



2014:49

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Henrik Alffram  
Ali Dastgeer

# Evaluation of the Raoul Wallenberg Institute's project "Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar"

Final Report



# Evaluation of the Raoul Wallenberg Institute's project “Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar”

**Final Report  
November 2014**

**Henrik Alffram  
Ali Dastgeer**

**Authors:** Henrik Alffram and Ali Dastgeer

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 2014:49**

Commissioned by The Embassy of Sweden in Thailand

**Copyright:** Sida and the authors

**Date of final report:** November 2014

**Published** by Citat 2014

**Art. no.** Sida61809en

urn:nbn:se:sida-61809en

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](mailto:info@sida.se). Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

# Table of contents

<b>Abbreviations and Acronyms .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Preface.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 Background to the assignment .....	7
1.2 Approach and methodology.....	8
1.3 The evaluated intervention .....	9
<b>2 Findings.....</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1 MNHRC's capacity on human rights law and the role and functions of NHRIs .....	12
2.2 Capacity and use of MNHRC's library .....	14
2.3 MNHRC's functional and operational capacities.....	17
2.4 Awareness among other stakeholders of the roles and functions of MNHRC and of human rights .....	18
2.5 MNHRC's cooperation with other stakeholders .....	19
2.6 The Commission's mandate .....	21
<b>3 Conclusions .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>4 Recommendations.....</b>	<b>27</b>
4.1 Recommendations to RWI.....	27
4.2 Recommendations to Sida .....	28
<b>Annex 1 – Terms of Reference.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Annex 2 – Inception Report .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Annex 3 – Persons Consulted .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Annex 4 – References.....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Annex 5 – Trainings.....</b>	<b>53</b>

# Abbreviations and Acronyms

AFP	Asia Pacific Forum on National Human Rights Institutions
CEDAW	Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights
IT	Information Technology
MNHRC	Myanmar National Human Rights Commission
NHRI	National Human Rights Institution
OHCHR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
RWI	Raoul Wallenberg Institute for Human Rights and Humanitarian Law
SEK	Swedish Krona
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
ToR	Terms of Reference
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights

# Preface

The Embassy of Sweden in Thailand commissioned this *Evaluation of the Raoul Wallenberg Institute's project "Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar"*, through Sida's framework agreement for reviews and evaluations.

Indevelop AB ([www.indevelop.se](http://www.indevelop.se)) undertook the evaluation between August - November 2014.

This evaluation report was finalised in November 2014 after feedback from the Embassy of Sweden and RWI on the draft report.

Indevelop's independent evaluation team consisted of:

- Henrik Alffram, as Team Leader
- Ali Dastgeer, as Evaluator

Quality assurance of the evaluation methodology and reports has been provided by Ian Christoplos, Indevelop's Project Director for the framework agreement. The Project Manager at Indevelop for this evaluation, Jessica Rothman, was responsible for ensuring compliance with Indevelop's QA system throughout the process, and providing backstopping and coordination.

# Executive Summary

The Raoul Wallenberg Institute (RWI) has received SEK 16 million from Sida for the period 1 November 2012 to 31 December 2014 in support of its project “Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar 2012-2016”. The overall objective of the project is to strengthen the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission (MNHRC) and its key partners.

In light of a possible extension of the project, Sida has commissioned an evaluation focusing on the period 1 January 2013 – 30 June 2014. Its purpose has been to “generate information on how effective the Project has been in achieving results thus far, identifying, where possible, factors influencing positive results achievement, and proposing any potential adjustments to ensure effective Project delivery for the remaining two years of the Project.” The evaluation should “contribute to the dialogue between Sida and RWI on the continued operation of the project.”

Since the start of the cooperation between RWI and MNHRC, a high degree of trust has emerged between the two institutions and the project has contributed to increasing the understanding of human rights and the role of National Human Rights Institutions (NHRI) among both MNHRC commissioners and staff members. Through the project, RWI has also been able to assist in the development of the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission Law. This combination of trust and a basic understanding of international human rights law and the role of NHRIs, as well as the establishment of a largely sound legal framework have laid the foundation for future delivery of reasonable project outcomes.

However, it is the Evaluation Team’s assessment that the originally envisaged project activities or approaches will not be sufficient to attain expected project results. Adjustments are necessary to create a credible link between activities and results. It should be reassessed if the emphasis on general awareness raising will be relevant when working with an organisation where the organisational development needs are so great. There are also reasons to question the validity of training individuals in one-off activities in an organisation going through such rapid changes and staff turn-over as is MNHRC. Furthermore, the appropriateness of “supply side” approach to communications and knowledge management needs to be revisited, especially as the Commission has not demonstrated a firm commitment to engaging with other actors apart from government officials.

For the future it is recommended that:

- RWI apply a more targeted and sustained capacity and organisational development approach, and reduces its focus on raising awareness through one-off events for MNHRC commissioners and staff and for government representatives.

- RWI and MNHRC agree on a set up for residential and long-term on the job training and advice through mentoring or twinning approaches. Particular attention should be paid to targeting the assistance to MNHRC's ongoing functional and operational processes.
- RWI make better use of its human resources by allowing its programme officers to provide direct capacity building support to MNHRC staff members. Efficiency will be enhanced if at least one Programme Officer is based within the country.
- RWI assist MNHRC in exploring how staff trainings can best be institutionalised in the future.
- RWI assist, for the longer term, MNHRC in developing a strategy to develop training capacity in functional and operational processes in-house.
- RWI phases out its support to the library or resource centre.
- RWI explores how it can more effectively promote MNHRC's cooperation with other actors and its interactions with civil society organisations.
- Sida should look broadly at how it can contribute, post 2016, to ensure that structures are in place that can best support both the management capacities of MHNRC and enhancement of its human right knowledge. In doing so, it should consider possibilities of drawing, to the extent possible, on national and regional institutions.
- If a final project evaluation will be carried out, it is recommended that the ToR include a value for money assessment comparing the inputs provided by Sida to the outcomes that the project has achieved.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE ASSIGNMENT

In late 2012, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and the Raoul Wallenberg Institute (RWI) entered into a sub-agreement whereby Sida provided 16 million Swedish Krona to RWI for the period 1 November 2012 to 31 December 2014, to implement the project “Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar 2012-2016”.

