional level can only be relatively limited unless part of a more long-term initiative.

The evaluation team finds that appropriate mechanisms to enhance partnership, local capacity development, institution building and ownership are not part of the design of the regional training programme. According to the documentation, the programme actually has very limited ambitions in this respect, although it is criticised by Sida as well as the Human Rights institutions in the region for falling short on this. It is a weakness, but a consequence of the poor design of the programme, not a failure in implementation of the programme.

Only in the follow-up programme (MENAFU) are there explicit aims for 'participants to reinforce their inter-regional networking activities in the field of human rights protection and promotion'.

The overall objective is to:

"contribute to the strengthening of human rights protection, by enhanced awareness of applicable international human rights standards among relevant stakeholders working with the protection of human rights."

The expected results are:

"deepened knowledge of both international human rights standards."

The participants are expected to have:

"obtained a raised understanding and awareness of pertinent regional challenges, possibilities and developments pertaining" to different areas of human rights.⁵

The evaluation team would like to emphasize that there is both an expressed need and a great interest among the participants and the management of the various Human Rights institutions in the region for enhanced partnership, local capacity development and local institutional development. Sida together with RWI should capitalize on this interest.

As mentioned above, the courses are relevant. The field has started to expand in the MENA region only recently, and there are more courses available than earlier. The RWI has to be present in the region in order to network and cooperate with other institutions and organizations and to establish where the courses fit in with other initiatives. Sida staff reiterate that they do not have the resources to monitor or coordinate this despite acknowledging that the input is needed. There are a number of Human Rights

⁵ Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law, Kursbeskrivningar – komplement till RWI:s MENA-ansökan 2003–2006.

institutions in the region but they need the tools and methodology for being effective, in order for there to be any impact on human rights. It is also important for Human Rights institutions to work on this together, not only donors.

How to establish a network of Human Rights actors is one of the issues. There is still very limited interaction and discussion between the countries in the region. The regional perspective could be stressed even further as expressed in the new MENA strategy. The National Council of Human Rights and “watchdog institutions” may be important partners for this.

Furthermore, participants claimed it would be very helpful to learn how human rights councils can be better at working with NGOs and governments both in their countries and in the region? It is increasingly important for human rights organizations in the MENA-region to form a forum to exchange ideas and experiences on regular basis to tackle specific issues, such as complaints. Also, it would be very useful for participants to learn more about how organizations in the field of human rights can effectively communicate with their communities/constituencies.

Despite claims of limited resources, it would be pertinent for Sida and the Embassy in Cairo to a larger extent consider synergies between the on-going programmes/projects in the MENA-region. This should also form part of the discussions with RWI for a possible new application to Sida. The RWI, essentially being an academic institution could also benefit from the cooperation with other development actors in order to further elaborate what could be “capacity development from a development cooperation perspective”. An extended formulation/identification phase should be considered for this purpose.

Sida provides support to Mediterranean Development Forum 5 WB/WBI-MDF 5. The overall objectives of the partnership of think tanks, the World Bank Institute and UNDP are to empower civil society, to contribute to the debate on policy and reform, to improve research on economic and social issues and to create regional networks.⁶ For many participants and their home organizations, this kind of programme could perhaps be a good complement to RWI’s competence on human rights. It could be useful for RWI to explore opportunities for collaborating with WBI or UNDP on enhancing partnership, local capacity building and local institutional building. Similar opportunities can be explored with UNIFEM⁷ and Kvinna till Kvinna (Woman to Woman)⁸. These two organizations are pertinent to the training programme on *Equal Status and Human Rights of Women*. At this early stage in exploring opportunities to incorporate partnership, local capacity development and local institutional development into the future programme, it could for practical purposes be useful for RWI to make another attempt at approaching the organisation Kvinna till Kvinna.

Another dimension of evaluating impact relates to the beneficiaries. Have the right groups benefited?

The participants of the training programmes are from altogether 15 countries, including Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestinian Occupied Territories, Syria, Tunisia, Yemen, Kuwait, as well as including observers from the UAE, Malaysia and Sweden.

There is a deliberate and fairly even distribution among NGOs and Government Institutions, with some variations between the different courses. (See the distribution per country and organisation/institution in annex 4 below).

The participants selected are mainly relatively young, yet experienced, middle- management level professionals in their respective organisations and institutions, with a few exceptions. In some cases the participants are more senior but their participation was justified by their limited training in Human Rights or Women’s Rights in relation to their current position.

⁶ Sida, Regional Office MENA, *Annual Report, MENA, Regional Program*, 2005, 2006.

⁷ UNIFEM manages a program on Arab Women Parliamentarians.

⁸ Kvinna till Kvinna manages a program on empowering women in the region to take part in society in their own countries.

According to the RWI, the applications received for the programme in the MENA region are in general of poorer quality compared to applications for similar courses in other regions, which consequently affects the selection and country distribution of participants.

