



2014:3

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Vera Devine
Dragiša Mijačić
Patrick Twomey

Final Evaluation of the European Roma Rights Centre 2012 - 2013

Final Report

Final Evaluation of the European Roma Rights Centre 2012 - 2013

**Final Report
December 2013**

**Vera Devine
Dragiša Mijačić
Patrick Twomey**

Authors: Vera Devine, Dragiša Mijačić and Patrick Twomey

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

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2014:3

Commissioned by Sida

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: December 2013

Published by Citat 2014

Art. no. Sida61701en

urn:nbn:se:sida-61701en

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

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

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

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

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

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms	3
Preface.....	4
Executive Summary	5
1 Background and Context	9
1.1 Objectives of the Project.....	9
1.2 Executing Modalities.....	10
2 Evaluation Purpose and Methodology	12
2.1 Purpose and Objective of the Evaluation.....	12
2.2 Evaluation Method.....	13
2.3 Limitations Affecting the Evaluation	15
3 Observation and Analysis.....	17
3.1 2011 Monitoring Report.....	17
3.2 Institutional Management Arrangements and Constraints	19
3.3 Results	21
4 Conclusions	31
4.1 Relevance	31
4.2 Efficiency.....	32
4.3 Effectiveness	33
4.4 Sustainability	33
4.5 Impact.....	33
5 Recommendations.....	35
Annex 1 – Terms of Reference.....	37
Annex 2 – Inception Report	42
Annex 3 – Headings and Rationale for Evaluation Questions	49
Annex 4 – List of Consulted Documents and Information Sources	52
Annex 5 – List of Persons Consulted.....	56

Abbreviations and Acronyms

DAC	Development Assistance Committee
ED	Executive Director
ERRC	European Roma Rights Centre
FYROM	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
HR	Human Rights
HRBA	Human Rights-Based Approach
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NRC	National Roma Centrum
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe
OSF	Open Society Foundations
RBM	Results-Based Management
SEK	Swedish Krona
Sida	Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency
ToR	Terms of Reference

Preface

This report presents the findings of the Final Evaluation of the European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC) 2012 – 2013. Indevelop was commissioned by the Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency (Sida) to undertake the evaluation through Sida's Framework Agreement for Reviews, Evaluations and Advisory Services on Results Frameworks.

The main objective of the evaluation was to provide ERRC and Sida with recommendations to be used in the elaboration and assessment of the proposal of a new phase of the programme.

The review was undertaken between September and December 2013 by an independent evaluation team consisting of Ms Vera Devine as Team Leader and member of Indevelop's Core Team of professional evaluators; Mr Dragiša Mijačić as evaluator for Serbia, and Mr Patrick Twomey, who provided desk-based support on the methodology and process.

Indevelop's Project Manager for the assignment was Ms Anna Liljelund Hedqvist, who was responsible for coordination and management of the evaluation process. Dr Ian Christoplos provided external quality assurance to the reports and methodology.

Sida's Programme Officer Ms Rebecka Kitzing-Ivarsson managed the evaluation from Sida Stockholm.

Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of an evaluation, commissioned by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) in September 2013, of the European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC). Sida's current support of 11.9 MSEK covers ERRC's work in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), Serbia, Turkey, and Ukraine. At present, Sida contributes 35% of the ERRC's total budget. With the currently suggested financial envelope for 2014-2017, and taking into account projections of commitments from other donors, the Swedish contribution may in the future make up 60% of the overall ERRC budget.

The objective of the evaluation was "to provide ERRC and Sida with recommendations to be used in the elaboration and assessment of the proposal of a new phase of the programme". Specifically, the Terms of Reference (ToR) requested that the evaluation (1) assess the level of implementation of recommendations to ERRC from a 2011 Sida-funded Monitoring Report; (2) map results achieved by ERRC, including those on the organisation's advocacy and communications work; and (3) undertake an analysis of how conducive ERRC's structures are with regards to the objectives the organisation is pursuing. The evaluation focus, then, was mixed, in that it covered both programme activities, as well as institutional elements. Despite the evaluation focusing on a two-year timeframe and activities funded by one albeit key donor, it is not an alternative to the organisational review that ERRC would need to reflect on the problems identified during the evaluation.

Work was carried out between mid-September and early December 2013. It involved a desk review primarily of documentation received by ERRC and Sida; discussions at ERRC's main office in Budapest/Hungary in October 2013; telephone and Skype interviews; and field work in Serbia, Macedonia, and, to a more limited extent, in Ukraine in November 2013. An attempt was also made at soliciting written comments from international organisations such as the OSCE and the Council of Europe.

A number of **limitations** had an impact on the task at hand, most significantly has been the loss of institutional memory inside ERRC as a result of a substantial turnover of staff in 2011 and 2012. ERRC has undergone a considerable amount of external evaluation and monitoring in the past. A key concern in terms of user focus is that very limited new insight has been generated by this evaluation, as many of the issues had already been identified and analysed in previous, similar exercises.

The evaluation finds that ERRC has recently started to implement measures that are in line with the recommendations of the 2011 Monitoring Report, although the report itself seems not to have been the key guiding document for these steps. The ongoing validity of the 2011 recommendations for **effectiveness** and **efficiency** of ERRC is

understood by the management, and the current evaluation has been presented with convincing evidence to conclude that reforms are going in the right direction. The findings of a 2010 Sida-funded evaluation of ERRC also remain largely valid and the evaluators' recommendations echo many of those made in the framework of the 2010 exercise.

The evaluation has been able to confirm a number of results; the key issue is, however, that ERRC is not, yet, systematically applying a results focus that would encourage documentation of these results over time.

One of the challenges to taking further steps in line with the 2011 recommendations are the considerable shadows cast by a prolonged (since 2007) period when senior management was not constantly present. This has resulted in parts of the organisation underperforming and inefficiency at the level of the Budapest office.

ERRC can draw on highly committed individuals at headquarters as well as at country level. The work at country level often takes place under difficult conditions, as could be experienced by the evaluators themselves.

ERRC's strategic objectives are highly **relevant to the widely acknowledged need for greater progress in the countries concerned to meet applicable legal obligations**, as is the work done to achieve these objectives at country and headquarters-level. This work takes a variety of forms: strategic litigation and related advocacy, aimed at securing justice for Romani victims of human rights abuses and judicial and administrative rulings that would then contribute to systematic reform; research and reporting, in order to create a solid factual basis for all ERRC work, including policy assessments and recommendations to governments, policy makers and opinion leaders; international and domestic advocacy, targeting governments, key intergovernmental agencies, media and the public to press for change at the international, domestic and local level; human rights education and legal training to achieve long-term impact by supporting the development of additional civil society actors skilled in legal and human rights advocacy.

With regards to ERRC's **advocacy** and related work, the evaluation was able to confirm a number of results, despite the deficiencies in systematic measurement by ERRC of these efforts. For example, a letter of complaint to the country's Equality Commissioner has resulted in the first formal complaint on the grounds of discrimination against Roma being upheld in **Macedonia**. In the same case, acting on information from the ERRC, the Delegation of the European Commission has been able to put pressure on the Macedonian authorities. A recent, second ruling based on ERRC advocacy represents an opportunity for litigation, initially in the domestic courts. In **Serbia**, ERRC's joint advocacy efforts with other NGOs in the framework of the Platform on the Right to Adequate Housing have led to the country's Equality Commissioner to recommend steps to improve the housing conditions for Roma in Niš. In **Ukraine**, ERRC contributed, along with other NGOs, to a halt in evictions of Roma in the country's Zakarpathia region. In **Serbia**, the Equality Commissioner, based on

submissions of ERRC and a partner NGO, Praxis, issued an official warning on racially motivated violent attacks in a Belgrade settlement. **Research**, in the case of Macedonia in the area of **education** and specifically on the overrepresentation of Roma pupils in special needs schools/classes, has strengthened the evidence base for advocacy work and has made a contribution to raising public awareness, as well as awareness of representatives of the various institutions involved in special needs education; the approach and methodology was then successfully transferred to work in Serbia.

With regards to **communication**, there have been examples of successful work, such as the launch of the data on overrepresentation of Roma pupils in special schools in Macedonia. NGOs in Serbia have reported that through ERRC's Newsletter, they are able to reach out to a much wider, international audience, which in many cases enabled them to widen their networks of partners. Statements published on the ERRC's website and Facebook (FB) page are timely, and highly relevant. But the evaluation finds that ERRC could do more to make use of the opportunities offered by social networks, in particular with regards to promoting ERRC's work to Roma activists (who are heavily connected via Facebook), i.e. to their "own" constituency.

National NGOs were able to clearly identify the value-added of their cooperation with ERRC as a Roma-rights organisation with international reach. ERRC's strength, as perceived by NGOs (and government counterparts), is their legal expertise – an area that has been repeatedly identified as a vector for capacity building at country level, and where closer cooperation is desired by NGOs and other stakeholders. Specific experience of cooperating with ERRC at national level has overall been positive, with the caveat that NGOs preferred that cooperation have less of a one-off character, and for ERRC to keep partners informed on developments beyond the specific activity.

Recommendations:

To Sida

- The evaluators recommend a further tranche of funding for ERRC, subject to benchmarks agreed between Sida and ERRC to deliver on, as well as following up with the organisation on implementing the recommendations from the 2010/2011 Sida monitoring exercise.
- The funding decision should be made contingent on the Executive Director having a medium-term contract.
- Sida should support ERRC with its organisational development/restructuring, in a format to be discussed with ERRC. The evaluators recommend training on results-based management within a Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA).
- Funding should be longer-term, with 4-year funding a reasonable proposition. This would give ERRC the opportunity to implement projects over a more sustained period of time.
- Sida should make available lessons learned, tools and systems Sida uses to implement its own HRBA legal and policy commitments.

To ERRC

- At the organisational level ERRC's management needs to continue their efforts to reconnect with their staff by extending steps to provide structured and regular feedback to staff. Structures need to be fair, and perceived by staff to be fair, e.g., job descriptions, working hours, working arrangements, pay scales, etc.
- Ongoing conflicts between staff members—a legacy of the past—should be conclusively resolved, possibly with the use of professional mediation. If mediation is unable to resolve the problems, personnel decisions need to be taken.
- The internal operations of ERRC, a human rights NGO, should be guided by human rights standards, i.e. transparency, accountability, participation, non-discrimination. Key documents such as the budget available for operational activities should be accessible to staff as a matter of course.
- ERRC in particular can benefit from explicitly adopting a coherent HRBA framework as the basis of its work and partnerships. This enhanced focus should include building upon its current focus on human rights of its target constituency; include equal focus on processes; and seeking to measure the quality of processes as key results in themselves.
- A renewed discussion is needed about the organisation's core area of expertise, strategic litigation and the resource implications of that at country level.
- A strengthened human rights-based approach should be the same in all countries: rights holders need to know when the organisation is taking up their cases and pursues them on their behalf with the authorities. Equally, where cases are considered for litigation, rights holders need to know about the next stages and actively participate in that process.
- ERRC should consider what is realistically doable with the resources available, and against the background of the experience with current Sida funding. This implies doing less in terms of quantity, and considering the implications of the limited country presence on the activities that can be pursued.
- ERRC's communication strategy should be clearer, including work with social media and extending efforts to more proactively speak to the Roma community, and also to include more positive messages.
- More consistent efforts need to be made to promote ERRC's publications knowledge products if they are to be used by like-minded stakeholders, e.g., international organisations and national and international human rights NGOs.
- ERRC should develop clear human rights-based guidelines on how to work with national and international partners at country level.
- The 2011 monitoring report recommendations should be revisited. In particular, there is an urgent need to establish sound monitoring and evaluation systems, not only to measure the results of ERRC's work, but also as a means to be accountable to those whose rights the organisation represents.

1 Background and Context

1.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC), established in 1996, is “an international public interest law organisation working to combat anti-Romani racism and human rights abuse of Roma through strategic litigation, research and policy development, advocacy and human rights education. [...] Since its establishment in 1996, the ERRC has provided Roma with the tools necessary to combat discrimination and achieve equal access to justice, education, housing, health care and public services.”¹

While ERRC’s main offices are in Budapest/Hungary, its work covers some 11 European countries. Sweden is, along with the Open Society Foundation (OSF), the ERRC’s biggest donor. Sida-funding has supported ERRC since 2008: a first tranche of funding spanned over three years and was for a total amount of 15.9 MSEK; in 2012 Sida decided on a second phase of funding, to span from 2012 to 2013, the total cost of which amounts to 11.9 MSEK. At present, Sida’s contribution to the total ERRC budget is 35%. With the currently suggested financial envelope for 2014-2017, taking into account projections of commitments from other donors, the Swedish contribution is likely to make up 60% of the overall ERRC budget in this period.