The sub-agreement states that an evaluation focusing on the results for the period 2012-2014 shall be carried out and serve as a basis for a possible extension of the project for the period 2015-2016. Even though the project has been in operation for less than two years, it was decided that an evaluation should be carried out and completed in time for a possible extension. The evaluation should cover the period 1 January 2013 – 30 June 2014.

Sida has, according to the Terms of Reference (ToR), initiated the evaluation to “generate information on how effective the Project has been in achieving results thus far, identifying, where possible, factors influencing positive results achievement, and proposing any potential adjustments to ensure effective Project delivery for the remaining two years of the Project.” The evaluation should “contribute to the dialogue between Sida and RWI on the continued operation of the project.”

The evaluation is expected to deliver:

- An assessment of results achieved, predominantly at output level
- Suggestions for furthering effective results achievement.

At the same time, the ToR stresses that the project’s focus has so far primarily been on building trust and creating a stable foundation for continued cooperation. The key OECD-DAC criterion against which assessment should be made is effectiveness, defined as “the extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance”.<sup>1</sup>

The ToR lists the following three broad evaluation questions:

1. To what extent have project activities led to the following results?

---

<sup>1</sup> Sida, Looking Back, Moving Forward, Sida Evaluation Manual (2nd revised edition), 2007

- Increased knowledge and understanding, among Commissioners and staff of Myanmar National Human Rights Commission (MNHRC) on international human rights law and the role and functions of NHRIs in promoting and protecting human rights in Myanmar
  - Increased capacity of the MNHRC library enabling it to use available resources for the benefit of staff, Commissioners and the public
  - Increased skills and capacities of MNHRC to exercise its functional capacities and operational capacities
  - Increased awareness of the roles and functions of the Commission in promoting and protecting human rights in Myanmar
  - Improved cooperation among and between the MNHRC and relevant stakeholders
  - Improved knowledge on human rights topics and areas of cooperation that concern both MNHRC and relevant stakeholders
2. To what extent has advice provided under the project contributed to an effective legislative mandate for the Commission?
  3. To what extent have results achieved contributed to laying a solid foundation for future effective project delivery, and what is the likelihood that they will lead to the achievement of expected project outcomes?

The ToR explicitly states, “relevance is not a criterion that will be applied or that shall be considered in this evaluation.” Regarding efficiency it is said “it is only possible to assess on a general level if the project has been managed with reasonable regard for efficiency and there is accordingly no specific evaluation question in this regard.”

## 1.2 APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

Methodologically, the assessment has been divided into the following main phases:

- Inception
- Data collection
- Reporting

The inception phase commenced with a desk review of the RWI’s planning and project documents, workplans, risk management plans, progress reports, travel and mission reports, concept notes, internal workshop evaluations, and budgets and financial reports. The Evaluation Team also assessed Sida’s appraisals of the proposed intervention, the decision on contribution, and the sub-agreement between Sida and RWI. The primary purpose of the review was to identify indicators to help address the evaluation questions.

The Evaluation Team met during the inception phase with relevant RWI staff members to discuss how to go about the evaluation and communicated through email with the designated focal point at the MNHRC. Shortly before the Evaluation Team’s visit, this contact person lost his status as commissioner and a new contact person was subsequently appointed. While this caused some uncertainties, it did not impact significantly on the implementation or outcome of the evaluation. The choice of specific

informants to interview during the main phase of the evaluation was discussed with RWI, Sida and MNHRC, who all provided suggestions.

Following the desk review and initial consultations with the evaluation's main stakeholders, tentative indicators to help answer the evaluation questions were developed. The various methods and sources of information, that the Evaluation Team expected to use to collect data, were also decided on and listed in the inception report. The report also contained a presentation of risks and mitigation issues relating to the evaluation.

The data collection and analysis phase of the evaluation started once the inception report had been approved in September. This phase included (a) a continued desk study, (b) participant and informant interviews, and (c) verification/debriefing sessions.

The continued desk study included a review of documents published by the MNHRC, as well as independent reports and reviews about its work. It also included an assessment of the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission Law and the comments and advice provided by RWI and others.

Interviews to help answer the evaluation questions and to verify information collected during the desk study phase were carried out with RWI staff members, Sida and Swedish Embassy Section Office personnel, MNHRC commissioners and staff members, ministry officials, and representatives of Myanmar civil society organisations, media, international organisations providing support to MNHRC and other international actors. The interviews, which were carried out in Lund, Stockholm, Yangon and Naypyitaw, were semi-structured and adapted to reflect the respondent's expected area of experience and knowledge. However, for questions relating to the experiences and views of workshop participants a pre-designed questionnaire was used to provide guidance. While most interviews were conducted face-to-face, a few interviews with respondents outside of Myanmar and Sweden were carried out by telephone or Skype.

Prior to leaving Myanmar, the Evaluation Team had the opportunity to discuss major findings and preliminary conclusions in separate sessions with a RWI programme officer, the Chair and a member of the Commission, and the Counsellor at the Section Office of the Swedish Embassy. A debriefing session was also organised at RWI in Lund before the draft report was finalised. The draft report was shared with MNHRC, RWI and Sida to obtain inputs and comments before finalisation. Quality assurance was provided by Ian Christoplos.