Both the gender balance and the participation per country and organisation/institution are found to be good. Even in the MENAWO courses on women's rights there has been a relatively good gender balance. Where there is an over or under-representation from a certain country this reflects the number of qualified applications and there are acceptable practical explanations.

Over the 3 years the distribution of participants per country has been as follows: (not including the follow-up course MENAFU 05) Jordan: 19, Iraq: 18, Lebanon: 15, Egypt: 10, Yemen: 6, Morocco: 6, Tunisia: 6, Syria: 5, Palestinian Territories: 4, Algeria: 4, Iran: 3, Kuwait: 1, UAE: 2 (observers), Malaysia 1 (observer), Sweden 1 (observer).

The evaluation team finds no indications of any serious negative impact of the programme or of any sub-group having benefited substantially more than any other, apart from the fact that potential participants may have been excluded because they do not have the necessary English language skills.

The English language requirement does pose restrictions on most participants from the MENA region, but especially from North Africa, where most participants apart from Arabic would often have French as their second language. A number of the participants from Iraq have also been reported by both the FHHRL, RWI and other participants as having very poor English, although they managed to pass the selection screening, but then found the lectures very tough to follow and had to consult fellow participants in Arabic afterwards.

Other limiting factors to participation include logistical arrangements such as visa and money transfers etc, which are covered under the management section above. It is worth noting that initially it was difficult for participants from Palestine Occupied Territories with only Israeli ID-cards to attend the courses in Lebanon which has since been solved. Whether Palestinian refugees in Lebanon should apply as Lebanese or on a special quota also remains contentious, (they do not enjoy Lebanese citizenship status) however, since there was an under-representation of Lebanese participants, the Palestinian refugees from Lebanon that qualified, have been accommodated so far.

The FHHRL as well as some of the participants criticise the selection procedures on the basis of the qualifications of the participants and recommend a more specific set of criteria to ensure a higher standard of participation and to avoid gaps.

As noted above, there was a deliberate and successful attempt by the RWI to achieve diversity among the participants both as regards gender, country and between NGO and public sector. Although religion was obviously not a selection criteria, group composition is critical for a programme like this, especially in a region characterised by conflict, and where religion plays an important role. It affects not only the interpretation of democracy, human rights, but also the role of women in society.

Participants and organisers were mainly happy with the great diversity among participants and lecturers of the programme as regards ideologies and religion, ranging from what they described as “fundamental” to “liberal” attitudes. However a significant number of participants mentioned with concern that participants with more fundamental views were being too vocal and had a bad effect on the conversations and discussions. On the other hand concerns were also raised about some of the lecturers proclaiming too liberal views.

As regards the training courses, apart from the specialists in the area of women's rights, other lecturers rarely applied a gender perspective. For the training programme on *Equal Status and Human Rights of Women*, women's rights were naturally integrated, with a strong focus on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). Discussions on women's empower-

ment and other tools and mechanisms for promoting gender equality apart from CEDAW institutions were very limited. Participants reported that there were general discussions on gender equality, or rather the lack of gender equality. One whole day was devoted to this in the MENAGO course. It centered around discrimination issues but linkages with economic, social and cultural rights were not sufficiently explored.

This could further fortify the sense that, according to leading gender specialists in the region, a gender perspective is not part of the main Human Rights discourse in the MENA region. There are often separate Women's rights organizations and Human rights organizations in the MENA countries.

Participants who raised the issue of gender equality in the other courses were told by lecturers and other participants that they should have applied for the training programme on Human Rights of Women instead.

The training courses did not apply a child rights perspective, although attention was devoted to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. No attention was paid to the Declaration for the Rights of Disabled Persons. On the child-perspective it is not altogether a given that it is suitable to stress it in a women's rights training course other than as a mainstreaming issue among others. The traditional attitude of stereotyping women and women's roles as mothers and nurturers may be reinforced if a too strong link is made in courses on women's rights and the rights of the child, undermining the importance that should be allocated to both these areas.

Participants mentioned that it is useful to learn about the impact of HIV/AIDS on development. Even if the HIV/AIDS pandemic does not affect this region to the same extent as other regions, HIV/AIDS is important to include in the context of a rights based approach to development. On the other hand, levels of HIV infection in the Middle East and North Africa are increasing and better education and prevention are urgently needed.

4. Sustainability

The evaluation team finds that the results obtained from the programme will not be sustainable in its current form beyond the benefits to the individual participants, and the limited impact on their respective organisations and institutions.

The programme is effective according to the level of ambition defined in the objectives set out in the programme proposal, it is relevant to regional priorities and Sida policies as well as the needs of the participants, and it is well-managed. However, few of the components necessary to ensure sustainability have been addressed, apart from possibly that the training courses have all been held in the MENA-region.

There is no clear ownership established for the programme in the region. It is not financially sustainable without donor-support. It has not led to institutional capacity development of any magnitude for the participants' organisations or for the implementing partner. Only in a few cases such as with the Ministry of Human Rights in Bagdad, the National Council for Human Rights in Cairo and the National Centre for Human Rights in Amman has there been several participant from the same organisation or institution participating in the different programmes.