The current funding—by Sida also referred to as the “project” or “programme”—is to contribute to the achievement of the ERRC’s objectives in the **Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia**,¹ **Serbia**, **Turkey** and **Ukraine**. At the time of the funding agreement (i.e., in the beginning of 2012), these ERRC objectives were thematically clustered as:

- 1) Violence against Roma – reduction in violence; elimination of impunity through ensuring effective law enforcement response
- 2) Education – Elimination of overt and intentional segregation in education through promulgation and implementation of clear law and policy against it
- 3) Housing – Reduction in the practice of forced evictions and resultant homelessness; reduction in segregation
- 4) Romani women’s and children’s rights – Recognition of and redress for Romani women coercively sterilised; effective law enforcement, social work and community response to trafficking of particularly vulnerable Roma; reduction in the overrepresentation of Romani children and youth in state care institutions

¹ The report will use “Macedonia” as a shorthand for FYROM throughout the text.

- 5) Disaggregated data – establishment of governments’ obligation to collect and disseminate data disaggregated by ethnicity as a necessary predicate to fulfilling other rights obligations and developing effective policy
- 6) Free movement and migration – ensure right to citizenship, state respect for freedom of movement, including the right to internal movement and the right to leave one’s country and return; involuntary returns with due process and support upon return
- 7) Empowering Romani activists – enhanced capacity in the Roma rights field in countries with lower level of human rights activity; increased professionalisation of Romani NGOs engaging in rights advocacy.

ERRC embarked, in 2012, on the development of a new strategy for the period from 2013 to 2017. Objectives in the new strategy have, in the main, remained the same, with thematic priority 7 (“empowering Romani activists”) having been replaced² by a priority on “identity documents”. The “ERRC Results Framework 2012 – 2013” which has, at least in theory³, been underpinning the Sida-funding, is based on the seven strategic objectives above.

1.2 EXECUTING MODALITIES

ERRC pursues the above objectives by working through:

- **Strategic litigation and related advocacy**, aimed at securing justice for Romani victims of human rights abuses and judicial rulings contributing to systematic reform;
- **Research and reporting**, in order to create a solid factual basis for all ERRC work, including policy assessments and recommendations to governments, policy makers and opinion leaders;
- **International and domestic advocacy**, targeting governments, key intergovernmental agencies, media and the public to press for change at the international, domestic and local level;
- **Human rights education and legal training**, to achieve long-term impact by supporting the development of additional civil society actors skilled in legal and human rights advocacy.

ERRC’s Executive Director was appointed in late 2011; he is supported by the ERRC’s Management Team, consisting of the Legal Director; the Programmes Director; the Director of Operational Development; and the Finance Director. There is a five-strong oversight Board.

At the level of ERRC’s Budapest office, nine staff, including one Legal Trainee from Macedonia, are involved in work in the four “Sida” countries (although most staff do not work exclusively on these four countries). Staff report to the Programmes Director and the Legal Director, respectively, although naturally, there are no clear boundaries between the legal and the programme work, as both areas are to reinforce each

other. There appears to be some variety in working arrangements, with two staff working at least partly from home outside Hungary.

At the country level, ERRC has a local liaison/presence whose title is “Researcher and Human Rights Monitor” (in contractual terms, the term “Proxy” applies); these Monitors formally report to the Programmes Director, although a considerable amount of their work is also of relevance to the Legal Directorate. The evaluators found that there are variances in what Monitors understand to be their job despite there being a standard job description. However, it appears that Monitors broadly are collecting evidence on specific cases of discrimination against Roma, as well as contributing to various pieces of research that ERRC is conducting. The Monitors typically go to the field and speak to concerned individuals, and then forward this information to ERRC in Budapest. Monitors have a monthly reporting obligation to ERRC. Monitors work on a part-time basis; the evaluators understand that the actual work they do often exceeds the hours they are being paid for considerably. It is not clear whether ERRC considers Monitors to be staff – ERRC’s website does not provide the Monitors’ names nor contact details. There might be good reasons for this. It does make it difficult for country-level stakeholders to identify how to reach ERRC. Including names and contacts on the ERRC’s website could potentially give visibility and, more importantly, credit to the work of the Monitors.

On the legal side, ERRC works with lawyers in the countries. This co-operation is mainly on those cases that ERRC considers for litigation through the domestic system, although *de facto*, co-operation starts earlier, during the pre-litigation phase. For specific programme activities, ERRC co-operates with domestic NGOs, which in Macedonia are identified on a case-by-case basis in accordance to the thematic area that the specific activity is to cover. Contracts with local NGOs are being tendered through calls for proposals. In Serbia, ERRC has well established, mature partnerships with a number of NGOs both through the Platform on the Right to Adequate Housing of which ERRC is a key driving force, as well as with other NGOs on a variety of issues.

Sida manages their contract with ERRC from Sida Stockholm. Direct involvement seems limited to receiving ERRC’s regular reports, as well as having annual meetings with ERRC to discuss the broad directions of ERRC’s work in line with the initial funding proposal.

2 Evaluation Purpose and Methodology

2.1 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION

Sida commissioned Indevelop AB in September 2013 to conduct a “Final Evaluation of the European Roma Rights Centre 2012-2013”. The objective of the evaluation was “to provide ERRC and Sida with recommendations to be used in the elaboration and assessment of the proposal of a new phase of the programme”.

Specifically, the Terms of Reference (ToR) (see Annex 1 to this report) requested that the evaluation:

- a) Assess the level of implementation of recommendations to ERRC from a 2011 Sida-funded Monitoring Report;
- b) That the evaluators map results achieved by ERRC, including those on the organisation’s advocacy and communications work;
- c) Provides analysis of how conducive ERRC’s structures are with regards to the objectives the organisation is pursuing.

The evaluation focus, then, was mixed, in that it covered both programme activities, as well as institutional elements. Despite looking at institutional elements, the evaluation was not an evaluation of the organisation as a whole, something that was clarified with Sida as well as ERRC. The rationale for this delineation was that Sida specifically supports ERRC’s work in Macedonia, Serbia, Turkey, and Ukraine, but that the geographical coverage of ERRC extends to at least six more countries. To evaluate ERRC as an organisation would have, at the minimum, required donor coordination with the OSF – the other major source of funding for ERRC. It was, however, understood by Sida and ERRC that looking at the four countries from the organisational perspective might provide useful insight for the organisation as a whole.

The ToR framed two “fundamental questions” that the evaluation should specifically answer:

- Why, what are the reasons behind the results or lack of results?
- What can be done in order to increase the chances of achieving results?

The geographical scope of the evaluation was set to be on ERRC’s work in Macedonia and Serbia; following a suggestion by Indevelop, it was agreed during the inception meeting with Sida that the evaluation would also, to the extent possible, look at ERRC’s work in Ukraine.

2.2 EVALUATION METHOD

The evaluation was carried out between mid-September and early December 2013. The following approach was taken:

- The Inception Phase helped frame the evaluators' focus to the evaluation generally. The team went through project documentation provided both by Sida and ERRC. On the basis of the information collated, the team produced an Inception Report which was submitted for comments and approval by Sida and ERRC; an inception meeting was held with Sida Stockholm.
- By the end of the Inception Phase it had become clear that the amount of information that could be extrapolated from ERRC's reports was limited, and an emphasis was then put on stakeholder interviews with staff at ERRC's Budapest offices.
- Interviews were held, on 9, 10 and 11 October 2013 with the ERRC's Management Team as a group and individually, as well as with 8 out of the 9 staff involved in work in the four "Sida-countries". Meetings with individual staff members lasted between 30 minutes and 2 hours. It was decided to make time for such individual interviews to provide a framework for the evaluators to understand the specific context in which people work, get a detailed insight into the issue that they are working on, as well as their perspective on the organisation they are part of. All interviews were held on the basis of non-attribution. At the end of the ERRC's meetings in Budapest, the evaluators de-briefed the Management Team about tentative findings from staff interviews.
- Given that the logical framework that underpinned Sida support had not been systematically used, the evaluators started a process of reconstructing the intended results chain with ERRC: it was agreed that ERRC would formulate results of their work in 2012 – 2013 and that could form the basis for the evaluators' work in the field. ERRC submitted a "Results and Outcomes 2012 – 2013" document to the evaluators on 22 October 2013.
- Field work was conducted in Serbia and Macedonia from 1 November to 19 November 2013. As the focus of the work is different in the two countries, it was decided to look closer at ERRC's methods and results on education in Macedonia, and on housing in Serbia; for both countries, the evaluators specifically looked at ERRC's advocacy work. The evaluators used a similar evaluation framework, developed by one of the team members (see Annex 2).
- In Macedonia, the Team Leader conducted, on 7 November 2013, a focus group meeting with 12 Roma activists that had been trained; she also held a number of individual meetings with stakeholders. The evaluation visit was planned around a conference that was organised by ERRC on overrepresentation of Roma children in special needs education, and the evaluator attended the conference for a day, also using the opportunity to talk to participants of the event.

- The field work in Serbia was carried out in November. On 1 November 2013, the evaluator participated in a training event for judges organised by ERRC in cooperation with the Judicial Academy on “Right on Housing and Minority Protection: International Conventions and Constitutional Framework”, where he used the opportunity to talk to participants. The field work was continued on 12 - 13 November when the evaluator carried out individual interviews with key correspondents in the field of Roma Human Rights protection. On 13 November, the expert participated at the conference on Roma housing, organised by OSF, the Roma League and the Housing Centre. The field work continued on 18 November, when the evaluator went on a field trip to Niš, where meetings were held with two NGOs, the ERRC Monitor and members of the Roma community that are settled in the warehouse in Daničićeve street. At the end, the evaluator participated at a press conference in Belgrade, where ERRC presented the results of the research on special education in Serbia.
- Taking advantage of a field trip to Ukraine in the framework of a different Sida evaluation, the Team Leader held one stakeholder meeting in Kyiv on 22 November 2013.
- The team also made attempts at soliciting feedback, in writing, from international organisations such as the Council of Europe, the European Parliament, and the OSCE’s Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), however, this yielded only a modest amount of replies.
- The ERRC Executive Director was de-briefed on the main points that would be made in the report during a Skype call on 13 November 2013. The evaluators had committed to ERRC to flag in particular the critical issues that would be included in the report to ERRC so that ERRC had a chance to respond and provide clarifications. Sida was debriefed on 27 November 2013.
- Written comments on the margins of the two different versions of the draft report were sent by ERRC. The Team Leader has made sure that all comments are being accounted for, by either agreeing to make suggested changes in the final report, or by explaining why the initial language was retained. This report incorporates the comments received from Sida and ERRC.
- The evaluators have strived to base the evaluation process on a human-rights based approach: the team has tried to reason out their understanding of some of the emerging issues with ERRC, and also made efforts to explain the rationale behind specific questions and by highlighting the importance of the process itself in terms of transparency; the accountability of duty bearers to rights holders; as well as the obvious processes related to non-discrimination. The evaluators understand that the evaluation process has contributed to a number of changes inside ERRC, as well as a new focus on thinking in terms of results and outcomes.

ERRC has been consistently helpful to the evaluators, both at headquarters level, as well as in Macedonia and Serbia, where staff and monitors have gone out of their way to assist the field work.

2.3 LIMITATIONS AFFECTING THE EVALUATION

The limitations affecting the evaluation are considerable, and by themselves provide insight into both objectives of the evaluation. The level of organisation and overall quality of ERRC's reporting has been problematic, and the evaluators struggled to find systematic documentation of results in the files that ERRC provided. It is clear that ERRC has not systematically monitored its work, and has therefore found it challenging to formulate results for the evaluation period. The putting into place of an internal monitoring and evaluation system had been one of the key recommendations of the 2011 Monitoring Report, and the evaluation concludes that this has, as yet, not been taken on board. However, the evaluation team has been provided with evidence that ERRC has started to make very credible progress on this issue shortly before the evaluation started; it has also, as a result of the evaluation, started to review its internal reporting and monitoring system.

A key issue seems to be uncertainty, by staff, as to the applicability of the logical framework approach (LFA)—the evaluators heard that the LFA had been in and out of use, and that various versions were circulating, without final confirmation as to the guiding document; there also seems to be a lack of a system in place to make sure that some sort of LFA is worked to by all, as well as a lack of capacity to apply LFA. Several staff repeatedly pointed out that they considered reporting to be a menial, bureaucratic exercise, and one that was considerably less urgent than the actual work ERRC was doing. The evaluators pointed to the limitations of this argument: reporting provides a very useful focus for thinking in terms of achievements and results, and is a key precondition for accountability to donors and to rights-holders that ERRC represents. Another voice heard was that the way reporting requirements were set out to staff was such that reports hardly ever went into substantive issues, although staff members were keen to share their thoughts and analysis on the areas they worked on. The evaluators have been presented with evidence that ERRC's approach to the process of reporting is changing, and urges ERRC to continue in this direction.

In terms of the discussions, with ERRC staff, on the way in which previous evaluation exercises had been taken forward, in particular—in accordance with the ToR for the evaluation—with regards to the 2011 Monitoring Process, the loss of institutional memory was a key limiting factor. As will be discussed in the report, the organisation lost, in 2011/2012, almost half of its staff, including at senior level. The Monitoring Report fell into this period of transition, and there was no clear sense of responsibility for implementing these recommendations inside ERRC. ERRC senior management reconsidered the 2011 Monitoring Report's recommendations in preparation of the evaluation and there appears to be consensus that while most of the recommendations were not implemented, their validity for the organisation remains (as do many of the recommendations from the 2010 Sida evaluation, a considerable number of which will be echoed throughout this report).