### 1.3 THE EVALUATED INTERVENTION

RWI has received SEK 16 million from Sida for the period 1 November 2012 to 31 December 2014 in support of its project "Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar 2012-2016". The overall objective of the project is to strengthen the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission (MNHRC) and its key partners to "more effectively implement their mandates to promote and protect human rights in Myanmar, so as to address the problem of ineffective implementation of human rights protection measures in Myanmar by focusing on the institutional strengthening of the key agen-

cy with the capacity to make a positive impact on the promotion and protection of human rights in the country.”

At outcome level, the project is expected to achieve:

- Improved capacities of the MNHRC to implement its mandate;
- Improved capacities of relevant stakeholders (e.g. justice sector institutions, academia, relevant government ministries and media.) to promote and protect human rights in Myanmar; and
- Improved cooperation among and between the Myanmar NHRI and relevant stakeholders (bridging objective).

An underlying assumption for the project has been that both solid knowledge of human rights and operational capacity – including IT, leadership, organisational structure, strategic planning, human resource and knowledge management and financial management – are prerequisites for the MNHRC to be able to effectively carry out its functional capacities. These capacities relate to advising the government, education and promotion of human rights, monitoring and investigation of alleged human rights violations, interaction with the judiciary, and cooperation with national and international organisations.

If the human rights capacity and operational capacity are in place, they will in the long run greatly contribute to MNHRC’s ability to fulfil its mandate and to its ambition to reach and stay in compliance with the Paris Principles which set standards for the composition, status and functions of NHRIs. An additional assumption is that increased capacity of the MNHRC, and improved cooperation between MNHRC and other relevant stakeholders, will have effect on a number of other institutions and organisations in implementing their duties.

The project therefore focuses on attaining the following outputs:

- Increased the knowledge and understanding, among Commissioners and staff on international human rights law and the role and functions of a NHRI in promoting and protecting human rights in Myanmar.
- Increased capacity of the MNHRC library enabling it to use available resources for the benefit of staff, Commissioners and the public.
- Increased skills and capacities to exercise the MNHRC’s functional and operational capacities.
- Increased awareness among other stakeholders of the roles and functions of the Commission in promoting and protecting human rights in Myanmar.

In terms of attaining these outcomes, the following methods are being used:

- Analysis – regarding MNHRC’s human rights, operational and functional capacities.
- Advisory services – consisting of technical advice provided by NHRI practitioners on the MNHRC’s functional capacities.
- Blended learning - consisting of online training to be followed by a face-to-face workshop.
- Training and education – targeting selected participants to build up human rights and functional capacities.
- Study visits and exchanges – involving visits to different NHRIs to learn from peers and colleagues.

- Networking – involving the creation and facilitation of networking initiatives and partnerships within and between different countries and sectors.
- Material support – in particular support to MNHRC’s library and provision of books and other publications to enhance institutional knowledge development in human rights.

Furthermore, the project is characterised by the following strategies:

- Providing long-term capacity development support;
- Building on the experience RWI has in combining theory and practice; using an extensive pool of NHRI practitioners;
- Ensuring local ownership and context-specificity;
- Treating gender as a cross-cutting issue; and
- Applying a comprehensive capacity building approach.

The project funding provided by Sida has primarily been used to cover salaries for RWI staff, fees for resource persons and travel costs of both staff and resource persons. During 2013, a total of 67 % of the annual budget was used. The project budget has an overhead of 26%.

The results summary of the project has undergone some changes since the original was approved in 2012. This is good practice; as the project managers become clearer about how the project will progress, and with changing circumstances, it is prudent to update the results summary. The changes have not been accompanied by explanations as to why they were made and what the original outputs, indicators and targets were. The positive changes include the following: The actual number of states in which outreach activities will be held is now specified (indicator 2, outcome 2). The original extremely cautious number of human rights books in English to be provided for the library has been revised from a 50 to 150 (indicator 1, output 1.b). The indicators to show progress towards better functional and operational capacities of the Commissioners are now better reflective of the objective (output 1.c).

Areas of the results framework that contain weaknesses include:

- Output 1.d, indicator 1: The indicator asks for the number of CSOs that attended MNHRC outreach activities. The achievements for 2013 instead mention ministry representatives who attended the trainings. Also, the targets for this indicator are quite modest: by the end of the project i.e. 2016, only 350 stakeholder representatives are expected to “know about the Commission’s existence and its roles and functions”.
- Output 1.d, indicator 2: The targets in the case of the promotional activities to be undertaken do not indicate what percentage of the population should be aware of “what the Commission does and the different ways to approach it.”

The most serious modification has been in the case of outcome objective 2, which concerns improved capacities of relevant stakeholders to promote and protect human rights in Myanmar. In this section, the results summary originally mentioned a range of stakeholders including the judiciary, academia and the media. In the revised version, only the academia is mentioned. This reflects that the focus of RWI’s work on engagement with other stakeholders under the project has narrowed, which may make it difficult to achieve the overall project objective.

## 2 Findings

### 2.1 MNHRC'S CAPACITY ON HUMAN RIGHTS LAW AND THE ROLE AND FUNCTIONS OF NHRIS

Under this objective, RWI's expects to enhance the capacity of MNHRC's Commissioners through specialised courses and study tours, and the capacity of MNHRC's staff through training courses and scholarships at Lund and Mahidol Universities.

When the Commission started its partnership with RWI, the understanding of its Commissioners and staff regarding human rights laws and the roles and functions of NHRIs was very low. Few of the Commissioners had previously had to deal with any human rights related issues, and those that did had to do so marginally. Similarly, the original staff of 22 members had been seconded from other government ministries with almost no knowledge of human rights law. Over the last two years, almost half of the original staff has left and been replaced by up to 36 new staff members. Some of the new staff members have prior work experience, while others are fresh from university. However, none of them could be said to have had any experience of either working for human rights issues or familiarity with them.