RWT's cooperating partner, the FHHRL in Beirut is a relatively small foundation with already highly qualified professionals and human rights specialists, mainly working on a voluntary basis. They have an agreement with the RWI to organise the training programmes. They have benefited to a certain extent

financially. Through cooperation with the RWI and the other lecturers they have further extended their international network and through the participants, also their regional network. Although both parties are very appreciative of the cooperation and hold each other in high regard, it is not likely that the FHHRL will be the main cooperating partner for the RWI in a future MENA programme with a more explicit focus on institutional capacity development for promotion of human rights.

It is generally accepted that interventions that are well integrated in the local institutional and cultural context and sensibilities, with sufficient institutional support, are more likely to be sustained. Having an agreement of cooperation with an institution in the region for implementing the programme and organising it in the region may not have been enough for the RWI in this respect. In a region like MENA, combined with the current global political tides, it is obviously extremely important to be culturally-sensitive and neutral when active in the field of human rights. Despite being competent and professional in every respect, individual lecturers and even the FHHRL are all prone to being “categorised” according to religious or political affiliation. The FHHRL have been clearly placed in the Christian and liberal category in Lebanon, with some of the Muslim participants from the region, especially those with more fundamentalist views voicing their concern.

Other participants raised the issue in more general albeit serious terms, as a perceived lack of respect for Arab and Islamic culture. In particular, they felt that the linkage between law and religion in the MENA-region should be explored further in the lectures. They further stressed the importance to see a link between Islam and human rights.

Apart from one or possibly two lecturers in the human rights and good governance training programme (MENAGO), where even the RWI staff raised concerns of a political agenda and this was discussed with the FHHRL at the time, the evaluation team does not conclude that this has had a serious impact on the outcome and impact of the programme. However, remaining neutral or depending on a partner organisation to be “neutral” may not be enough and these issues will have to be addressed as part of the discussions in the planning of a future programme.

Again, in a region like MENA that is currently rather volatile and apprehensive to political and cultural insensitivities from ‘outsiders’, it is crucial to ensure highest degree of cultural and political sensitivity. On this note, it is neither useful nor culturally sensitive to organize a training programme during Ramadan. Participants who fast are greatly affected and suffer from difficulties to concentrate. RWI and its partner should therefore make sure that the training courses do not occur or coincide with Ramadan and other culturally important holidays.

The evaluation team finds that although the courses were duly evaluated by the course participants as part of the programme, and follow-up courses have been available to some participants, this has not been sufficient to sustain or develop contacts and to share experiences beyond personal contacts with fellow participants. Even these contacts have fizzled out after a few months. This has resulted in missed networking opportunities at a regional level. The participants feel it is difficult to continue their relationships with their newly gained contacts from the training programme. They emphasize the importance of establishing a network. Some are more interested in a network as a working tool or resource, while others are interested in using it as a forum for exchange of ideas and experiences.

There are no resources set aside within the framework of the training programme to support networking of any kind. Both the RWI and the FHHRL provide contact details and answer requests by individuals but this is purely out of good will and not formalised. The team finds that for reasons of sustainability and continued support it would be essential in any future programme to enable a technical platform through Internet, which could include important and relevant documentation and provide networking opportunities.

Closer links between the two training opportunities are necessary to support sustainable capacity development, where the follow-up course should be advertised at the outset and where a relevant project or assignment can link the two courses, and further engage other colleagues and management within the participants' organisations and institutions. The RWI have already responded to these issues and are currently exploring possible opportunities to address these, in line with what is mentioned above.

The RWI are also discussing the option of sub-regional courses on more specific topics, which is welcomed by the evaluation team but with the caution not to lose the added value of both the regional focus, and the importance of providing the opportunity of bringing people together in a region, where people rarely have an opportunity to interact across national boundaries.

The new Swedish strategy for the MENA region clearly stresses the importance of the involvement of Swedish actors/organizations, and promoting Swedish engagement in the MENA region. In this way it is different from other regions of interest for Swedish development cooperation. Because of the considerable achievements, and RWI good reputation in the area, as well as the contacts that have already been established during the course of this programme the team recommends that RWI establishes a presence in the region. This is also necessary for improved cooperation, coordination and networking, in view of increased impact as regards capacity development and institutional capacity development in the field of human rights.

5. Conclusions and Lessons Learned

The evaluation team concludes that the Raoul Wallenberg Institute together with their cooperating partner the Foundation for Human and Humanitarian Rights, Lebanon have successfully implemented the MENA regional training programme on human rights in line with the agreed objectives.

The overall content of the training programme is highly relevant. It is in line with regional priorities and Sida/Swedish policies for the region as well as the needs of the participants.

Furthermore, RWI's training programme is unique in the MENA-region, with its comprehensive approach of focusing on both international human rights standards and women rights in particular, and with the regional dimension. The regional courses have the further benefit of bringing together participants from different countries in the MENA-region with different professional backgrounds, from both civil society and government institutions around the sensitive topic of human rights in a conflict prone region where the opportunities to meet are very rare.