As mentioned above, the evaluation was not an organisational evaluation, although organisational issues were looked into. The evaluation has identified or confirmed

some of the issues of concern. However, the *specifics* of the steps that ERRC will have to take could not be addressed in this evaluation exercise—they should, in the evaluators' view, be dealt with through medium-term assistance in organisational development that the evaluators recommend Sida to consider providing to ERRC as part of the recommended ongoing support.

Limitations need to be pointed out with regards to the findings and how they apply across the countries the evaluation looked at. The evaluators have found there to be considerable variation between ERRC's work in the different countries, to the point that in some cases, findings seemed to be mutually exclusive.

With regards to the fieldwork, the team had repeatedly stressed its commitment to a human rights-based approach to the evaluation, this means to pro-actively solicit the feedback of rights-holders. This has been achieved to a very limited extent, only, mainly as a result of constraints in terms of time—this does not refer to the time allocated by Sida for the evaluation in the way it was set out in the ToR (where it was foreseen to limit the exercise to the boundary partners). It rather is a lessons learned for the evaluators in terms of the time required for arranging rights-holders input.²

² For example, in Macedonia, it took a couple of days to identify rights-holders that could have specific input to address the objectives of the evaluation. By the time the names and contact details were received, it was too late to make practical arrangements to interview the individuals.

3 Observation and Analysis

3.1 2011 MONITORING REPORT

The recommendations of an external Monitoring Report, finalised in late 2011 —the result of a medium-term support provided to ERRC by Sida in 2010 and 2011—has been taken forward by ERRC in a very limited way.

The main reason for this seems the coinciding of the report with a period of transition on a substantial scale: in late 2011 and early 2012, a total of nine staff members left, accounting for almost 50% of the overall staff of ERRC. The Executive Director, appointed in late 2011, had to manage this transition, including through the recruitment into those positions that were left vacant. There was an ERRC Management Response to the recommendations which was sent to Sida; the response considered the implementability of a number of recommendations. However, there was no follow-up from Sida on this, which might also have contributed to a loss of momentum on implementation by ERRC.

A number of the concerns the ERRC had in relation to the recommendations seem to be justified (see below). However, the overall direction of the comments seems to not have been clearly understood at the time. The recommendations need to be seen in their totality, and clearly aimed at ERRC's taking a more consolidated approach to strategic planning; follow-up; monitoring and evaluation, in line with results-based management (RBM) standards. In RBM terms, there is no alternative to internal monitoring and evaluation, while ERRC seemed to suggest, at the time, that ERRC could do without a structured approach. The relevance of the recommendations for the organisation today has been understood, and ERRC management has, recently, undertaken first steps that would go towards implementation of the recommendation, even though they have not as such being guided by the 2011 Monitoring Report.

The evaluators present the following grid of progress on the recommendations in relation to the four countries that Sida-funding is covering, i.e. Macedonia, Serbia, Turkey, and Ukraine (the findings might be different for the other countries that ERRC is working in, but which were not covered by the evaluation):

Recommendation	Implementation	Comments
Decide on a strategy for each focus country and revise the results framework accordingly	This has not been taken up; the results framework fits into the overall ERRC 2012-2017 strategic objectives, but the framework does not reflect country-specific plans.	ERRC's management response had questioned the do-ability/practicalities of this approach and indicated that Sida should give ERRC a clear preference of

		how to go about country vs. thematic plans.
Make a risk assessment for each expected outcome	This is done in part in the results framework, although not consistently.	
Design a work plan for each country team where it is possible to see the relation between activities, outputs and outcomes within each thematic area.	Staff and management have confirmed the presence of work plans they are working against, although they do not seem to have a specific country focus, nor a clear theory of change (which is what the recommendation in essence is about). From the LFA alone, such a theory of change is not immediately evident; a further problem is that staff is uncertain about the status of the LFA which seems to circulate in various versions.	ERRC's management response questioned the practicality of such country plans/country team plans but it would seem to the evaluators that the rationale of the recommendation hadn't been fully understood by ERRC. In absence of Sida's insistence on implementation, this was then probably not taken forward.
Introduce a monitoring plan for each country. The monitoring plan should be used to collect information on the progress of indicators.	This recommendation has not been implemented.	In the management response to Sida, ERRC indicated the need for further discussion on this, highlighting that this would be difficult for ERRC to take up. At the core of this hesitation seems to be a misunderstanding of what information would be collected and why. It is the evaluators' understanding that this has not been followed up between Sida and ERRC, resulting in a lack of implementation.
Align project proposals, travel reports, monitoring reports from field monitors to result management making sure that these documents provide the information needed in relation to the expected outputs and outcomes in each thematic area	This recommendation has not been implemented. While the evaluators have skimmed a considerable number of various ERRC reports, including travel reports, there is no evidence of this being quality controlled; or that it feeds into the process of documenting expected outputs and outcomes in relation to the LFA.	ERRC pointed out, in their management response, that they thought alignment of project proposals was not feasible because of different donor requirements. However, ERRC did accept the need to develop common templates for reporting against the results matrix.
Develop the capacity building programme to also include organi-	There is no specific evidence to suggest that this has happened in this form in the four countries.	ERRC suggested that this was in their planning for 2012, i.e. considered that this recommendation

sations, preferably at the management level		would be implemented.
Set up a better information system for following-up all kinds of capacity development activities and introduce an Alumni Club.	Neither part of the recommendation has been taken up in practice.	ERRC committed to implementing this recommendation.
Analyse why the ERRC website is not used by smaller grass roots organisations. Consider to translate all content into Romani.	<p>No evidence that analysis has been done.</p> <p>Translation into titular languages of the target countries has also not been done.</p>	<p>The ERRC's management response did make a credible point that translating the website into Romani was not feasible.</p> <p>ERRC suggested that instead, there should be more translation of the website material into the titular languages of the target countries.</p>
The ERRC has no Human Resource Officer and the internal capacity building is under the human rights education officer. To maintain and upgrade the knowledge on results management, this person could benefit from some capacity development in this area and thereby act as a resource person for all staff.	<p>The ERRC still had, at the time of the evaluation, no Human Resource Officer; however, such a position has been included in the new budget, i.e. the substance of this recommendation is going to be taken up from 2014 onwards.</p> <p>There has been training on RBM for individual staff members. However, as the organisation as a whole does not adopt a RBM approach, its efforts to enhance the capacity of the individuals is unlikely to contribute to ERRC's staff capacities.</p>	ERRC responded by emphasising the need for capacity to be built for several staff and specifically asked Sida for the possibilities of training on RBM.

In sum, the recommendations made by the 2011 Monitoring Report are, with only a few caveats, still relevant for the organisation today. Lack of implementation was caused by a transition of the organisation on a considerable scale, resulting in the loss of institutional memory and momentum for implementation. But at the institutional level, ERRC has yet to fully embrace the need to reorganise its work in RBM terms.

3.2 INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND CONSTRAINTS

This section summarises the findings from one of the focus areas of the evaluation, i.e. where organisational aspects are concerned. As mentioned above, the assignment was not an organisational exercise: ERRC works in 11 countries, the work in four of which is funded by Sida. The ToR specifically requested assessment of the Sida-

funded activities from 2012 to 2013, and so an organisational focus is by definition subsidiary. The below analysis should be read against that background.

An Executive Director (ED), based permanently at ERRC's offices in Budapest, was appointed in late 2011. He lacks security of tenure that goes beyond his current contract extensions of one year at the time. The evaluators are unable to find a stringent justification for this arrangement. Stakeholders have also repeatedly pointed out that there is a need for clearer delineating the executive from the oversight functions of ERRC. At present, the level of operational involvement of the Board seems unusual. For example, weekly management meetings are being "attended" (via Skype) by the Chair of the Board. The combination of both—i.e. the current lack of security of tenure coupled with the involvement of the Board in operational matters of ERRC—create, in the view of the evaluators, a situation that is not conducive to take the organisation into a next phase. The ED has to be able to act independently, and he has to be seen to act independently to build up trust among staff. ERRC is in need of a period of calm and continuity, but this is thus far not reflected in the work package of the ED, providing only medium-term job security.

One of the key challenges identified by the evaluators to taking further steps in line with the 2011 recommendations are the considerable shadows cast by a prolonged (since 2007) period of management of ERRC mainly by distance, i.e., where senior management were not based in Budapest. This has resulted in parts of the organisation underperforming and ineffectiveness at the level of the Budapest office. Interpersonal conflicts have been left unresolved, to the point of a breakdown in communication between some staff members. Senior management is investing considerable resources in facilitating communication by proxy—however, in terms of efficiency, this situation is unacceptable.

The ERRC management team has undertaken a number of steps to make up for some omissions of the past: for example, staff have now been given job descriptions, and formal and regular feedback on staff performance has been introduced. This is welcomed by staff as a sign that they are being managed, and as a departure from what some perceived as largely being left to their own devices in the past. There are some variances in working arrangements that might create the impression of double standards, for example where they relate to distance working.

ERRC can draw on highly committed individuals at headquarters as well as at country level. In particular at country-level, the challenges staff and Monitors face are considerable, as could be experienced by the evaluators themselves.³

³ The Team Leader hosted a focus group meeting with Roma NGO activists in a Skopje hotel and witnessed a blatant discrimination when the hotel management made clear they did not want participants to use the public restrooms.

The evaluation process—and in particular the interviews with individual staff members—demonstrated that staff wants to be closer involved and consulted on their skills, expertise and experience, and that they feel that they can contribute to the development of the organisation. The core human rights principles of accountability, participation, and transparency have not been fully applied to ERRC's own operations. For example, it is not clear why staff has no access to the operational budget that they can plan their activities around.

Monitors are very committed and loyal to the cause and to the ERRC as an organisation; they are the liaison between the country and the headquarters level but stakeholders in two countries have pointed out that they are in some cases unsure about the role the Monitors are expected to play as well as where to reach them, i.e., they do not seem to be recognisable to stakeholders as the face of the ERRC in all countries.

The evaluation has not looked at the relative merits of the fairly large organisation at the level of the Budapest office vs. very limited in-country presence. This will have to be analysed comprehensively in terms of where the greatest workload is. At present, it would seem that resources are severely stretched at country level to do some of the thematic work effectively. There is also a concern over meeting the resource requirements arising from the considerable number of cases at the level of pre-litigation/the early stages of litigation in domestic courts, which can only be done effectively at country level. While there is no suggestion to create additional structures at country-level, ways may need to be found to resource this workload adequately. ERRC is co-operating with lawyers at country level on specific cases that are taken to litigation; but in Macedonia, their involvement is also necessary at the pre-litigation stage, which is not reflected in the current contract ERRC has with the Macedonian lawyer. The nature of the lawyer's input might be better reflected through a retainer contract (for example annual contracts for two days per week), which would allow ERRC to draw on their services in the pre- and/or litigation phases.

3.3 RESULTS

The following section complies with the second objective of the organisation, which is the requirement, set out in the ToR, to map the results of the ERRC work in 2012 and 2013, including the organisation's advocacy and communications work.

Results listed and discussed below were submitted by ERRC. With regards to the results reported from the country-level, the evaluators took those as the basis for the fieldwork. As mentioned in chapter 2, the specific focus of the verification in Macedonia and Serbia were ERRC's activities in education, and housing, respectively, as well as on advocacy in both countries. The results for Ukraine have been noted in full for the sake of completeness – however, the evaluation has only to a very limited extent focused on ERRC's work in Ukraine, and could therefore verify only very few of the results. This does not mean that these results have not been achieved—it means that they could not be looked at in detail in the framework of this exercise.