It is in this context, that RWI started its partnership with MNHRC. As of June 2014, the Commissioners had undertaken study tours of Australia, New Zealand, and more recently Mongolia. RWI has organised several workshops and training courses for them. The staff members have benefitted from three training courses: 2 in 2013 and 1 in 2014 of several days duration each. One staff member is currently doing a fellowship at RWI in Lund and another three are expected to proceed there shortly for a one-month intensive training course. Two staff members are currently attending master courses at Mahidol University in Thailand, replacing the original plan of sending a single student to Lund.

Opportunities for trainings have been provided to both male and female Commissioners and staff of the organisation. Of the staff (excluding Commissioners), a third (33%) are male and two thirds (66%) are women. In the three general staff trainings so far conducted with RWI support, there has been good proportional representation of males and females.

Trainings for MNHRC Staff on Human Rights and Roles and Functions of NHRIs		
	Female	Male
Overall staff strength	66%	33%
Composition of staff in 3 staff trainings	71%	29%

In addition, in the Disability Inclusive Development Workshop of April 2014 in which 20 MNHRC staff participated, 16 were female.

Apart from the staff trainings, there have been several trainings targeted mainly at the Commissioners and external stakeholders such as government representatives. In these trainings, the attendance of male to female participants from MNHRC has been 60:40. However, it should be noted that of the 15 Commissioners holding positions till the end of the period under review, only 3 were women. The gender-wise representation is thus positively skewed in favour of women. Training sessions on CEDAW, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, are included in the staff trainings. In addition, one commissioner and one staff member from MNHRC have participated in RWI's sub-regional blended learning course on the human rights of women.

The course evaluations conducted at the end of the training courses organised by RWI show that Commissioners and staff have been very satisfied with the trainings. All respondents interviewed stated that the trainings and study tours have resulted in increased awareness and they have gained considerable knowledge from them. Participants state that they are more familiar with the contents of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and such international instruments as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). They also state that they have enhanced their knowledge regarding the functions and roles of a national human rights institution. They particularly acknowledge the depth of expertise and knowledge of the three key resource persons who have delivered the trainings.

Language has been a problem though. In addition, participants have had trouble becoming familiar with the lexicon of the subjects of human rights and international law. Initially, an interpreter was tried, but that experiment failed due to the dearth of English-speaking interpreters who could ably interpret the terms and concepts used in the trainings. The problem has been compounded by the fact that all the hand-outs, presentations and slides have been in English.

The second issue has been that trainings have so far not been targeted to the needs of individuals and the overall organisational processes underway in MNHRC. They have given staff a general understanding of human rights and the roles and functions of NHRIs. Staff members are deployed in one of five divisions in the Commission: Planning and Finance, Policy and Legal, Protection, International Relations, and Promotion & Education. Task-specific trainings have been lacking, though it is recognised that a general familiarity is required before staff members are exposed to specific topics. Over time, RWI states that the Commission has become more specific regarding the type of trainings it foresees it needs for itself, e.g. on torture (held in March 2014) or racial discrimination (held after June 2014).

Commissioners have used the knowledge gained in the development of promotional material in their outreach activities. Thus far, 36 gatherings have been held at the township levels in which local government staff officials have participated. In these gatherings, MNHRC Commissioners have introduced the subject of human rights, international law and the role and functions of MNHRC. In addition, RWI-supported

training workshops in two states have been held, lasting 3 days each. In both types of events, Commissioners have been able to develop material and convey the key messages learnt from the training workshops and study tours.

The use of the knowledge gained by staff members has been more limited. The Commissioners thus far deem them to be insufficiently competent to undertake promotional campaigns, deliver talks, handle complaints or undertake a comparative review of national and international legislation. They are mostly engaged in administrative or logistical work, supporting the Commissioners in carrying out the mandate of the Commission.

During the period of collaboration between RWI and MNHRC, and even prior to it, other international institutions have also provided trainings, e.g. the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), Asia Pacific Forum on National Human Rights Institutions (APF) and Mahidol University. A complete list of trainings is given in Annex VI, with those provided by RWI shaded green.

In September 2014, of the original 15 Commissioners, 9 were replaced. The membership of the Commission has been reduced from 15 to 11, so only 5 new Commissioners have come on board. Thus, some of the knowledge and capacity gained through training and support provided by RWI to MNHRC has gone elsewhere. In addition, RWI has to work with MNHRC to bring the new Commissioners up to a similar level of understanding as their colleagues.

Regarding staff, the 36 new staff members joined the Commission at different times. Some have been with the organisation from the beginning as secondees, having been confirmed as permanent staff after they passed the recruitment examinations. Others have joined the organisation over the last six months. MNHRC foresees recruiting up to 75 more staff in the next 2-3 years.<sup>2</sup> This is a sizeable number whose capacity will take considerable effort to be built. The one or two classroom-type trainings a year will not suffice if it is expected that they are increasingly going to share, and then take over, many of the functions that the Commissioners are currently undertaking, and if MNHRC hopes to be engaging with more stakeholders and a greater proportion of the citizenry of Myanmar.

## 2.2 CAPACITY AND USE OF MNHRC'S LIBRARY

### **Library**

One of the planned project outputs is “Increased capacity of the MNHRC library enabling it to use available resources for the benefit of staff, Commissioners and the pub-

---

<sup>2</sup> Initial provision was for the staff strength to increase to 167 in three years time, with a third of that total being recruited every year.

lic.” In relation to this output, two activity areas are referred to in the project document: (a) “Translation and printing of human rights materials”, and (b) “Library support (including e-library) and development of a website for the Commission.”