There is no proper programme document, apart from the application to Sida, which contains a very limited problem analysis but outlines the objectives for each proposed course. These objectives have been achieved and relevant stakeholders in the MENA region have been reached by the programme. A fair distribution of participants from diverse backgrounds and countries has been achieved. The RWI and the FHHRL have also largely responded to the diverse needs and interests of the participants and maintained a professional and balanced approach. All lecturers were viewed as highly competent and experienced in their field although some were found displaying poor communication and presentation skills and not being open and dynamic in their interaction with the participants. The courses were all given in English which despite thorough screening of participants proved to be a limiting factor to effective participation for a significant number of participants.

The training courses have been well-managed and carried out in a timely and professional way, and have been successful in offering the participants greater knowledge and awareness of international

human rights standards and broadened their thinking and understanding of human rights issues, women's rights and good governance. However, in regard to more long-term or broader local and institutional capacity development there is limited impact.

Appropriate mechanisms to enhance partnership, local capacity development, institution building and ownership were not part of the design of the regional training programme. This limits the results obtained from the programme to benefits to the individuals rather than having any measurable impact on their respective organisations and institutions. Furthermore no synergies or cooperation has been established with other on-going programmes or projects in the MENA-region in the same field.

Beyond the attention to the relevant international conventions and declarations, the lecturers did not systematically apply a child rights perspective, or a gender perspective. No attention was paid to the Declaration for the Rights of Disabled Persons. There was a strong focus on the CEDAW and discussions on discrimination, but discussions on women's empowerment and other tools and mechanisms for promoting gender equality were very limited.

The follow-up so far has been limited with missed networking opportunities at a regional level as a result.

Discussions among participants have been very enriching, especially the exchange of experiences between participants from Mashreq and Maghreb regions. The discussions led to new "insights" with consequently further questions emerging, including the need to understand the links between religion and law in the region. For this reason, RWI's discussions to offer a sub-regional courses on more specific topics need to ensure that it does not lose the added value of both the regional focus, and the importance of providing the opportunity of bringing people together in a region, where people rarely have an opportunity to interact across national boundaries.

6. Recommendations

General Recommendations

The evaluation team recommends that the RWI prepare a proposal for a second phase, building on the experiences gained and the contacts made in this first phase.

An identification or planning phase should form part of the new programme, where proper stakeholder analysis and context analysis is carried out. The use of LFA or other appropriate planning methodology, tools and frameworks, including setting targets and benchmarks for capacity development and institutional capacity development is recommended.

As part of the planning phase RWI should investigate opportunities for synergies and collaboration with other Swedish and international actors in the region within the same field, in cooperation with Sida or the Embassy in Cairo, also to coordinate possible future support to institutions in the region.

RWI should as part of the identification phase investigate the possibility of establishing a presence in the region for more strategic continuous and closer participation and contact with other actors in the region.

The RWI essentially being an academic institution, will need to improve certain aspects as regards their involvement in development cooperation, including capacity development from a development cooperation perspective.

The findings are ambivalent regarding the use of Arabic or English, and therefore a combination could be explored. It is clear however that in order to make the lectures more interactive and dynamic, and to

promote exchange of experience, Arabic should be used to a larger extent. Material in English should also be made available, and interpreters should be budgeted for and used when necessary.

Sida should consolidate its cooperation with the RWI under one agreement and specify its institutional home within Sida. This should be done in close cooperation with the RWI.

Specific Recommendations in Relation to Content and Modalities:

- Improved advertising/marketing of the Regional Programme.
- Prepare and support lecturers in the use of modern technology for better presentations.
- Discuss methodology with the lecturers and reiterate the importance of dialogue and interaction with programme participants as part of the input.
- More practical exercises including case methodology.
- Increase the number of field visits in order to link theory and practice.
- More about how to link a rights-based approach to development.
- More thematic debates.
- Follow up and support the establishment of some type of e-forum as a platform for exchange of information.
- Closer links between the two training opportunities, including perhaps a project or assignment which can also provide the opportunity to further engage other colleagues and management within the participants' organisations and institutions

Below are some issues raised by the participants. These are findings but do not form part of the evaluation team's recommendations. They may nevertheless be useful in the process of formulating a second phase.

There are requests for more practical aspects during the training programme on how to apply the newly gained knowledge in the field of human rights, more of tools for advocacy, lobbying, working with pressure groups, and the role of media, applied on human rights issues. The needs from a practical perspective differ however among the participants. There are nevertheless some commonalities around the 'how'-question.

First of all, how can participants and their organization be better at promoting human rights in the region? For participants working with advocacy of human rights, it is vital for to know how one can influence policy work and national legislation. How human rights organization can be better at achieving their goals? There is a general feeling that participants' organizations need to be better at implementing human rights projects, and it would therefore be useful if the training programme includes a component to tackle this issue.