Results reported by ERRC	Evidence, comments and discussion; other results identified by the evaluators
(Cross-country) Provision of an extensive archive of Roma rights-related information in Europe through website:	
<p>a) In 2012 a total of 114,816 people visited the ERRC website and 479 individuals subscribed to the emailing list, accessing up-to-date, comprehensive information. During January-June 2013, 84,011 people visited the website and 307 subscribed to the emailing list. Currently the list comprises 2,494 subscribers.</p>	<p>a) The evaluators cannot make an informed assessment of this data, as this would require specific media analysis skills that the team does not have. The evaluators would suggest that there be some analysis on how the number of visitors reported and the subscription to the mailing list relate to each other. What the evaluators are missing is that the analysis also reflects on the use of the ERRC's Facebook page and Twitter account. Evidence from the field suggests that Roma activists are very strongly connected through social media, and this is an area where ERRC might want to invest further efforts.</p> <p>A number of interesting steps have been considered and undertaken. For example, ERRC has recently teamed up with Guardian Witness⁴ to encourage reporting about life in Roma communities without discriminatory stereotypes; other ideas include the production of images as evidence about the experience of Roma being victim of forced evictions.</p>
<p>b) In July 2013 the ERRC published on the website its country profile focusing on the situation of Roma and the work of the ERRC. The report has been acknowledged by the European Commission, and the Council of Europe monitoring bodies. ERRC introduced the report at the OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meeting in September 2013.</p>	<p>b) There has been somewhat mixed evidence from the field confirming this. ERRC is a highly respected organisation in the countries it works in, both at the level of the international community present in the countries, as well as among local NGOs. ERRC publications are useful to both, as they are considered authoritative, and important for advocacy work of the organisations at country-level. However, the accuracy of the information presented in the reports has been an issue of concern in one of the countries, with criticism that the country profiles did not reflect up-to-date information and/or omitted important policy documents from the analysis. Stakeholders have pointed out that the publication could have been accompanied by launching events at country level—something that is neither difficult not costly to organise. If the country profiles are to be useful at country level, they also have to be available in the local language.</p> <p>c) The evaluators also consider communications and outreach work, prompted by the recent child removal case in Greece, as having contributed to changing the terms of the debate and reduce discriminatory reporting. ERRC has answered</p>

	to 200 media requests, and has also proactively issued statements and placed articles in the international media.
Macedonia: Improved information for targeted legal advocacy and increased awareness on segregation of Roma children	
a) Increased awareness among the Macedonian Roma community about special education.	a) The evaluators consider that this result has been achieved in part. The following caveats apply: ERRC has not conducted any systematic follow-up to measure the actual level of awareness raising among those who have been reached through the activities. The awareness raising campaign has covered some 219 families (with the community presumably being considerably bigger), and it would be important to put this figure into context, as it could provide useful insight how far ERRC can realistically reach out into the communities with the resources available.
b) Public discussions on the issue of segregation in special education in Macedonia.	b) The evaluators have found sufficient evidence that this has been achieved. ERRC has been credibly linked with putting this topic on the public agenda in Macedonia. ERRC also broke new ground in initiating a discussion among education professionals on the topic.
c) UN human rights bodies as well as the European Commission highlighted issues related to discrimination of Roma children following ERRC advocacy submissions on Macedonia.	c) The evaluators have found evidence to confirm this.
d) Increased capacity of 37 Romani activists to understand special education in Macedonia and to conduct community-based surveys, data collection among the Roma community.	d) The evaluators have collated mixed evidence on this claim; participants in a focus group discussion partly agreed that they had learned, through their engagement with ERRC, how to conduct surveys and do data collection.
e) Editorial on segregation of Romani children in Special schools in Macedonia published in a Macedonian newspaper (Dnevnik).	e) The evaluators consider this to be evidence for result b), not a stand-alone result. With regards to the activity cluster on special education, the evaluators understand ERRC's (plausible) theory of change to be trying to work on the issue through a multi-pronged approach involving rights-holders and duty bearers, as well as working on building capacities inside the NGO community. Having said that, the key concern shared by the evaluators is the one-off nature of the individual activities. This might originate in time and resource constraints of the current funding cycle.
Macedonia: Ensuring Roma from Macedonia are not discriminated against when leaving	

their country of origin or forced to leaving their country of origin	
Increased media coverage at national level, including the issue of free movement of Roma	The evaluators have not found specific evidence that the debate in Macedonia is linked to ERRC's work. The team understands that ERRC is preparing specific, targeted actions in this area, which should then feed into the debate.
Macedonia: Romani activists empowered through training, gender fellow, and legal trainee programmes	
a) Romani activists empowered to address human rights problems that affect their communities, specifically, 54 Roma trained to raise awareness of challenges in education and segregation in Macedonia	a) See comment in previous section where the evaluators can confirm that this has, in part, been achieved. There is a contradiction in numbers that the evaluators have resolved insofar as 54 Roma activists were trained, while 37 activists eventually were involved in the activities. ERRC has yet to define or measure what they mean by "empowerment" or "capacity building". Has, for example, a needs assessment taken place to understand the initial capacity of the participants, and has this been measured after the activity? What is known about how the knowledge is being taken forward by participants after the activity ended?
b) Romani legal trainee from Macedonia trained on how to use law to promote Roma rights	<p>b) The evaluators have found evidence that this has been achieved. In general, stakeholders consulted in the framework of this evaluation showed a particular interest in ERRC's work to build the capacity of Roma lawyers at country level. One of the ideas that are considered at ERRC's legal department in Budapest, i.e. to explore the potential of supporting young Roma law graduates to get placements in law firms was much encouraged by stakeholders.</p> <p>ERRC is aware of the need to make sure that legal trainees should, at the end of their traineeship with the organisation, be able to pass the bar exam. In the past, this has not always been the case (though there have not been too many traineeships in the first place), as trainees might not have had sufficient time and supervision to study and ultimately, to achieve this goal.</p>
Macedonia: Combating discrimination against Roma in Macedonia	
a) The Macedonian equality body, in response to a complaint ERRC brought, delivered a ground-breaking decision finding direct discrimination based on racial and ethnic grounds (concerning the dismissal of Roma workers from the City Mall)	a) This result has been confirmed by a wide variety of stakeholders. Stakeholders considered the particular strength of the ERRC submission to have been a complaint based on well researched facts, and with the case coherently laid out. The EU Delegation, based on the ERRC's forwarding the case to them, used the organisation's submission to highlight the case to the Macedonian authorities.
b) The equality body became aware of two other cases (which ERRC brought)	b) In one of the two cases, the Commission for the Protection against Discrimination has ruled that this was a case of discrimination. This case can

	<p>now be taken up by for litigation at the country level, as they claimant is adamant to take this case forward.</p> <p>For both cases, the evaluators found that the individuals were not aware of the ERRC taking the cases forward; this is not in line with HRBA principles, which would include that if a complaint is taken forward on behalf of individuals, these individuals have to know that that is happening, and they need to be explained what the implications are.</p> <p>With regards to the individual claims that ERRC has been working on in Macedonia, stakeholders expressed strong interest in being better informed, even at an informal level, about these individual incidents and cases that ERRC is considering to litigate—ERRC is better connected inside the Roma community and therefore, often has the more direct access to information that could then be taken forward by other strategic partners. The evaluators have found convincing evidence that the doors are wide open and that ERRC would not face any significant obstacle to be seen by international partners, provided that the cases are well researched.</p>
Macedonia: improve authorities' response to violence and hate speech against Roma	
a) Raised awareness among the Macedonian authorities, media and public about the violent incident in Topana	a) The evaluation was able to confirm this through verifying media coverage on the topic.
b) Brought to the attention of the judicial and prosecutorial authorities a death in custody	b) This is a case that is taken forward by ERRC, and an example of the amount of work that is involved in the pre-litigation stage, and which might require a rethinking of how resources are being allocated which should be reflected in the contracts ERRC has with the lawyers.
Serbia: Improved information for targeted legal advocacy and increased awareness on segregation of Roma children, lessons learned in Macedonia implemented in Serbia	
a) Increased awareness among the Serbia Roma community about special education;	a) The evaluation was able to confirm this result. After completing the training, in the course of field survey, 15 Romani activists visited 128 households in Roma settlements in 10 towns across Serbia explaining the consequences of special education to Romani parents and caregivers. The final report has been presented to the broader public at the press conference in Belgrade, that was held on 28 November 2013.

<p>b) Public discussions on the issue of segregation in special education in Serbia, with UN human rights bodies as well as the European Commission highlighting issues related to discrimination of Roma children.</p>	<p>b) In July 2012 ERRC made submission of a parallel report to the UN Human Right Council, within its Universal Periodic Review (UPR) for consideration at its 15th session that was held in January/February 2013. Findings of this report have been included in the final document of the UN UPR 15th Sessions, incorporating recommendations to Serbian government to “[e]nforce legal safeguards to ensure fair and equal access [.....] education for Romani individuals” (A - 132.95), “[e]nhance measures regarding the integration of Roma citizens through the social and educational systems” (A - 132.96.) and “increase measures to guarantee non-discrimination, to improve the conditions of Roma regarding the realisation of good education” (A - 132.94.). Similarly, ERRC made submissions on issues of special education (among other things) that were included in the European Commission progress report on Serbia for 2012 and 2013 on issues of special education (among other things). Recent findings on overrepresentation of Romani children in special education in Serbia were also presented at a press conference.</p>
<p>c) Increased capacity of 16 Romani activists to understand special education in Serbia and to conduct community-based surveys, data collection among the Roma community.</p>	<p>c) The evaluation confirmed that 15 out of 16 trained activists conducted field research among 128 Romani households in 10 towns across Serbia. The research was focused on reasons and process leading to enrolment of Romani children to special schools. This approach was copied from Macedonia. As in the case of Macedonia, one of the key questions is how “capacity building” is understood by ERRC, and how ERR measures whether capacity building has happened or not.</p>
<p>Serbia: Increased awareness on Roma housing rights violations</p>	
<p>a) Monitored, recorded and successfully challenged forced evictions of Roma</p>	<p>a) The evaluation was able to confirm this. Within the Platform on the Right to Adequate Housing, ERRC is active in monitoring and reporting on forced eviction. Besides, ERRC is active in pressuring authorities to comply with international standards and domestic legislation when it comes to forced evictions. There is a body of evidence which shows that local authorities changed their behaviour on this issue.</p>
<p>b) Raised awareness of the judiciary of international housing rights standards, constitutional obligations applying these standards, as well as of the relevant jurisprudence and main principles developed in Roma-related cases before the European Court of Human Rights</p>	<p>b) The evaluation was able to confirm this claim as well. ERRC is active in raising awareness on international housing right standards and domestic legislation in this field. ERRC has constantly been challenging authorities and other parties (i.e. Delegation of the European Union, UN agencies, OSCE, etc.) to align their efforts with international standards. In addition, ERRC or-</p>

and UN bodies, mainly Human Rights Committee.	organised a training for judiciary on sharing international experience in the field of Roma-related cases before the European Court of Human Rights and UN bodies, mainly Human Rights Committee.
c) Secured (along with other NGOs on a platform) an important consultative partner, UN OHCHR, which has agreed to consult with the platform in any dealings it has with state authorities on evictions and suitable relocation plans.	c) The evaluation has confirmed that ERRC (in cooperation with Praxis and other NGOs from the Platform) has been able to develop good cooperation with UN OHCHR. In 2012 ERRC and Praxis have submitted a parallel report to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) on Serbia, which dedicated a separate chapter on forced eviction of Roma in Serbia.
d) Raised the awareness of UN bodies (notably the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights).	d) The evaluation has confirmed that ERRC is active in advocacy and raising awareness on Roma housing issues towards UN bodies. Together with parallel report for CEDAW, ERRC submitted two other parallel reports to UN bodies on Serbia. In January 2011 ERRC submitted a parallel report on Serbia to the UN Committee on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination for consideration at the 78 th Session that was held in February – March 2011 (available at http://bit.ly/1ekzCXu). In October 2013 ERRC has submitted written comments on housing and adequate standard of living in Serbia to be considered by the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights at the 52 nd Session to be held on 2-6 December 2013 (available at http://bit.ly/17Ue1GH). Those comments were included in the final document, yet rephrased to the language that is accepted to these UN bodies. Furthermore, ERRC is also active in advocating toward EU bodies, especially in regard to the EU-funded project on Roma housing in Serbia. Together with the NGO Praxis, ERRC is persistent in pressuring EC authorities in Serbia and Brussels to apply best international and EU practices for social housing.
Serbia: Increased awareness on Roma women's rights	
a) Increased awareness of the problems Roma women face within the UN Human Rights Council, which has asked Serbia to address racial prejudice, xenophobia, hate speech and other forms of	a) Praxis and ERRC have submitted a parallel report to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), emphasising issues related to Roma Women's rights. This report was welcomed and praised by a number of national Roma and non-Roma women's NGOs in Serbia.

discrimination, in particular against Romani women.	
b) One Romani gender fellow trained on how to carry out research on women's rights in relation to housing, health, employment and education.	b) The evaluation report has confirmed that one Romani gender fellow has been trained to carry out research on women's rights. The fellow supposed to finish her research on the Bride Sale. However, she left her job and moved abroad without completing the research. Roma women NGO "Ženski Prostor", where this researcher was employed, committed to finalise the research on the bride sale and submit to ERRC. There is no information when this report is due to be finalised.
c) One Romani gender fellow trained on how to raise awareness about sexual minorities (notably lesbians) in Romani women's communities.	c) ERRC has supported a gender fellow to carry out a research on Romani lesbian. This is the first known research on this topic. The research has been finished and should be published by the end of the year. There is as yet no evidence available as to whether the traineeship has led to the activist's taking this issue forward.
Serbia: Securing access to justice for Romani victims of racially motivated attacks, police torture and discrimination	
a) Brought to the attention of the Serbian judiciary five cases of housing rights violations.	a) The evaluation confirmed that ERRC has 4 on-going court cases regarding violation of tenancy rights and 1 court case regarding destruction of property and forced eviction resulting in homelessness. All cases are pending either before the first instance or appellate court.
b) Secured a decision from the Commissioner for Equality that housing conditions for a group of Roma were inadequate, leading to the introduction of electricity in their homes.	b) The evaluation has confirmed successful advocacy on the Commissioner for Protection of Equality to raise her awareness on issues related to inadequate housing of Roma that are forcefully evicted from Bellville. For instance, on 8 August 2012 the Platform and ERRC sent a letter to the Commissioner for Protection of Equality, raising her awareness on inadequate living conditions of four Romani families (18 individuals including 7 children) evicted from Bellville in April 2012 and accommodated in the abandoned warehouse in Niš. The Commissioner visited the families on 13 August 2014 and based on her findings in the field she submitted the recommendations to the City administration to improve living conditions in that facility. Based on this recommendations Romani families got electricity and running water.
c) Raising the awareness among Serbian prosecutors and the judiciary of police beatings in two cases.	c) The evaluation has confirmed these claims. At the moment ERRC has 2 on-going case regarding police brutality against Roma. In both cases victims were minor at the time of the incident. ERRC submitted criminal complaints against the police officers that were engaged in those cases of torture. Cases are still pending.