When the project started, MNHRC had no website and no library. Since then RWI has, according to MNHRC, donated 93 books (not all unique titles) on topics such as international criminal law, humanitarian law, UN mechanisms, children’s rights, racial discrimination, minorities’ rights and environmental rights. It has also financed bookshelves, furniture, a computer and a printer. RWI has encouraged MNHRC to engage a trained librarian and during the second half of 2014 provided opportunities for the person recruited to attend a RWI organised regional workshop in Malaysia on human rights library and information management and to undertake a study visit to Lund.

Between January 2013 and the end of June 2014, the RWI’s expert on library and information management visited MNHRC three times to assist in setting up the library, purchase furniture and other materials, discuss overarching issues with the commissioners and coach the staff members working in the library. In addition to these visits, the expert has also been available to provide the library staff with advice through email.

Currently, the library has about 1,400 books, of which 486 are in English. The target set out in the 2012 project document is that the library should have “at least 50 human rights publications in English” by 2016. The books available cover a broad variety of subjects, ranging from fiction and biographies to law and human rights. While the books written in Myanmar are primarily bought by the MNHRC, actors such as the British Council, UNICEF, Asia Foundation and the Australian Government, in addition to RWI, have donated the English language books. The Commission’s annual budget for buying books is currently Kyat 200,000 (roughly USD 200).

During the month of August 2014 a total of nine individuals borrowed from the library. In September the number was thirteen. The average number of books borrowed per week was, during this two months period, seven. It should be noted that RWI’s results framework has no indicators and targets relating to the extent to which the library is actually being used.

While RWI has funded a few reading spaces in the library, these spaces were not used for studying during the week the Evaluation Team visited the MNHRC, but were stacked with books and papers. The computer donated by RWI is connected to the Internet. However, no electronic books are available and the library does not subscribe to any human rights and legal research database, such as Heinonline, through which academic journals can be accessed.

RWI has encouraged the Commission to allow outsiders, such as university students and researchers, to access and borrow from the library. However, the Evaluation Team was told that the library, contrary to the intended project output, is still only open to members and staff of the MNHRC.

### **Website**

In 2013, RWI engaged a web developer in Sweden to help MNHRC establish a website. The web developer subsequently visited Yangon for three days in order to discuss options and solutions with the Commission. RWI's own information management expert followed up on this visit and provided training to the Commission's two web administrators on how to update the website and upload new information.

The website currently contains, among other things, the Commission's activity reports and public statements, as well as links to relevant international human rights instruments and reports. The website has, by civil society actors, been recognised as a step towards increased transparency. However, it is not used to its full potential and regularly updated with materials that can help promote human right and raise awareness of the mandate and work of the Commission. MNHRC's web administrators are constrained by the fact that they need permission from the commissioners prior to uploading materials. RWI recognises that the establishment of a well-functioning website requires broader discussions about how information is handled within the Commission and stronger buy-in from Commissioners and key staff.

The specific target for the website, as set out in the RWI project document, has been "A well-functioning and accessible MNHRC website visited at least 2000 times a month." From its establishment in September 2013 until the end of the year, the website was according to RWI on average visited about 200 times per month. The Commission's own web administrators informed the Evaluation Team that they do not know how many hits the website has and that they are not aware of how this can be found out.

### **Translation and publication**

RWI has supported translation and printing of human rights materials in order to make such material and information "available and accessible to the public, including those who are from the minority races of Myanmar." The explicit target set out in the original results framework was "at least 3 human rights books translated into the Burmese language and at least 1000 copies distributed to partners" by the end of 2016.

With the support of RWI, MNHRC has since the start of the project made a new translation of the UDHR into Burmese and printed 130,000 copies for dissemination. RWI has also supported translation and printing of various information materials about MNHRC, including two publications about its activities and a compilation of statements issued. It should be noted that at least two previous translations existed of the UDHR, of which one is used and disseminated by OHCHR and the UN Information Centre. MNHRC states, however, that there are weaknesses in these translations and outside observers interviewed by the Evaluation Team confirmed that the MNHRC had produced a high quality translation. At the time of writing, no human rights instruments, laws, books or brochures have been translated into any of Myanmar's minority languages.

## 2.3 MNHRC'S FUNCTIONAL AND OPERATIONAL CAPACITIES

According to the proposal presented to Sida by RWI, the strengthening of MNHRC's functional and operational capacities was expected to be achieved through the provision of technical missions by its experts over the project period. According to the results summary (version 2014), the two targets are that by the end of the project, (a) staff and commissioners have all the necessary knowledge and skills to address the Commission's specialised function, and (b) at least 60% of the staff have increased knowledge and practical skills in a select functional NHRI capacity (complaints handling, leadership, training and awareness raising, etc.).

When RWI started its collaboration with MNHRC, there were very weak institutional and organisational capacities present. None of the Commissioners or seconded staff had any experience of working in a human rights institute - government or otherwise; neither had they been given any formal training in the functions or operations of NHRIs.

In August 2012, a seminar was organised for MNHRC and participants from other government agencies on "Good Practices in Achieving Compliance with Paris Principles on National Human Rights Commission". This set the path for the major initiative that has been undertaken so far which has been the support provided by RWI on MNHRC's draft establishing legislation and its compliance with international standards, before the draft legislation was presented to the Houses of Parliament. More on this is discussed in section 3.6 below.

In October 2013, an RWI-supported training on "Human Rights and the Role of Media" was also held attended by the Commissioners of MNHRC. During that training, various tools for promotion of social messages were introduced by the resource persons from BBC Action Forum based in Yangon. Since then though, the Commission has not pursued a follow-up of this to enhance its promotion and education function. Instead it pursues promotion activities primarily through visits to townships; 36 of which have so far been undertaken as stated above, and more recently to the ethnic states.