Secondly, how can human rights councils be better at working with NGOs and governments both in their countries and in the region? It is increasingly important for human rights organizations in the MENA-region to form a forum to exchange ideas and experiences on regular basis to tackle specific issues, such as complaints. Also, it would be very useful for participants to learn more about how organizations in the field of human rights can effectively communicate with their communities/constituencies.

Thirdly, how to be a researcher in human rights in order to make it useful and applicable to training purposes, advocacy, or protection work? Participants request to learn more about Internet for researching on human rights issues.

Fourthly, how can human rights be better embedded in the curriculum's' of degrees of law and political science at the university level?

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Evaluation of Sida support to the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law, RWI, and its Development of Regional Training Activity – Promotion of Human Rights in the Middle East and North Africa, September 2003–December 2006

1. Background

The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law, RWI, is an independent academic institution at the University of Lund, Sweden. It was established in 1984 with the purpose to promote academic education, training and research in the area of international human rights law in Sweden and in developing countries.

Sida has provided support to RWI's Asia Programme since the 1990's.

In May 2003, when RWI submitted a new programme proposal for the Asia Programme for the period September 2003–December 2006, it included a new component; the MENA Regional Advanced Programme in Human Rights (later renamed Development of Regional Training Activity – Promotion of Human Rights in the Middle East and North Africa).

The overall objective of the Development of Regional Training Activity – Promotion of Human Rights in the Middle East and North Africa, is to contribute to the strengthening of the respect for human rights in the Arab world, by enhanced awareness of applicable international human rights standards among academics, lawyers, personnel within the judicial systems, NGO representatives and other vital stakeholders for the protection and promotion of human rights.

This would be achieved through three training courses a year with focus on the following topics; rule of law and human rights, human rights of women and one follow-up course including a third human rights issue of regional concern. The training courses are undertaken together with the Lebanese Foundation for Human and Humanitarian Rights in Beirut.

The training programme is to be regarded in a long term perspective of reinforcing RWI's activities in the MENA-region and has been considered as a "first phase".

The total cost of the MENA programme is SEK 8 380 000.

In addition to the regional training courses, RWI has conducted other activities concerning the MENA-region, also financed by Sida (INEC/KTS, PEO/ITP). This includes training courses on human rights of women in Lund and Alexandria, workshop on human rights of women for the Syrian Commission for Family Affairs in Damascus and workshops and seminars for judges, lawyers and journalists in Morocco.

2. Evaluation purpose

The evaluation, together with other documentations and considerations, is expected to provide information and lessons learnt in order to serve as a basis for decision on future support as the current agreement between on RWI's Asia programme between Sida/DESA and RWI is coming to an end in December 2006.

It is expected that the evaluation will contribute to strategic choices, both for Sida and RWI, regarding contents and methodology in the design of any future support to RWI programmes in the MENA-region.

3. The assignment – aspects to be evaluated

The scope and focus of the assignment is to evaluate the impact and results of RWI's Regional Advanced Programme in Human Rights for the MENA-region during the period September 2003–December 2006.

The evaluation shall also assess the possibilities for a consolidated and coherent approach for a RWI regional MENA-programme with one agreement with Sida.

The evaluation should determine whether the objectives have been accomplished, whether the support was relevant and had any strategic impact and whether results are sustainable. The evaluation should analyse whether the programme has been well managed and efficient regarding achievements and the use of resources.

In detail, issues to be covered by the evaluation are as follows:

- a) Has a problem analysis been made and was the composition of the programme a strategically useful choice according to such an analysis? Are the training courses offered relevant in relation to training courses that are already available in the region? Is the programme relevant from a needs perspective? Have the training programmes met with the needs and expectations of the participants and if so, to what extent? To what extent have the participants benefited from the courses? Has the programme contributed to networking among the participants?
- b) What have been the effects and the major accomplishments of the programme? Has the programme reached its objectives? If not, what are the reasons? Are there unexpected positive or negative effects of the programme as a whole or of any of the courses included in the programme?
- c) What organisations/institutions are the participants representing: distribution per country and between NGOs and public administration? From what levels within their organisations? Have the training courses played an important role in enhancing the respect and protection of human rights among the organisations and institutions to which the participants have returned and are presently active in, and if so, how?
- d) It should be evaluated how the RWI has managed the programme regarding quality of the technical assistance, the administration and cost efficiency. Could the training programmes have been significantly better organized, and if so, how? How does this programme fit in with RWI's other activities, both bilateral and regional, in the MENA-region? Could the complementarities between these activities be reinforced?
- e) It should be evaluated how RWI's Lebanese partner has fulfilled its obligations. Has the Lebanese partner met with the expectations of RWI and the participants? Has the choice of Lebanon as the country to conduct regional courses in proved to be adequate? If not, what are the reasons?
- f) Has the programme been designed and implemented in a way that enhances partnership, local ownership, local capacity building and local institutional building?
- g) Have gender aspects been dealt with in an effective way? Have the training programmes provided the participants with knowledge about women's rights, children's rights and the rights of disabled persons? If so, have the knowledge been sufficient and has it played an important role for the participants' possibilities to promote these rights within their home organisations?