Ukraine: Freedom of Movement – Paralegal Project	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Increased awareness and knowledge among communities in Odessa on HR, Roma rights, and community organising b) Raised awareness of the right to personal documents, how to access personal documents, and the importance of exercising this right among Roma communities c) Raised the capacity of 22 community members in community organising; 7 of these raised their capacity to engage with the community as community-based paralegals [...] d) Prepared local actors to advocate for special measures to facilitate acquisition and or legislative changes in the document application process e) Detailed survey of 150 households in Odessa region by paralegals f) 4 community-based paralegals actively working with clients in document applications g) 22 adults and 16 children secured as clients h) 4 passports, 3 birth certificates, 9 civil registrations obtained 6 cases filed with civil court relating to cases that have stalled due to legal and bureaucratic obstacles 	<p>The evaluators were not able to independently verify the results (quantitative or qualitative) as reported by ERRC, but believe them to be overall credible based on data ERRC staff collated.</p>
Ukraine: Housing and land	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) ERRC has compiled detailed information on access to land and legalisation of land in Odessa region b) ERRC has highlighted threat of eviction faced by two communities c) ERRC, together with a local lawyer, has opened a case representing over 200 people on legalising their land in Uzhgorod 	<p>Results a)-c) were confirmed through a stakeholder interview. ERRC's engagement was reported to having significantly contributed to the halting of evictions. ERRC has signed a Memorandum of Cooperation with the Renaissance Foundation Ukraine to work jointly on cases relating to land legalisation and document acquisition in land legalisation and document acquisition in Zakarpathia region of Ukraine.</p>

Ukraine: Education	
<p>a) Raised awareness in local administration and in national media of school segregation of Roma communities</p> <p>b) Started work to reduce segregation through a dedicated programme</p>	The evaluators were unable to independently verify these results because of time constraints.
Ukraine: Other litigation	
<p>a) European Convention on Human Rights in Fedorchenko v Ukraine case, judgment of 20 December 2012, (http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-113119#{\"itemid\":[\"001-113119\"]}). It is the first time the ECtHR found Ukraine in violation of Article 14 of the ECHR (prohibition of discrimination) in relation to Roma minority, coupled with procedural violations of the right to life.</p> <p>Perpetrators of the racially motivated murder of a Roma woman were found guilty.</p>	<p>a) Although the final judgement was issued in 12/12, this case seems to be considerably “older” and the evaluators have difficulties to locate it in the period of the review.</p>
Ukraine: Advocacy	
<p>a) ERRC, through submissions to international human rights committees and monitoring bodies, raised awareness of the situation of Roma in Ukraine and succeeded in having concrete recommendations made to Ukraine by these bodies</p>	The evaluators were not able to verify these results through field work.
Ukraine: Letters of Concern	
<p>a) ERRC has raised awareness in Ukraine on issues such as hate speech, violent attacks, and on the new National Action Plan, by sending letters of concern to relevant authorities; replies have been received in many cases.</p>	The evaluators have not verified these results beyond the information that was collated and submitted by ERRC.

4 Conclusions

4.1 RELEVANCE

Relevance considers the extent to which the 2012-2013 objectives and activities chosen to reach those objectives were suited to the context.

The areas of work of the ERRC in Macedonia, Serbia, and Ukraine are highly relevant overall in relation to the problems Roma are facing in these countries. The work ERRC is pursuing in the countries is also in line with regards to ERRC's 2012-2017 Strategy, as well as with Swedish policy objectives. In the context of **Macedonia**, stakeholders had concerns that the work in the area of education lacked explicit reference to the country's existing policies, and already existing official data and research undertaken by other actors. The education work had an explicit capacity building component, but to be relevant to the activists, a needs assessment should have been carried out to understand what type of capacity would need to be built—stakeholders had mixed feedback on the relevance of the training that was provided to them, and there was a clearly articulated concern that the activity would have been more relevant had the activists been actively involved in designing the questionnaire that they subsequently administered among the Roma community. Also, the one-off nature of the activity was highlighted as an issue of concern, as was the lack of a monitoring mechanism built into the activity which would have provided useful feedback on the impact of both the questionnaire as well as the awareness raising in the community.

In the context of **Serbia**, ERRC's main focus of work was on Roma housing, an issue that has been recognised internationally, for example by the European Union in their EU Progress Report on Serbia (including in the latest, 2013, report). ERRC work in the field of forced eviction has been also recognised the Commissioner of Equality and a few local self-governments. ERRC's work in other areas such as education, with special emphasis on special education, and the prevention of torture are also highly relevant to the context of Serbia.

In **Ukraine**, work to establish a network of paralegals in and around Odessa has been relevant in terms of building the capacities inside the Roma communities to gain access to personal documents as a precondition to access other basic rights. Work has successfully resolved a considerable number of individual cases, i.e. where community members were able to take out documents as a result of the paralegals' work. In Zakarpathia region, ERRC, in partnership with the Renaissance Foundation of Ukraine, is preparing a legal case on land ownership on behalf of 200 individuals, thereby addressing a highly relevant area and matching it with ERRC's core legal expertise at the European level.

4.2 EFFICIENCY

Efficiency measures the outputs—qualitative and quantitative—in relation to the inputs.

With regards to an assessment of the efficiency criterion, the previous sections dealing with organisational issues of ERRC have provided an extensive discussion. The evaluators believe that implementing the recommendations issued to ERRC in the 2010 and 2011 evaluation/monitoring assessments would contribute to the organisation becoming more efficient in the use of the resources available to it.

With regards to ERRC's work in the countries, this is an area for further reflection and the evaluators understand that it has been part of internal discussions in ERRC for some time. ERRC is an organisation with limited financial resources at its disposal, as well as with a limited presence at country level, at least in three of the four "Sida countries". Yet, the organisation works at country level on areas with protracted, systemic problems, and where therefore efforts will need to be sustained, and medium- to long-term. The key question is whether ERRC as an organisation with limited country presence (in most cases) is the right vehicle to deliver certain activities. In the opinion of the evaluators, **Serbia** is a good example of ERRC's coalition- and partnership building with local/national peer organisations also maximising the use of ERRC's own resources. The building up of similar long-term partnerships, or networks of partner organisations, should be considered for other countries, too.

The evaluators consider the work done in Odessa/**Ukraine** to be important and of direct benefit to the **individuals** involved. But there is a concern as to the feasibility and ultimately, efficiency of working at the level of building the capacity of individual paralegals in a country the size of **Ukraine**. Because of its limited resources, ERRC needs to be strategic on how it goes about its objectives, and there is an argument in favour of increasing the capacity of professional lawyers⁴ as opposed to starting at the level of paralegals at the community level.

With regards to its litigation work, there is, at the moment, a considerable number of cases at the pre-litigation or litigation stage in **domestic courts**, i.e. not at the European level where the core of ERRC's experience and expertise is. This, then, requires more emphasis—and resources—on working at country-level. For example in **Macedonia**, ERRC is currently engaging a lawyer on a case-by-case basis; however, her workload seems considerable at the pre-litigation phase, which is at present not part of her contract with ERRC (this work is done pro bono).

⁴ Stakeholders have pointed out that there is less of a shortage of Romani lawyers than in other countries, and that they might be a good entry point for the work in the Odessa region.

4.3 EFFECTIVENESS

Effectiveness considers the extent to which activities/outputs contribute to reaching the programme's stated objectives.

As has been pointed out elsewhere in the report, an assessment of effectiveness is hampered by the lack of an internal ERRC monitoring system to systematically monitor its own work. For example, with regards to the awareness raising activities on special education among rights holders in **Macedonia**, there is no assessment on whether and how many of those that ERRC (through the National Roma Centrum) had reached out to have, as a result, taken action on behalf of their families.

This need for internal monitoring and evaluation persists across ERRC's areas of work, including ERRC's advocacy work. While the evaluators have been able to collect some stakeholder feedback on ERRC's contributions to halt forced evictions and improve domestic legislation (in **Serbia**, through ERRC's role in the Platform on the Right to Adequate Housing and in **Ukraine's** Zakarpathia region, in coalition with a number of domestic partners), it would be useful if ERRC itself could collect evidence in a more systematic way. This could help the organisation to better understand where its advocacy works and why, as well as establishing a causal link between ERRC's efforts and changes in policies.

4.4 SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.

Sida funding covered activities between 2012 and 2013, and clearly, it would be too early to judge sustainability at this stage. It is difficult to discuss the potential for sustainability given the absence of follow-up and monitoring on ERRC's activities.

There are sustainability concerns with regards to the work with paralegals in Ukraine; stakeholders have highlighted that some of those trained through the programme have left the communities or had a change in life circumstances that did not allow for them to continue the work they were trained to do. The way in which the programme is set up, this might happen to the currently active legal trainees, too.

Sustainability is also likely to be enhanced by a coherent human rights-based approach that prioritises processes as much as results, including more focus on building capacity of partners.

4.5 IMPACT

Impact considers the positive and negative changes produced by an intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Impact is typically assessed after a project/intervention has finished, as in many cases, it is too early to tell during the lifetime of a project what impact has been achieved as with the “sustainability” and “effectiveness” criteria, it is difficult to assess impact in absence of ERRC systematically monitoring this.

In the case of the 2012-2013 ERRC programme, the evaluation has some evidence on impact having been achieved at the level of individual beneficiaries in Ukraine, Macedonia, and Serbia. In Ukraine, individuals have been able to obtain personal identity documents, which are a precondition for those individuals to realise a number of fundamental rights. Roma activists involved in awareness raising on special education in Macedonia were very sceptical as to whether they had managed to change the attitudes of community members; there is, however, anecdotal evidence of a couple of families seeking to send their children to mainstream schools as a result of the awareness raising activities that ERRC conducted together with the National Roma Centrum.

Advocacy work has had impact at the level of duty bearers in governmental institutions. In Macedonia and Serbia, ERRC has successfully pushed for rulings by the countries’ equality bodies which have publicly confirmed cases of discrimination against Roma.

5 Recommendations

Recommendations:

To Sida

- The evaluators recommend a further tranche of funding for ERRC, subject to benchmarks agreed between Sida and ERRC to deliver on, as well as following up with the organisation on implementing the recommendations from the 2010/2011 Sida monitoring exercise.
- The funding decision should be made contingent on the Executive Director having a medium-term contract.
- Sida should support ERRC with its organisational development/restructuring, in a format to be discussed with ERRC. The evaluators recommend training on results-based management within a Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA).
- Funding should be longer-term, with 4-year funding a reasonable proposition. This would give ERRC the opportunity to implement projects over a more sustained period of time.
- Sida should make available lessons learned, tools and systems Sida uses to implement its own HRBA legal and policy commitments.

To ERRC

- At the organisational level ERRC's management needs to continue their efforts to reconnect with their staff by extending steps to provide structured and regular feedback to staff. Structures need to be fair, and perceived by staff to be fair, e.g., job descriptions, working hours, working arrangements, pay scales, etc.
- Ongoing conflicts between staff members—a legacy of the past—should be conclusively resolved, possibly with the use of professional mediation. If mediation is unable to resolve the problems, personnel decisions need to be taken.
- The internal operations of ERRC, a human rights NGO, should be guided by human rights standards, i.e. transparency, accountability, participation, non-discrimination. Key documents such as the budget available for operational activities should be accessible to staff as a matter of course.
- ERRC in particular can benefit from explicitly adopting a coherent HRBA framework as the basis of its work and partnerships. This enhanced focus should include building upon its current focus on human rights of its target constituency; include equal focus on processes; and seeking to measure the quality of processes as key results in themselves.
- A renewed discussion is needed about the organisation's core area of expertise, strategic litigation and the resource implications of that at country level.