The complaint handling system remains in need of improvement, with no automated database in place and Commissioners handling the caseload themselves. No specific training has been undertaken in this regard. This may change with a training, supported by RWI, due to be undertaken in November. Similarly the Human Rights and Legal Division has, as it itself recognises, weak capacities to undertake comparative review of international or national legislation and to assess whether current laws are in harmony with the human-rights related conventions ratified by Myanmar.

The weak functional and operational capacities in the Commission and the nation-wide expectations from it, especially since the law governing its mandate was passed in April 2014, would indicate the importance of deeper and longer engagement of RWI with the Commission. There are various types of capacity building methods that could be applied alongside classroom trainings, study tours and scholarships for studying at universities. Some of them could involve mentoring, which would not compel staff to abandon their existing day-to-day assignments. However, the Commission is

hesitant to consider any such approaches but at the same time does not seem to have any alternative plans on how it will build the functional and operational capacities of its staff to enable MNHRC to evolve into a strong human rights institution.

While RWI has successfully managed to build a strong relationship with the commissioners and staff members, during the first 18 months limited attention has been given to strengthening the functional and operational capacities of MNHRC as an organisation. While general trainings have been relevant to build the staff's understanding of human rights and the role of NHRIs, in order to contribute to significantly enhancing the performance of the Commission more sustained and targeted capacity building initiatives focusing on strengthening the Commission's capacity to implement its protection, promotion and legal mandates would be required. Appropriate structures and routines will be particularly important considering the expected turnover and growth of the Commission in terms of staff members over the coming years.

## 2.4 AWARENESS AMONG OTHER STAKEHOLDERS OF THE ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF MNHRC AND OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The indicators and targets for the achievement of this output have changed since the original proposal was submitted. The latest results summary i.e. that of 2014 lists the following targets to be achieved by the end of the project:

1. At least 350 stakeholder representatives know about the Commission's existence and its roles and functions
2. At least 5000 copies of information materials on MNHRC distributed to the public, and the public is aware of what the Commission does and the different ways to approach the Commission
3. MNHRC and relevant stakeholders have identified primary areas of cooperation

The project's original objectives included the judiciary, media and other stakeholders. This was later narrowed to include only academia. A scoping mission by RWI was undertaken during 2014 to identify suitable academic institutions with which to partner. There have been no concrete steps to engage the judiciary or the media, apart from one training in October 2013 in which one media organisation informed the Commissioners, and participants from the Ministry of Information who were also present, about how media could be used for promotional activities and awareness raising.

Beyond government institutions there has been little effort to engage civil society in MNHRC's activities under the project activities with RWI. MNHRC has attended, and sometimes given presentations, at seminars and workshops organised by other institutions such as OHCHR where civil society representatives were also present. It has invited a group of CSOs to its offices to present the draft (as it was then) law on the Commission. However, there has not been any systematic engagement of CSOs during 2013-14 either to advocate for any issues, or to promote its work amongst Myanmar citizens. The country has a wide range of CSOs: those that engage in advocacy

to those that are solely concentrating on improving service delivery and raising awareness on rights and responsibilities amongst the grassroots. However, it appears that the Commission feels that all CSOs are pitted against it. It is averse to engaging with civil society and there have been no moves to do that.

Thus far, the one major stakeholder that MNHRC has engaged with as a participant in a number of RWI-organised trainings is the government. Various relevant government ministries have attended trainings on torture, human rights and business, and covenants such as ICESCR and ICCPR. Regarding participation from outside the Commission in these trainings, the gender representation is males (64%) and females (36%). The Commission has also engaged in the outreach work to local government officials described earlier. Training sessions on CEDAW have been a component of the two RWI-supported training workshops held by MNHRC in the ethnic states.

The result is that there has been some increased awareness amongst government but to a limited extent. Most government officials who have attended the trainings have not been in positions of influence where they could diffuse the knowledge learnt within their ministries or agencies. Participants are mostly mid-level officials. There is no clear strategy regarding which person is selected to attend, as that decision is made by the ministry or agency concerned. After 2013, RWI and MNHRC have purposely moved the venue of trainings targeted at government ministries from Yangon to the capital Naypyitaw in the hope of attracting more senior-level officials to these events.

## 2.5 MNHRC'S COOPERATION WITH OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

With regard to MNHRC's cooperation with other stakeholders, RWI has in its project document included a bridging outcome: "Improved cooperation among and between the MNHRC and relevant stakeholders (e.g.: judiciary, academia etc.)". The original target to be reached by the end of 2016 is modestly formulated as "At least 8 new joint initiatives (e.g.: statement /activity) satisfactorily carried out between MNHRC and its partners." In the results summary for 2013, this target has been revised to 7 initiatives.

Relating to the bridging outcome is a single output: "Increased knowledge and understanding among relevant ministries, the justice sector, academia and media stakeholders of international human rights law and the role and functions of NHRIs in promoting and protecting human rights in Myanmar." RWI originally aimed to have "at least 360 stakeholder representatives trained on human rights and the roles and functions of the Commission." This number has since been revised downwards to 240.

When the current project was initiated, the Commission had only been in existence for about 16 months. At that time, it had not initiated close cooperation with any domestic stakeholders other than the office of the President. It had, however, had dozens of foreign delegations visiting and had initial discussions with several of these about future cooperation.

During 2013 and the first half of 2014, the Commission cooperated, in addition to RWI, with APF and OHCHR as well, not least around the development of the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission Law. As mentioned above, together with RWI, the Commission also organised six workshops in Yangon and Naypyitaw dealing with various different human rights topics. In addition to MNHRC commissioners and key staff members, over 150 ministry officials and representatives of the Attorney General's Office have attended these workshops.