4. Methodology

a. General orientations

The evaluation should be carried out on a programme level, focusing on the coherence, relevance and achievements of the programme as a whole. In order to carry out the evaluation the consultants should:

- Assess reports and other relevant documentation
- Interview different stakeholders – staff as well as beneficiaries – that have been involved in the programme at different times (including staff at Sida and RWI)
- Interview academic institutions and other actors regarding the relevance of RWI training courses and the availability of similar training courses

b. Information sources

Written Sources

- Programme and project documents
- Decision Memoranda
- Programme and Project Reports
- Audits
- Strategy for the Swedish Development Co-operation with Middle East North Africa

Persons to be interviewed

- Current and former representatives for Universities and NGOs involved in the Programme
- Participants at the training courses
- Sida staff in Stockholm (DESA, INEC/KTS, PEO/ITP) and at the Swedish Embassy in Cairo
- RWI staff in Lund
- University representatives not involved in the programme
- If possible and deemed relevant – other donors active in the field of human rights training in the MENA region

c. Alternative approaches

Sida would welcome any alternative suggestions that the consultant might present in the tender document on approaches and methods to be applied in performing the assignment.

5. The evaluation team, requirements and qualifications

The assignment is proposed to be carried out by a team of two consultants – one with special knowledge of the MENA context. The team leader must have experience in evaluation of development projects and specific knowledge of development co-operation within the area of Human Rights.

The team competence requirements must include

- Good knowledge in Swedish development cooperation objectives and methods
- Good knowledge in Human Rights, preferably the legal sector
- Good knowledge in capacity building and institutional development

- Good knowledge in the political and social situation in the MENA-region, including the human rights situation
- Fluency in English (read and write)

6. Reporting and Time Schedule

The work should be carried out during a maximum of 4 weeks during May–June 2006, including field work in Lebanon. The evaluation report shall be written in English and should not exceed 20 pages, excluding annexes. The report should be of an analytical character and include recommendations for future development co-operation within the area of Democracy and Human Rights in the Middle East and North Africa.

A Draft Report shall be submitted to Sida electronically and in paper no later than x 2006. The Lebanese Partner of the Programme, The Swedish Embassy in Cairo, Sida and RWI shall have a maximum of two weeks for submitting written comments to the draft report. The Final Report shall be presented to Sida in 3 printed copies as well as an electronic version. Subject to decision by Sida, the report may be published and distributed as a publication within the Sida Evaluation series. The report shall be written in 6.0 for Windows (or in compatible format) and be presented in a way that enables publication without further editing.

Annex 2: List of People Interviewed

Sweden

Sida, Stockholm

Camilla Redner, DESO/DESA

Birgitta Weibar, DESO/DESA

Birgitta Danielson, Embassy of Sweden, Cairo

Karin Fyrk, Embassy of Sweden, Cairo

Eva Smedberg, Asien/MENA, (only briefly)

Kristina Jelmin, ITP

Rolf Folkesson, INEC/KTS

Ulf Ekdahl, INEC/KTS

RWI, Lund

Johannes Eile

Hanna Johnsson

Birgitta Jansson

Zophie Landahl

Lebanon

Wai'l Kheir, FHHRL

Eliane Masry, FHHRL

Khalil Jbara, (lecturer)

Ahmed Karaoud (lecturer) Amnesty International,

Christofer Politis, Mercy Corps Lebanon, previously Rene Mouawad foundation. MENAHR 04

Ghazi Aad, Solide Lebanon MENAHR 2004 – MENAFU 05

Bahaa Balboul, previously Caritas Migrants Centre HR Protection Beirut, MENAHR 2004

Husein Khalidat: Solidarity Association for Development and Culture, MENAWO 05

Sylvia Eid, Caritas Migrant's Center, MENAWO 05

Egypt

Mona El-Bahtimy, Desk officer, *Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department of Human Rights*

Nancy Adly, *Center for Egyptian Women's Legal Assistance (CEWLA)*

National Council for Human Rights in Egypt:

Ambassador Kotb Mokhless,

Asmara Fawzy Mahmoud Salem, Researcher on the Social Rights Committee, MENAWO 06

Mai Hamdy Dessouki, Researcher on the Cultural Rights Committee

Participated in December 2005/May 2006 in the training programme on Equal Status of Women (ITP course)

Mounira Faried Morsy, Researcher on Social Rights Committee, MENAGO 06
Amira Osama, Researcher on International Relations Committee, MENAWO 06

Jordan

The National Centre for Human Rights:

Mohammed Al-Helou, Spokesperson,

Samar M. Tarawneh

Nisreen S. Zerikat, Advocate

Saleh Al-Zu'bi, Executive Director

Shaher Bak, Commissioner

Riyad Alsubh, Training and Awareness Unit

Mohamed Alnaser, Head of Training Unit

Dr. Ibtesam al-Atiyat, Programme officer, *The Jordanian National Commission for Women*

Danah Al-Dajani, External Relations Director, Youth Adviser, *The Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development*