- A strengthened human rights-based approach should be the same in all countries: rights holders need to know when the organisation is taking up their cases and pursues them on their behalf with the authorities. Equally, where cases are considered for litigation, rights holders need to know about the next stages and actively participate in that process.
- ERRC should consider what is realistically doable with the resources available, and against the background of the experience with current Sida funding. This implies doing less in terms of quantity, and considering the implications of the limited country presence on the activities that can be pursued.
- ERRC's communication strategy should be clearer, including work with social media and extending efforts to more proactively speak to the Roma community, and also to include more positive messages.
- More consistent efforts need to be made to promote ERRC's publications knowledge products if they are to be used by like-minded stakeholders, e.g., international organisations and national and international human rights NGOs.
- ERRC should develop clear human rights-based guidelines on how to work with national and international partners at country level.
- The 2011 monitoring report recommendations should be revisited. In particular, there is an urgent need to establish sound monitoring and evaluation systems, not only to measure the results of ERRC's work, but also as a means to be accountable to those whose rights the organisation represents.

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

Final evaluation of ERRC 2012-2013

1. Intervention Background

The European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC) is an international public interest law organisation working to combat anti-Romani racism and human rights abuse of Roma through strategic litigation, research and policy development, advocacy and human rights education. The organisation is based in Budapest.

Since its establishment in 1996, the ERRC has provided Roma with the tools necessary to combat discrimination and achieve equal access to justice, education, housing, health care and public services.

The ERRC has consultative status with the Council of Europe, as well as with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Sida decided in 2008 to support ERRC during a three year period with a total amount of 15.9 MSEK (Dec. no. 2008-006450). In 2012 Sida decided on a second phase of the project, the total cost of which amounts to 11 900 836 SEK (Dec. no. 2012-001036). The project, which ends in 2013, is to contribute to the objectives as follows:

- 1) Violence against Roma:
 - Reduction in violence;
 - Elimination of impunity through ensuring effective law enforcement response
- 2) Education:
 - Elimination of overt and intentional segregation in education through promulgation and implementation of clear law and policy against it;
 - Application of European Court of Human Rights judgements banning certain forms of segregation.
- 3) Housing:
 - Reduction in the practice of forced evictions and resultant homelessness;
 - Reduction in segregation;
- 4) Romani women's and children's rights:
 - Recognition of and redress for Romani women coercively sterilised;
 - Effective law enforcement, social work and community response to trafficking of particularly vulnerable Roma;

Reduction in the overrepresentation of Romani children and youth in state care institutions.

- 5) Disaggregated data:
Establishment of government obligation to collect and disseminate data disaggregated by ethnicity as a necessary predicate to fulfilling other rights obligations and developing effective policy.
- 6) Free movement and migration:
Ensure the right to citizenship;
State respect for freedom of movement, including the right of internal movement and the right to leave one's country and return;
Involuntary returns with due process and support upon return.
- 7) Empowering Romani activists:
Enhanced capacity in Roma rights field in countries with lower level of human rights activity;
Increased professionalisation of Romani NGOs engaging in rights advocacy.

ERRC strives to achieve the objectives mentioned above through the means of the methods as follows:

- Strategic litigation and related advocacy, aimed at securing justice for Romani victims of human rights abuses and judicial rulings contribution to systematic reform;
- Research and reporting, in order to create a solid factual basis for all ERRC work, including policy assessments and recommendations to governments, policy makers and opinion leaders;
- International and domestic advocacy, targeting governments, key intergovernmental agencies, media and the public to press for change at the international, domestic and local level;
- Human rights education and legal training, to achieve long-term impact by supporting the development of additional civil society actors skilled in legal and human rights advocacy.

In 2010 an independent evaluation was carried out, procured by ERRC. The conclusions from this evaluation were not clear cut as it both gave a picture of a very successful organisation and at the same time an organisation in an identity crisis. The recommendations did, however, highlight the need for ERRC to be more strategic in its choice of activities and ensure improved synergy to maximise the effects of different programmes.

During the period 2009-2011 Sida funded a monitoring consultant for the continuous monitoring of the project. In late 2011 the final report of the monitoring consultant was presented. This report shows that an important change had taken place in the work of the organisation with an increased focus when it comes to its geographical

coverage and improved planning and management. The report provided a number of recommendations for ERRC, to which ERRC elaborated a management response.

In addition to the evaluation and monitoring carried out under the Sida funding, the ERRC has, over the years since its foundation in 1996, carried out a number of review. The most recent of these involves a survey of stakeholders and an internal review in preparation for the production of a new five-year strategy (2013-2017). The survey was carried out in 2012, and the results were fed into the strategic planning process.

According to the agreement between ERRC and Sida an evaluation shall be carried out during the second half year of 2013. The evaluation shall summarise obtained and expected results in relation to the results framework, and contain an analysis of any deviation there from. As Sida is planning to provide further support to ERRC, the main aim of the evaluation is to provide input to the next phase of the project.

2. Evaluation Objective and Scope

To provide ERRC and Sida with recommendations to be used in the elaboration and assessment of the proposal of a new phase of the programme.

3. Organisation, management and stakeholders

The main stakeholders of the evaluation are the staff responsible for the strategical planning and donor funds at ERRC in Budapest. These ToR have been elaborated in cooperation with ERRC. The methodology and the time schedule should be agreed with ERRC in Budapest.

Stakeholders to be interviewed are:

- ERRC country staff in Macedonia and Serbia
- ERRC local monitors
- Romani civil society organisations in Macedonia and Serbia
- Roma Education Fund
- European Roma Grassroots Organizations Network
- Council of Europe

(for contact details see annex 5 to “ERRC Planning and Review Process of the Program Strategy 2013-2017)

4. Evaluation Questions and Criteria

- To what extent has ERRC responded to the recommendations of the 2011 monitoring report?
- What are the results of the project? Please make a list of the most important results? To what extent have the planned outcomes of the project been achieved (i.e. effectiveness)? What are the reasons for the achievement/non-achievement?

- What are the effects of ERRC's advocacy and communications work? What are the effects on the boundary partners? Have these effects influenced or are likely to influence the situation of the target group of the projects? What are the reasons for the effects?
- The effectiveness of engagement with Roma organisations at national and local level?
- What are the effects of ERRC's work in Macedonia and Serbia? What are the reasons for the effects?
- The effectiveness of current organisational structures and human resource use.

In order to ensure that the evaluation will draw conclusions on the lessons learnt so that ERRC and Sida will receive clear cut recommendations the two fundamental questions of the evaluation are:

- 1) Why, what are the reasons behind the results or lack of results?
- 2) What can be done in order to increase the chances of achieving results?

5. Recommendation and Lessons Learned

Considering the overall objective of ERRC – the full enjoyment by Roma of all civil and political, economic and social rights – propose to ERRC and Sida changes in the scope and design of ERRC's organization and activities in order to make the subsequent project even more effective and relevant.

Provide ERRC and Sida with clear cut information on what works and what does not work.

6. Methodology

- Desk review on project documentation provided by Sida and ERRC
- Interviews with relevant staff at ERRCs office in Budapest
- Interviews with relevant staff at ERRCs offices in Macedonia and Serbia
- Interviews with relevant staff at Sida, Stockholm
- Interviews with the stakeholders listed above

7. Time schedule and Reporting

As the evaluation is to provide recommendations for ERRC and Sida while elaborating and assessing the proposal for a new phase of the cooperation, the evaluation needs to be ready as soon as possible. At the same time it is important that the evaluation experts are allowed the time necessary for a quality evaluation. Thus the consultant is requested to propose a time schedule to Sida and ERRC.

The terminology of the OECD/DAC Glossary on Evaluation and Results-Based Management should be adhered to as far as possible.

The methodology used must be described and explained in the final report. Any limitations shall be made explicit and their consequences discussed in the reports.

The final report should be written in English

8. Resources

Maximum budget 500 000,- SEK

9. Evaluation Team Qualification

The consultancy team shall be comprised of the following competencies:

- Experience on Human Rights or Minority Rights work
- Experience on undertaking evaluations
- Experience of working in and knowledge on the region
- Language skills necessary to carry out interviews with the stakeholders listed above

10. References

The main documents to be reviewed:

- Project proposal, results matrix and risk analysis included
- Sida's assessment memo
- Monitoring report 2011
- ERRC's management response to the monitoring report
- ERRC Planning and Review Process of the Program Strategy 2013-2017
- ERRC Programme Strategy 2013-2017

Annex 2 – Inception Report

1. Introduction

Sweden has supported the European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC) since 2006. A second phase of funding, from 2008 to 2011, had a financial ceiling of 15.9 MSEK (approx. 1.8 M€). The current funding, which commenced in spring 2012 and which will end in 2013, is for an overall amount of just over 11.9 MSEK (approx. 1.37 M€). Sweden is considering a contribution, possibly in the form of core support, for two years after current funding ends, on the understanding that this would be the final contribution from Sida.

The current funding—by Sida also referred to as the “project” or “programme”—is to contribute to the achievement of the ERRC’s objectives in Macedonia, Serbia, Turkey and Ukraine; at the time of the funding agreement (i.e. in the beginning of 2012), these ERRC objectives were thematically clustered as:

- 1) Violence against Roma – reduction in violence; elimination of impunity through ensuring effective law enforcement response
- 2) Education – Elimination of overt and intentional segregation in education through promulgation and implementation of clear law and policy against it
- 3) Housing – Reduction in the practice of forced evictions and resultant homelessness; reduction in segregation
- 4) Romani women’s and children’s rights – Recognition of and redress for Romani women coercively sterilised; effective law enforcement, social work and community response to trafficking of particularly vulnerable Roma; reduction in the overrepresentation of Romani children and youth in state care institutions
- 5) Disaggregated data – establishment of governments’ obligation to collect and disseminate data disaggregated by ethnicity as a necessary predicate to fulfilling other rights obligations and developing effective policy
- 6) Free movement and migration – ensure right to citizenship, state respect for freedom of movement, including the right to internal movement and the right to leave one’s country and return; involuntary returns with due process and support upon return
- 7) Empowering Romani activists – enhanced capacity in the Roma rights field in countries with lower level of human rights activity; increased professionalization of Romani NGOs engaging in rights advocacy.

ERRC embarked, in 2012, on the development of a new strategy for the period from 2013 to 2017. Objectives in the new strategy have, in the main, remained the same,

with thematic priority 7 (“empowering Romani activists”) having been replaced⁵ by a priority on “identity documents”. The results-framework underpinning the Sida-funding is based on the seven strategic objectives above.

ERRC has undergone a considerable number of evaluations over the past 8 years. In 2005, the Open Society Institute (OSI) commissioned a review; Sida funded an evaluation in 2009, which included a monitoring assignment (which was implemented only in part) and a monitoring report in 2011; in 2010, ERRC commissioned its own evaluation, also funded by Sida. The current, fourth, evaluation, had been agreed between Sida and ERRC at the onset of the project in 2012.

2. Assessment of scope of the evaluation

2.1 Elements of the Evaluation

The Terms of Reference (ToR) specify the main objective of the evaluation to produce “recommendations to be used in the elaboration and assessment of the proposal of a new phase of the programme” (see Annex 2 for the ToR).

The ToR particularly accentuate two elements, both of which are interlinked:

Element 1 - Sida and ERRC want to receive information and an analysis on how the 2011 monitoring report recommendations were taken up by ERRC and

Element 2 - The evaluation is to compile results and to provide an assessment about the *effectiveness* of the project.

Element 1:

The 2011 monitoring report came up with specific recommendations that to a great extent relate to how ERRC’s processes could be adapted to better monitor, and eventually capture, trace, and assess the impact of its interventions. It is, at the end of the inception phase, not clear how the dialogue between Sida and ERRC evolved after ERRC’s management response to these recommendations. The evaluators will seek to clarify this with Sida; the evaluators will also set aside sufficient time to cover this element with ERRC in Budapest during their initial meeting.

With view to the considerable number of reviews and evaluations that ERRC has gone through over the past 8 years, an overarching question to be addressed under this element is what learning takes place as the result of these exercises in ERRC, and how ERRC embraces or makes use of the recommendations directed towards them. This issue will be explored in light of Sida’s readiness to provide coaching/specific training support on results-based management to ERRC.

⁵ Capacity building has become a cross-cutting concern in the 2013-2017 Strategy, i.e. it has not been abandoned, but framed differently.

Element 2:

In its initial response to the Terms of Reference, the Indevelop evaluation team made it clear that the project will be assessed using a wider range of the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, i.e. the focus, in the ToR, on effectiveness is too narrow to provide a systematic assessment of the project. Applying the definitions as set out by the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC), we define **results** as the “outcome, output or impact (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative) of a development intervention.”⁶ The evaluation will try to map, test, and verify results reported by ERRC using a human-rights based approach, including actively seeking the views of rights-holders in the process.⁷

The DAC evaluation criteria and respective definitions apply as follows.

Effectiveness – defined as “[a] measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.”⁸

Efficiency – defined as “[a] measure of how economically resources/input (funds, expertise, time etc.) are converted into results.”⁹

Sustainability – [t]he continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.”¹⁰

Relevance is defined as “the extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.”¹¹

Gender equality – a cross-cutting priority for Sweden – will be a focus of the evaluation beyond the specific activities in under the seven sector aims specified in the results framework.