According to RWI's own assessment, the workshops contributed to "enhancing the knowledge of the role and functions of the Commission among those stakeholder representatives, and how they can cooperate on the human rights issues raised during the trainings."<sup>3</sup> Most ministry officials interviewed by the Evaluation Team stated, however, that they had not had any opportunities to share any new knowledge acquired with their colleagues, or to explore opportunities for institutional cooperation. Members of the judiciary, parliament, academic institutions, media and civil society organisations have not yet been invited to the workshops.

On a couple of occasions, the workshops have, however, been organised in cooperation with other institutions. As mentioned above, in 2013 RWI and MNHRC organised a workshop together with BBC Media Action and also invited a representative of the Union of Myanmar Federation of Chamber of Commerce and Industry to make a presentation at its business and human rights training workshop. The Commission has also had a few information sessions for CSOs, as discussed in the previous section, and among other things briefed them on the content of the draft law.

While the Commission has organised these information sessions for civil society actors and some commissioners have had some additional interaction with human rights CSOs, the Commission has generally had a strained relationship with the human rights groups. Some RWI staff have stressed the importance of interaction between the Commission and CSOs, but RWI has so far made few concrete attempts to help building bridges between MNHRC and civil society. A significant exception is, however, the RWI supported workshop with disability organisations after the period under review i.e. in July 2014.

Both RWI staff and external observers consulted during the course of this evaluation recognise the need for MNHRC to have closer interaction with a broader set of institutions, including parliament, CSOs and academic institutions.

Another issue is that topics or issues have not been systematically pursued. When a two-day workshop was held on human rights and business, the process ended with the workshop; the Chambers of Commerce was not approached again to see how collaboration could be pursued. Similarly, in the case of journalists who acted as resource

---

<sup>3</sup> RWI, Progress report for 2013

persons in one training for the Commission, there were no attempts to follow-up and see how media could be engaged. Furthermore, a number of the participants have attended a large number of other, and sometimes more extensive, human rights trainings inside the country and abroad.

## 2.6 THE COMMISSION'S MANDATE

The MNHRC was established under a Presidential decree in September 2011. In its 2012 project document, RWI mentions that it is “important to strengthen MNHRC’s position under the law as decrees can be indiscriminately revoked.” However, the project document does not mention the establishment of a suitable legal framework for the Commission as a specific project outcome, and no specific activities to attain such an objective are presented.

In reality, RWI has in different ways played a significant role in the development of the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission Law, which was finally adopted by Parliament and approved by the President in April 2014. According to RWI, the MNHRC developed the very first draft of the law with guidance obtained from the book *National Human Rights Institutions in the Asia-Pacific Region* that was written by RWI’s visiting professor Brian Burdekin, with the assistance of Jason Naum, the head of the Institute’s Unit for National Human Rights Institutions, in 2006.

In May 2012, in response to a request for advice from MNHRC Brian Burdekin submitted a 12-page document with comments on the draft law. The advice provided ranged from the importance of public consultations before adoption of the law to the need for ensuring explicit reference to UDHR and other international human rights instruments, a balanced composition of members of the commission, gender neutral language, prison visits without prior coordination with prison authorities and the right for the Commission to undertake national inquiries and investigations on its own initiative and in such a manner as it sees fit. Among the many other pieces of advice given in this document was the suggestion, “under no circumstances, should the Commission take on the role of prosecutor in the courts”.

In addition to the May 2012 document, Brian Burdekin provided, on behalf of RWI, advice on many occasions and in a variety of ways, orally as well as in writing, formally as well as informally, directly to the Chairperson as well as to the entire Commission, and through comprehensive reviews of complete drafts as well as on particular issues or articles.

In July 2013, RWI also sent a letter to the Bills Committee of Parliament suggesting firstly that the law should require the Commission to report not only to the President but also to the Parliament, and secondly that the membership of the committee in charge of selecting the Commission members should include stronger representation

from “civilian society”. The letter also raised appreciation of the fact that the Parliament had invited comments from the public.<sup>4</sup>

During the drafting process the MNHRC itself had limited interaction with civil society organisations, which it says was a result of the draft process being very rushed initially. Civil society actors have expressed concern about a lack of consultation with the Commission, while at the same time expressing appreciation about the dialogue they have had with Parliament. It should be mentioned that while domestic civil society actors had little influence over the drafting process, RWI was not the only foreign or international institution with which the MNHRC liaised. Representatives of APF and OHCHR also provided advice. Throughout the drafting process, there was fairly close coordination between APF and RWI.

RWI has referred to the adopted law as one of the best NHRI laws in the region, even though some of the advice provided by RWI was not followed. Others, who the Evaluation Team discussed this issue with, agreed with this assessment and even civil society organisations that have expressed serious concern about the functioning of the Commission recognise that it has a better legal mandate than most other commissions in Southeast Asia. It is also the Evaluation Team’s assessment that the law in many ways is significantly stronger than could have been expected considering the history of Myanmar and the socio-political context in which it was adopted.

A weakness is the fact that, due to existing constitutional provisions, it states that human rights means the rights of citizens rather than the rights of all human beings, which may for instance impact on its work in relation to the Muslim Rohingya minority which the government does not recognise as being Myanmar citizens. Considering the difficulty for CSOs to get officially registered and that few CSOs with views critical of the government and its armed forces have such registration, another weakness relates to the fact that the selection committee only includes members of “registered” civil society organisations.

In its project document, RWI discussed the risk that existing commissioners would no longer remain with the Commission following the passing of the law. The real possibility that a new government, following the elections scheduled for 2015, may repeal or amend the law and thereby open up for the appointment of new commissioners and retirement of the old commissioners is not discussed.

---

<sup>4</sup> Letter from Prof Brian Burdekin, Visiting Professor, RWI to U Zaw Myint, Chair, Bills Committee, Amyotha Hluttaw, dated 29 July 2013.

### 3 Conclusions

Since the start of the cooperation between RWI and MNHRC, a high degree of trust has emerged between the two institutions and their respective staff members and affiliates. Of the relationships that MNHRC has with international partners, it views the one with RWI as the most productive and durable.