Arab Women Organization of Jordan

Leila Naffa Hamarneh,

Majdoleen Ohlman

List of participants who replied to the questionnaire

MENAGO 2006

Mona Ammar Feki	Tunisia
Rana Milhem	Jordan
Sallama Namani	Lebanon
Lala Arabian	Lebanon
Roula Abou Chabké	Lebanon
Hamid Benhaddou	Morocco
Lana Naem Ragheb Dghish	Palestine

MENAWO 2006

Reem Nejdawi Fariz	Jordan
Hareth Al-Samarraée	Iraq
Rana Anwar	Iraq
Ahmed Mhsen Hmidi	Iraq
Rowaida Tawfiq Ebrish	Libya
Fatiha Daoudi	Morocco
Hanan Qarout	Palestine
Nariman Ahmad Awad	Palestine
Lagha Mohieddine	Tunisia
Baligh Mohammed	Yemen

MENAWO 2005

Alawi Hala	Jordan
Azzaoui Jassem	Iraq
Naela Saraireh'	Jordan
Hassan Mozn	Egypt
Khaddam Duha	Syria
El-Gani Amina	Morocco
Najem Senan	Iraq

MENAWO 2004

Eman H. Alwan	Iraq
Golmehr Kazari	Iran
Manal Jomaa	Lebanon

MENahr 2004

No replies – many outdated hotmail and yahoo addresses, (however, a number of participants were interviewed in Lebanon, Jordan and Egypt)

Plus 4 more respondents. Total of 31.

Annex 3: Documents Consulted

Course Programmes; MENAHR04, MENAWO04, MENAWO05, MENAFU05, MENAG06, MENAWO06

Agendas for MENAHR04, MENAWO04, MENAWO05, MENAFU05, MENAG06, MENAWO06

Participants' lists

Literature lists

Case studies

Agreement between RWI and FHHRL

Annual Report 2005, Regional Programme MENA, Embassy of Cairo

RWI Application to Sida for MENA (Asia Programme)

RWI Vision Paper

UNDP, Annual Human Development Reports 2002, 2003, 2004

Amnesty International Report 2006

UD Strategy for MENA 2006–2008

UD – Position paper 2002–2005

Tradition och Förnyelse, DS 1999:63. En studie av Nordafrika och Mellanöstern. UD

Travel Reports, RWI

Looking Back, Moving Forward, Sida Evaluation Manual, Sida 2004

Let's talk! Human Rights meet Peace and Security, Sida.

Annex 4: Distribution of Participants per Country and Organisation

Country (No. of partic.)	NGO or CBO	Gov. Inst. or HR com	Univ. or Acad Institution	Internat. Organ.	Other Media, lawyers
Course title: MENAGO 06					
Algeria (1)		1			
Egypt (1)	1				
Iraq (6)	2	4			
Jordan (4)	1		1	2	
Lebanon (2)	1			1	
Palestinian T (1)		1			
Syria (1)			1		
Tunisia (2)		1	1		
Sweden (Obs)		1			
Course title: MENAWO 06					
Algeria (1)	1				
Egypt (3)	1	2			
Iraq (7)	3	4			
Jordan (3)		2		1	
Libya (1)		1			
Tunisia (2)	2				
Morocco (1)	1				
Palestinian T (3)		3			
Yemen (1)				1	
Course title: MENAWO 05					
Iraq (3)		3			
Jordan (4)	1	3			
Egypt (3)	1	2			
Lebanon (5)	2			2	1
Morocco (2)			1		
Syria (1)		1			
Tunisia (1)			1		
UAE – obs(2)	2				
Iran (1)					1
Course title: MENAWO 04					
Egypt (3)	1	2		1	
Jordan (4)	1	3			
Yemen (3)	1	1		1	
Iraq (1)		1			
Morocco (2)	1		1		
Syria (1)				1	
Lebanon (5)	1	1	1	2	1
Iran (1)					1
Algeria (1)		1			

Country (No. of partic.)	NGO or CBO	Gov. Inst. or HR com	Univ. or Acad Institution	Internat. Organ.	Other Media, lawyers
Malaysia (1) obs		1			
Course title: MENAHR 04					
Lebanon (3)	3				
Iran (1)		1			
Iraq (1)		1			
Syria (2)				1	1
Yemen (2)		1		1	
Jordan (4)	1	1		1	1
Morocco (1)	1				
Tunisia (1)			1		
Algeria (1)		1			
Kuwait	1				
Other?		1			
Total	30	45	8	15	6

Annex 5: E-mail Questionnaire to Participants

Dear Sir/Madam,

The Institute of Public Management has been commissioned by Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (*Sida*) to conduct an *Evaluation* of the relevance, impact and sustainability of the *Regional Training Courses* on Human Rights, held by the Raoul Wallenberg Institute (*RWI*) and the Foundation for Human and Humanitarian Rights (FHHR), in Lebanon.