2.2 Evaluability: Key Concerns

The key conclusion at the end of the inception phase is that the evaluation approach cannot be based on document review and will therefore need to be based more on interviews and subjective perceptions of ERRC staff. This, inevitably, will raise questions about credibility of the data collected in the process.

⁶ See OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management at <http://www.oecd.org/development/peer-reviews/2754804.pdf>.

⁷ For an overview of what a human-rights based approach to evaluations entails, we have provided a table grid in Annex 3 that might be helpful.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ See <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

The evaluators have, at this point, seen very limited project documentation that would give any comprehensive and structured insight into the project in the four countries. A “Detailed Activity Report of the ERRC for Sida”, covering the period from January to December 2012 covers all 11 ERRC countries, while the information on the four countries that the project covers (i.e. Macedonia, Serbia, Turkey, Ukraine), and that will be the focus of the evaluation, is so sparse that it does not even allow for an overview of what the project has pursued in those countries.

Documents received from ERRC are not organised in any systematic way, for example across sector aims; this makes them of very limited use for this exercise without getting significant additional information from ERRC staff. The overall quality of the reports is an issue of concern; most reports are lacking even basic information, such as the name of the author or dates, so it is not possible to place them on a time continuum.

The evaluators are continuing to receive documentation beyond the date of submission of the Inception Report, and will screen these documents in preparation of their visit to Budapest.

We can only hypothesise, at this stage, what the reasons are for the difficulties encountered with regards to the availability of documentation. It is possible that ERRC is not systematically collating monitoring and analytical data and therefore, there is insufficient documentation to share with the evaluators in the first place. The evaluation team, at this point, tentatively concludes that Results Framework is a tool that is actually not actively used inside ERRC. As the Framework serves as the starting point for the evaluation, it would be important to have clarity on this. If the 2012-2013 Framework is not used, it would be good to know whether there is a different tool or framework instead that is used to monitor progress of the project and that we might or should take as the basis for evaluating the results of the activities in the four countries. I.e. we are ready to “depart” from unpacking a tool that is not being utilized, it would be appropriate to investigate if there is an alternative in use that would serve as a better starting point for analysis.

3. Methodology and Approach

3.1 Data collection and review

As mentioned above, there is concern with regards to ERRC’s internal monitoring processes, which seem to affect the availability and quality of documents for review. This means that the visit of the evaluation team to ERRC in Budapest from 9 to 11 October 2013 will have to serve primary data collection purposes, and the evaluators might have to adapt a more “forensic” approach than would normally be the case in similar exercises. The team will seek to allocate sufficient time during its visit to ERRC to ascertain the nature of the documents available; the team will also seek to understand what channels of information collection and sharing there are inside ERRC that could be tapped into to gain a better understanding of the work in Macedonia, Serbia, Turkey, and Ukraine.

In practical terms, it means that we would like to spend considerable time with each individual staff member working on the activities in the four countries during their visit to Budapest, and in that way, canvass what ERRC staff perceive as results they have achieved and to bridge the gap arising from the lack of documentation. We would then develop a methodology of verifying these results during the field visits.

With the data that we have at our disposal at the end of the inception phase, we conclude that a highly iterative approach will be required to designing the specific evaluation methodology and questions for the field visits.

If ERRC agrees with this approach to the meetings, this would require an adjustment of the agenda that ERRC has suggested for the evaluators visit to Budapest; we will be in contact with ERRC in the remaining days leading up to the visit. We would want to ask staff to prepare and think of their work in the past couple of years in the following terms:

- Did the project/ERRC's work make a difference?
- How has the project/ERRC's work made a difference?
- To what extent can a specific result be attributed to the project/ERRC's work?
- What are the changes in behaviour and attitudes among the people you work with and for?

As is usual practice in evaluations, views and statements will not be attributed in the report.

There are some data gaps with regards to Sida that the evaluators are going to try to fill prior to their visit to Budapest. This includes the follow-up, from Sida's side, to the recommendations of the Sida-funded monitoring exercise.

3.2 Stakeholder interviews

Stakeholder interviews will commence only after the team has held its initial meetings with ERRC staff in Budapest. This includes such stakeholders that we would be able to talk to outside of the in-country visits.

At the moment, we have a patchy picture, in particular at country-level, of who the stakeholders are: in the case of Macedonia, there is a reasonable amount of information available on primary and secondary duty-bearers, as well as on some of ERRC's partner organisations. There is very little to no information available for the other three countries. We are uncertain about rights-holders across the three countries that we will be looking at in detail (i.e. Serbia, Macedonia, Ukraine); we will—in keeping with Sida's commitment to a human rights-based approach to development cooperation, including to evaluation—want to involve them in the process.

The upcoming visit to Budapest will therefore also try to gather as much as possible information on stakeholders on duty-bearers and, in particular, rights-holders who should be part of the evaluation—depending on the type of data there is to contact

stakeholders, we will decide on the best format to solicit their views and thoughts (direct, one-to-one interviews; focus group discussions; surveys etc.).

Currently, the plan is to have two in-country visits, to Macedonia and Serbia, respectively; for both countries, five days each are estimated. There is also a possibility to spend some more limited time in Ukraine, making use of a separate Indvelop evaluation mission for Sida. How these in-country visits will eventually be structured can, however, only be decided after our visit to ERRC in Budapest. It might, for example, be useful to have a follow-up visit to Budapest to validate findings with ERRC management and staff. Also, depending on our ability to reach out to rights-holders, the in-country visits might have to be adjusted in length.

3.3 Report drafting

We will seek to have an outline of the report available before the beginning of the field work, and will submit a draft report one week after the end of the field work.

4. Workplan

a) Desk Review/Inception Phase

By the time of our visit to Budapest from 9 to 11 October 2013, we will have reviewed all documentation that has been made available to us by both Sida and ERRC (see a preliminary list of these documents in Annex 2 of this Inception Report). We will also spend considerable time on preparing clusters of questions to ERRC management and staff.

b) In-country work

At the end of the inception phase, we are planning to conduct two in-depth country missions to Macedonia and Serbia, respectively. There is also an option of some in-country work in Ukraine. We are unable, given the concerns described above, to confirm the timing and precise length of these country missions prior to our meetings in Budapest – much depends on the availability of data on activities, and rights-holders' details that we are hoping to find out more during our meetings in ERRC.

c) Analysis and report-drafting

We are planning to draft the detailed methodology for the in-country work after our visit to Budapest, and will prepare the outline of the report before the field work.

Inception Report Annex – Five Core Principles of Human Rights-Based Evaluation

Core Principles	Application in Practice
1. Expressly apply human rights framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Define evaluation goals in terms of the relevant international human rights commitments – as legally binding norms. This includes determining whether the sector or institution concerned: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Explicitly takes human rights obligations into account at every stage (from the identification of needs through to policy and programme identification as well as implementation, monitoring and evaluation). ▪ Addresses the full spectrum of human rights (civil, cultural, economic, political and social) and acknowledges their legal nature as <i>indivisible, interdependent & interrelated</i>. ▪ Builds the capacity of legislators, civil servants and other duty-bearers to apply the human rights framework in their work (e.g. through appropriate recruitment, promotion, training, specialised support).
2. Empowerment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Ensure that evaluation both promotes, and seeks to measure, empowerment - by promoting a common understanding of the human rights framework applicable to the sector/substantive area and the duties to respect, protect and fulfil rights. ✓ Ensure that the evaluation seeks to measure the extent to which duty-bearers educate and raise awareness of all sector actors (duty bearers and rights holders) according to specific roles & capacities (whether political, management to operational level). ✓ Ensure that the evaluation itself contributes to empowerment by ensuring participation by rights holders and duty bearers, by informing and by raising expectations for the future.
3. Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Ensure that evaluation measures participation in development against the legal test of the human right to participation - “active, free, and meaningful” including, whether development processes and institutions are accessible, to what extent information is transparent and timely etc.
4. Non-discrimination & vulnerable groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Ensure that evaluation measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the impact of development on discrimination & vulnerable groups– commonly minorities, women, children, but noting that vulnerability is a question to be answered according to context & varies overtime. ▪ whether data is disaggregated, by race, religion, ethnicity, language, sex, migrants, age and any other category of human rights concern relevant to each sector (eg in Justice sector context = status of remand/convicted, juvenile/adult etc). ▪ gender issues as part of the wider human rights-proofing of programming. Including the implications for women and men of planned actions, including policies, legislation and programmes.
5. Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Ensure that evaluation measures the impact of policies, budgets, and programmes accurately in human rights terms, by clearly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identifying rights-holders (and their rights) and corresponding duty-bearers (and their obligations) and positive obligations (to respect, protect, and fulfil) and negative obligations (to abstain from violations) of the full range of relevant actors (including local authorities and relevant private companies). ▪ Translating universal/regional human rights law standards into benchmarks & indicators to measure accountability and progress towards such accountability, including effective laws, policies, institutions, administrative procedures, and mechanisms of redress. ✓ Ensure that evaluation processes and results are also governed by the principle of accountability, including objectivity, due process, adherence to the principle of ‘do no harm’ etc.

Annex 3 – Headings and Rationale for Evaluation Questions

Relevance: The extent to which the 2012-2013 objectives and activities chosen to reach those objectives were suited to the context (note wide definition of context is required)

OECD DAC generic questions under this heading are typically

- To what degree do the programme's objectives remain valid?
- Are the activities and outputs consistent with its key objectives?
- Are activities and outputs consistent with its intended results?

But HRBA lens needs to be applied to the DAC generic questions

The state/duty bearers (eg what needs assessment review of Treaty body recommendations, existing country laws and policies); beneficiaries/rights-holders (what input of Roma community); what existing knowledge from other/prior ERRC activities what consultation of stakeholders ... in the case of activities such as capacity building then relevance requires looking a sub-level eg relevance to needs/capacities of targeted partners or individuals. Relevance also entails looking at different features of targeted groups (eg literacy, gender etc)

This heading is closely linked to PCM first stage needs assessment/design

Effectiveness: The extent to which activities/outputs contribute to reaching stated objectives.

Starting point questions under this heading from DAC

- To what degree were the programme's objectives achieved, or are anticipated to be achieved?
- What key factors were responsible for the achievement or failure of the objectives?

But questions need nuancing to **assess the way in which results were defined, monitored and achieved (or not) in HRBA/gender terms and the processes that led to these results were aligned with these principles** (e.g. express use of legal standards empowerment/participation focus on vulnerability/non-discrimination, accountability, etc.).

Some issues to consider include the:

- Extent to which any Theory of Change and results framework integrated HRBA/gender

- Extent to which a human rights based approach (including gender mainstreaming) were incorporated in the design and implementation of the intervention;

Efficiency: Efficiency measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.

Starting point from DAC

- How cost-efficient were programme activities?
- Were objectives achieved on time?
- How efficient was the programme/project implementation compared to alternatives?

HRBA/gender dimensions of efficiency require a broader analysis of the benefits and related costs. A key aspect that needs to be considered is that HRBA involve long term and complex change processes that require sustained support.

While a direct relationship between resource investment and long term results should be carefully established, the assessment of efficiency should also consider short term process achievements (eg empowerment and participation etc.) and medium term results (developing an enabling environment, building capacity, etc.). Some aspects to consider include the:

- Provision of adequate resources for addressing HRBA in the intervention;
- Extent to which the allocation of resources to targeted groups takes into account the most marginalised.

Impact: The positive and negative changes produced by the intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. In particular impact refers to positive or negative human rights change resulting from the activity. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of capacity, conditions.

DAC starting point questions

- What occurred as a direct result of the programme/project?
- What real difference was made to the beneficiaries as a result of the activity?
- How many people were affected?

Again re-interpreting DAC understanding of impact in HRBA/gender terms means assessing actual longer term change, in terms of realization and enjoyment of HR by rights holders and capacity of duty-bearers to respect, protect and fulfil HR

Impact can be positive or negative, intended or unintended, primary or secondary. For a number of reasons (e.g. multi-causality, timeframe etc.), attributing impact to an activity is complex; however, some efforts are needed as best practice, for learning what works or not. Examining whether any negative impact is critical as activities may reinforce existing discrimination and power structures. Some aspects that should be considered in such an assessment include:

- Whether rights-holders are better able to enjoy their rights and duty bearers have enhanced ability to comply with their obligations
 - Any unintended effects on any groups that were not adequately considered in the design (e.g. Roma sub-identities ...);

Sustainability: Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.

DAC starting point questions

- To what degree are the results likely to persist into the future?
- What were the key factors that make the results achieved more or less sustainable

Assessing sustainability of results and impacts in HRBA terms means the extent to which the activities have generated results that need to be in place for the change generated to be maintained.

Some examples include:

- Institutional and environmental change conducive to systematically addressing the objectives of the programme;
- Permanent and real attitudinal and behavioural change;
- Establishment of accountability and oversight systems between rights holders and duty-bearers;
- Capacity development of targeted rights holders (to demand) and duty bearers (to fulfil) rights;

Annex 4 – List of Consulted Documents and Information Sources

Documents:

Sida Assessment Memo, 9 March 2012, Reference number 2011—001631 (submitted by Sida Stockholm)

Agreement between Sida and European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC) on Supporting Roma Rights in Macedonia, Serbia, Turkey and Ukraine during 2012-2013, 17 April 2012 (submitted by Sida Stockholm)

European Roma Rights Centre Funding Proposal to the Swedish International Development Agency for 2012 – 2013, Annex A, 9 March 2012 (submitted by Sida Stockholm)

Annex 1 (also mentioned at margins as Annex B) Results Framework, no date (submitted by Sida Stockholm)

Detailed Activity Report of the European Roma Rights Centre for Sida, Period January-December 2012; no date (submitted by Sida Stockholm)

ERRC Financial Report, “2012 ERRC for Macedonia, Serbia, Turkey and Ukraine”, excel file, no date (submitted by Sida Stockholm)

Document entitled “ERRC Results Framework 2012-13 Project Proposal Macedonia, Serbia, Turkey, Ukraine”, no date (submitted by Sida Stockholm)

ERRC Results Framework 2012-13 Project Proposal Macedonia, Serbia, Turkey, Ukraine, reporting to Sida, covering January to June 2013 (submitted by ERRC)

Document entitled “Detailed Activity Report of the European Roma Rights Centre for Sida; Period January-December 2012”, no date or author (submitted by Sida Stockholm)

Programme Strategy 2013 – 2017, European Roma Rights Centre; no date/author (submitted by Sida Stockholm)

ERRC Planning and Review Process of the Programme Strategy 2013 – 2017; no date/author (submitted by Sida Stockholm)

External Evaluation for Sida 2010, Lilla Farkas, August 2012 (submitted by Sida Stockholm)

2011 Monitoring Report 2011 European Roma Rights Centre, SPM Consultants, Madeleine Elmqvist, Draft version 15 November 2011 (submitted by Sida Stockholm)

ERRC Response to Monitoring Report 2011, no date/author (submitted by Sida Stockholm)
 “Interim Paralegal report”, Kieran O’Reilly, Darya Alekseeva, September 2013 (submitted by ERRC)

“Paralegal Client List”, excel file not clear without additional explanation from ERRC, no date (submitted by ERRC)

“Travel Narrative Report”, trip to Macedonia 2 – 4 April 2013, Tefik Mahmut, no date (1 page, submitted by ERRC)

“Travel Narrative Report”, trip to Macedonia 7 – 15 September 2013, Tefik Mahmut, no date (3 pages, submitted by ERRC)

Letter with subject line “Discriminatory treatment by the management of Skopje shopping centre”, dated Budapest, 27 March 2013 (submitted by ERRC)

Letter addressed to Gordana Jankulovska, Minister of Interior of the Republic of Macedonia; Aneta Stancevska, Assistant Minister for Internal Control and Professional Standards; Ivo Kotevski, Assistant Minister for Public Relations, with subject line “Police brutality against Roma residents of Topana”, dated Budapest, 13 May 2013 (submitted by ERRC)

Press release(?) / document with subject line “Macedonian Police Target Roma with Excessive Force”, dated Budapest, Skopje, 13 May 2013 (submitted by ERRC; document appears to be draft)

Document with heading “Prilep case/ Police brutality case_Macedonia”, signed “Tefik”, no date (submitted by ERRC); followed link to “Utrinski Vesnik” provided in document, but unable to locate reference to ERRC through it

Document with heading “Complaint re discrimination in access to the Aqua Park in Skopje”, status of document is not clear (track changes; seems in draft form); no author, no date (but after 30 July 2013), (submitted by ERRC)

Document with heading “Complaint regarding discrimination in access to the swimming pool ‘Snupi’ in Veles”, status of document is not clear (seems in draft form); no author, no date (but after 23 June 2013), (submitted by ERRC)

Document with heading “Travel restriction case/Macedonia”, status of document is not clear (seems in draft form); no author (“T.”), no date (but after 25 May 2013), (submitted by ERRC)

Document with title “Copy of LFA training social workers”, not clear what the document relates to, no date, (submitted by ERRC)

Programme Meeting Notes with the following dates: 5 March 2013; 12 March 2013; 19 March 2013; 26 March 2013; 9 April 2013; 16 April 2013; 23 April 2013; 30 April 2013; 14 May 2013; 23 May 2013; 4 June 2013; 4 July 2013; 10 September 2013; 17 September 2013 (submitted by ERRC)

Document, in Russian, with heading “Отчет о проделанной работе от 30.05”, no author, no date, summarises in grid-form work done in Ukraine (submitted by ERRC)

Access to Land Ukraine, no other, no date (apparently draft), submitted by ERRC

ERRC Country profiles 2011 – 2012 Macedonia; Serbia; Ukraine; Turkey (downloaded from www.errc.org)

Document with file name “Advocacy Letters – Overview” - empty document (submitted by ERRC)

Report on “Adult literacy training Odessa Ukraine” – 2 page report in Russian, no date, no author (submitted by ERRC)

April May 2013 Monitor’s report: Отчет за период с 01 апреля по 30 мая 2013 года Украине , Одесская область, author Vladimir Kondur, in Russian, no date (submitted by ERRC)

Case Recommendation Uzhgorod, to Legal Director Adam Weiss, by Darya Alekseeva, 23 September 2013 (submitted by ERRC)

Minutes meeting with paralegals, author Corina (?), ½ page document, no date (but referring to 23 February 2013 meeting) (submitted by ERRC)

Ukraine Paralegal Coordinator activity report, 8 – 14 April, 2 page document, no date (submitted by ERRC)

Monthly Report, August 10 - September 10, 2013, Paralegal coordinator, Odessa, Ukraine (submitted by ERRC)

Monthly Report, July 1 – 30 (no year), author Corina (?), 1 page document, no date (submitted by ERRC)

Report, Отчет за период с 01 по 31 марта 2013 года Украине , Одесская область, in Russian, author Vladimir Kondur, no date (submitted by ERRC)

Parallel Report concerning Serbia to the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), Praxis and ERRC, available at: <http://bit.ly/17MBt6t>, accessed on 25 November 2013.

Written Comments of the European Roma Rights Centre, Concerning Serbia, for Consideration by the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights at the 52nd Session (2-6 December 2013), available at <http://bit.ly/17Ue1GH>, accessed on 25 November 2013.

Parallel Submission by the European Roma Right Centre to the Committee on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination on Serbia, for its Consideration at the 78th Session 14 February to 11 March 2011, available at <http://bit.ly/1ekzCXu>, accessed on 25 November 2013.

Parallel Report by the European Roma Right Centre and Minority Rights Centre concerning Serbia to the Human Rights Council within its Universal Periodic Review, for Consideration at its 15th Session (21 January to 1 February 2013), available at <http://bit.ly/TR8O9B>, accessed on 25 November 2013.

Serbia Analytical Report 2011, European Commission, available at: <http://bit.ly/oNX58k>, accessed on 25 November 2013.

Serbia 2012 Progress Report, European Commission, available at: <http://bit.ly/UxVc3h>, accessed on 25 November 2013.

2013 Serbia Progress Report, European Commission, available at: <http://bit.ly/1bW7DAq>, accessed on 25 November 2013.

Amnesty International “Home is more than a Roof over your Head: Roma Denied Adequate Housing in Serbia”, available at: <http://bit.ly/fZLxEwm>, accessed on 25 November 2013.

Websites/Social Media

Website of ERRC at <http://www.errc.org/>

Facebook site of “Association of Citizen Sumnal”; website www.sumnal.org was not available (status 30 September 2013)

Школа для ромських дітей: ласкаво просимо до гетто? Article in Ukrainska Pravda 31 August 2013, in Ukrainian, at <http://life.pravda.com.ua/society/2013/08/31/137591/>

Roma in Ukraine face significant barriers in accessing personal documents on website of the Ukraine Branch of the International Renaissance Foundation, 29 August 2013, at http://www.irf.ua/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&catid=82&id=40633&Itemid=43

Website of “the Commissioner for Protection of Equality of the Republic of Serbia”; <http://www.ravnopravnost.gov.rs> was not available (status 25 November 2013)

Website of the NGO PRAXIS, <http://www.praxis.org.rs/> (status 25 November 2013)

Macedonian news website on case of denial of entry to Aquapark (summer 2013)
<http://www.plusinfo.mk/vest/101338/Direktorot-go-demantira-tatkoto-Deteto-ne-e-isfrleno-oti-e-Rom-tuku-oti-nemalo-kostim-za-kapenje>

Annex 5 – List of Persons Consulted

Dezideriu Gergely	Executive Director, ERRC
Stephan Mueller	Programmes Director, ERRC
Ailsa Spindler	Director of Organisational Development, ERRC
Adam Weiss	Legal Director, ERRC
Hajnal Vernes	Finance Director, ERRC
Darya Alekseeva	Lawyer, ERRC
Andrea Colak	Legal Consultant, ERRC
Djordje Jovanovic	Research and Advocacy Coordinator, ERRC
Kieran O'Reilly	Researcher, ERRC
Anca Sandescu	Human Rights Trainer, ERRC
Marianne Powell	Communications Officer, ERRC
Tefik Mahmut	Legal Trainee, ERRC
Robert Kushen	Chair of ERRC board
Lilla Farkas	Lawyer
Rebecka Kitzing-Ivarsson	Sida Stockholm
Mustava Asanovski	Country Monitor Macedonia, ERRC
Keti Jovanova	Lawyer, Macedonia
Nadica Strbovska	NGO Sumnal Macedonia
Afrodita Rakipovska	NGO Sumnal Macedonia
Burhan Zekir	NGO Sumnal Macedonia
Sabina Ramadanova	Kochani, Macedonia
Dragancho Georgiev	Kochani, Macedonia
Aida Idrizi	Tetovo, Macedonia
Ersan Aliev	Veles, Macedonia
Erdzan Ramadanov	Veles, Macedonia
Almadet Osmanova	Skopje, Macedonia
Almira Redzeqi	Skopje, Macedonia
Sunai Sabiroski	Prilep, Macedonia
Asip Selim	Skopje, Macedonia
Emir Kadri	Skopje, Macedonia
Arife Shakiri	Tetovo, Macedonia
Nersin Kurtishi	Tetovo, Macedonia
Robert Liddell	Delegation of the European Union to Macedonia
Elvis Ali	Delegation of the European Union to Macedonia
Ramadan Berat	OSCE Macedonia
Rahman Berisha	Rights-holder Macedonia
Mehmet Nedzati	Right-holder Macedonia
Anita Dimitrevska	National Roma Centrum Macedonia
Sebihana Skenderovska	National Roma Centrum Macedonia

Vaska Bajramovska-Mustafa	Deputy Ombudsperson Macedonia
Blagica Kacanska	Teacher, Kumanovo, Macedonia
Dusko Minovski	Equality Commissioner Macedonia
Marija Deletic	NGO Lastovica, Macedonia
Roberta Mitrevska	NGO Lastovica, Macedonia
Olga Zhmurko	Renaissance Foundation Ukraine
Marija Zaric	The Office of the Commissioner for Protection of Equality, Serbia
Jovana Vukovic	Regional Centre for Minorities, Serbia
Marko Vasiljevic	Regional Centre for Minorities, Serbia
Cerim Gashi	Paralegal, Serbia
Danilo Curcic	PRAXIS, Serbia
Borka Vasic	Women in Black, Serbia
Aleksandar Olenik	Lawyer, Serbia
Sandra Abramovic	Centre for Minority Rights, Serbia
Osman Balic	YUROM, Serbia
Bozidar Jovanovic	Roma Legue, Serbia
Vera Kurtic	Ženski prostor & ERRC Fellow, Serbia
Fetija Ametovic	Roma from the warehouse, Serbia
Suncica Pasic	Roma from the warehouse, Serbia
Amet Idrizi	Roma from the warehouse, Serbia
Marija Demic	ERRC Monitor, Serbia
Dragan Djordjevic	CHRIS Network, Serbia
Several participants at the training for judges (1 November)	
Several participants at the conference on Roma housing (13 November)	



Final Evaluation of the European Roma Rights Centre 2012 - 2013

This report presents the findings of an evaluation, commissioned by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) in September 2013, of the European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC). The objective of the evaluation was "to provide ERRC and Sida with recommendations to be used in the elaboration and assessment of the proposal of a new phase of the programme". ERRC's strategic objectives are highly relevant to the widely acknowledged need for greater progress in the countries concerned to meet applicable legal obligations, as is the work done to achieve these objectives at country and headquarters-level. Specifically, the Terms of Reference requested that the evaluation (1) assess the level of implementation of recommendations to ERRC from a 2011 Sida-funded Monitoring Report; (2) map results achieved by ERRC, including those on the organisation's advocacy and communications work; and (3) undertake an analysis of how conducive ERRC's structures are with regards to the objectives the organisation is pursuing. The evaluation has been able to confirm a number of results across ERRC's core strategic areas in Macedonia, Serbia, and Ukraine. A key concern is, however, that ERRC is not, yet, systematically applying a results focus that would encourage documentation of these results over time, and that would allow a better assessment of ERRC's work on the key criteria of effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact.

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

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

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

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