As a participant of the training course and as such a beneficiary of Swedish donor funding, we now *kindly ask you to assist us* in this evaluation by replying to the following *10 questions*. Please reply even if you were an observer. (Vous pouvez repondre en francais.)

We would appreciate your *reply* as soon as possible, or by *Thursday 22nd of June* at the latest.

Please use the reply function in your e-mail programme and in your reply e-mail write your answers under each question below. Otherwise the E-mail address is anna@publicmanagement.se

Please note that the information you provide will be used by the Evaluation Team *in confidence* and only aggregated information from the questionnaires will be used in the final evaluation report to Sida. Neither Sida, RWI or the FHHR will have access to the information provided by you as an individual.

We would also like to encourage you to be outspoken in your answers in order for this evaluation to be able to contribute to improving future training courses.

Thank you very much! We are very grateful to you for taking the time to reply to this questionnaire and to share your experiences and comments with the evaluation team.

Yours sincerely,

Ms. Anna Collins-Falk

Senior Consultant and Team Leader for the evaluation

Institute of Public Management,

Bastugatan 45

118 25 Stockholm, Sweden.

QUESTIONNAIRE TO COURSE PARTICIPANTS

(Please press REPLY to this e-mail and then type in the answers in your reply e-mail)

Title and Year of Course Attended:

Your Country:

Do you work for:

- 1 Government institution and public administration
- 2 Independent Human Rights or Women's Council or Commission
- 3 Academic Institution, Research Institute or University
- 4 NGO or CBO
- 5 International Organisation and donor agency
- 6 Other (please specify)

1. *Why did you apply for this course?*

2. *Did the training course meet your expectations on:*

a) *Academic level*

(Mark the appropriate number and explain)

4= yes, better than expected.

3= yes

2= Not really

1= Not at all.

b) *Design of course and quality of lectures, presentations and study visits.*

(Mark the appropriate number and explain)

4= very high quality

3= good

2= acceptable

1= poor

c) *Selection of relevant topics for the region (course content)*

(Mark the appropriate number and explain)

4= very relevant

3= mostly relevant

2= acceptable

1= not relevant

3a) *Has the FHHR met with your expectations on management, administration and organisation? please explain.*

3b) *Has the RWI met with your expectations? Please explain*

4. *Is the choice of Lebanon as the country to conduct regional courses suitable? If not, what are the reasons, and what are feasible alternatives?*

5. *Is English or Arabic the most suitable language for the training courses? (please motivate your choice).*

6. *In what way have you benefited from the course?*

7. *Are there any negative effects of the course? What can be improved?*

8. *Have you been able to apply what you have learnt in your work (organisation or institution)? Please explain and give examples.*

9. *Are you in contact with, or networking with other course participants in your country or in the region? Please explain.*

10. *Any other comments or information to help improve future courses:*

Thank you very much!

Recent Sida Evaluations

06/20 End of Programme Support Evaluation of Regional Psychosocial Support Initiative (REPSSI)

Richard Matikanya, Victoria James, Nankali Maksud
Department for Africa

06/21 Review of Sida's Field Vision

Jan-Olov Agrell
Department for Latin America

06/22 Organisationsstudie av SAREC

Lina Lenefors, Lennart Gustafsson, Arne Svensson
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit

06/23 University and Faculty Research Funds at Universities in Mozambique, Tanzania and Uganda

Göran Hydén
Department for Research Cooperation

06/24 Sidas U-landsforskningsråd

Olle Edqvist
Department for Research Cooperation

06/25 Promoting Women's Human Rights and Enhancing Gender Equality in Kenya

Atsango Chesoni, Salome Muigai, Karuti Kanyinga
Department for Africa

06/26 Legal Interventions in HIV/AIDS and Related Contexts in India

María Herminia Graterol
Asia Department

06/27 SARECs stöd till svensk u-landsforskning

Börje Svensson, Enrico Delaco, Andreas Högberg
Sekretariatet för utvärdering och intern revision

**06/28 Solid Waste Management and the Environment in Tegucigalpa
Cooperation between the cities of Stockholm and Tegucigalpa**

Sergio Albio González, Camilla Andersson
Department for Latin America, Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation

**06/29 Manejo de desechos sólidos y el medio ambiente en Tegucigalpa
Cooperación entre las ciudades de Estocolmo y Tegucigalpa**

Sergio Albio González, Camilla Andersson
Department for Latin America, Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation

06/30 Anti-Trafficking Activities in Central Asia Financed by Sida

Bonnie Bernström, Anne Jalakas, Christer Jeffmar
Department for Europe

**06/31 The National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP)
Phase I Impact Assessment**

Melinda Cuellar, Hans Hedlund, Jeremy Mbai, Jane Mwangi
Department for Africa

Sida Evaluations may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida
SE-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0)8 779 96 50
Fax: +46 (0)8 779 96 10
sida@sida.se

**A complete backlist of earlier evaluation reports
may be ordered from:**

Sida, UTV, SE-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0) 8 698 51 63
Fax: +46 (0) 8 698 56 10
Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>



SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden
Tel: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: sida@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>