The project Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar has contributed to increasing the understanding of human rights and the role of NHRIs among both MNHRC commissioners and staff members. Through the project, RWI has also been able to assist in the development of the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission Law. This combination of trust and a basic understanding of international human rights law and the role of NHRIs, as well as the establishment of a largely sound legal framework have laid the foundation for future delivery of reasonable project outcomes.

However, it is the Evaluation Team's assessment that the originally envisaged project activities or approaches will not be sufficient to attain expected project results. Adjustments are necessary to create a credible link between activities and results. There are, for example, reasons to reassess if the emphasis on general awareness raising will be relevant when working with an organisation where the organisational development needs are so great. Questions can also be raised about whether the modality of training individuals in one-off activities will be valid for an organisation going through such rapid changes and staff turn-over. There are also reasons to question if the "supply side" approach to communications and knowledge management (including the library and website) will be appropriate in an organisation that has not really demonstrated a firm commitment to engaging with other actors apart from government officials.

RWI has contributed significantly to building MNHRC's capacity, starting from a very low baseline. It has provided skilled trainers with extensive theoretical knowledge and practical experience. At the same time, MNHRC's capacity has also been built through support from other partners such as APF and OHCHR. The most obvious use of capacity built has been in undertaking the promotion and awareness raising of human rights and MNHRC's functions. Commissioners and staff alike have appreciated the trainings. However, language has been a barrier. Also, the capacity building activities have generally been of the classroom variety and of short duration. A few Commission staff have also participated in blended learning course which comprise online learning followed by face-to-face workshops. Thus far, the trainings have been general in nature and have not delved into the specific functions of the Commission through the targeting of specific divisional staff, except the librarian. It may be questioned to what extent a workshop and training-focused approach to organisational development is appropriate for an organisation with such significant internal and external challenges as MNHRC.

Over the last two years, significant turnover of MNHRC's staff has occurred and staff numbers are expected to grow in the short-term. All staff members come with rudi-

mentary, if any, knowledge of human rights and NHRIs. This means that the current modus operandi of classroom trainings, study tours for Commissioners and university courses for a handful of staff members will have to change if the Commission is going to be a strong, active and well-regarded institution. They will need to be supplemented with long-term residential support comprising mid-level expertise, practical on-the-job guidance and mentoring, online tutoring, twinning with more mature NHRIs in the region or West and if possible, placements and internships in other NHRIs.

Since the start of the project, a furnished and functioning library with relevant books, a trained librarian and a computer has been established. The planned output at the end of the project of an “Increased capacity of the MNHRC library enabling it to use available resources for the benefit of staff, Commissioners and the public” has been partly attained. However, the library is so far used to a very limited extent. RWI’s recommendation that it be open to people outside of the Commission is not yet adhered to, well developed links with other libraries in Myanmar have not yet been established and the original plans for an electronic library have not yet been realised. A higher degree of utilisation can logically be expected following the planned increase in the number of MNHRC staff members and the recruitment of a trained librarian. Sustainability is, however, an issue of concern given that all the training has been provided to a single individual.

RWI is also supporting the development of the Commission’s website. To what extent the website has attracted visitors and to what extent the materials placed on it have been downloaded is not known by the Commission, which indicates that insufficient attention has been given to ensuring that the website can be used for knowledge management. However, even the MNHRC’s critics acknowledge that it has to some extent contributed to spread information about the mandate and work of the Commission, and has helped give it a more open and transparent image. The content and scope of the website is still strictly managed by the Commissioners and the site is not used to its full potential. It is not updated frequently enough, even though there are two full-time staff members within the Commission responsible for uploading content.

The translation, printing and dissemination of the UDHR and information materials relating to the work of the Commission have contributed to increased awareness of human rights. No documents have yet been translated, as envisaged, into any of Myanmar’s minority languages.

Regarding the functional and operational capacities of the MNHRC, these have been enhanced but leave plenty of room for further engagement, especially below the levels of the Commissioners. Even at that level, the recent replacements of Commissioners mean that gaps have developed which need to be filled through further support from RWI and others. RWI has thus far has paid limited attention to the functional and operational aspects of organisational growth, concentrating instead on general awareness raising of what human rights are and the functions of NHRIs. It is recognised by MNHRC that its complaint handling system is weak. It is also not automated, thus further limiting its effectiveness. Regarding the legal functional capacity, the Commission Draft Law was developed but no other outputs have been realised. As stated earlier in this section, it appears that more hands-on, sustained support to de-

veloping organisational capacities is required. This becomes even more pertinent given the significant increase in staff numbers that the Commission is anticipating.

The awareness raising trainings that RWI has organised for other stakeholders have been limited to attendance of government ministries and agencies. The media, academia, judiciary or civil society have not been invited to participate in these trainings except, in a couple of cases, as resource persons. While each training that involved external stakeholders was subject-specific, none was built upon in a process-oriented manner to achieve any outcome beyond awareness raising, either by RWI or by the Commission. The participants of trainings have had limited opportunities to apply the knowledge gained or share it with others, as they are often not in positions of policy-making or high-level influence.

MNHRC has cooperated with a number of international actors, in particular around the development of the draft law. It has also had one-off or sporadic engagement with various government and civil society actors. RWI has, together with MNHRC, built the trust necessary to facilitate its relationships with others in the future. However, none of the broader engagements have yet been of a sustained nature and resulted in cooperation towards a joint objective. There is no strong and convincing link between RWI's activities focusing on informing government officials of human rights and the role of the MNHRC, and the goal of actual cooperation with a range of stakeholders. RWI staff members have encouraged MNHRC to more actively interact with outside actors, but few activities have so far specifically contributed to building necessary bridges.

A fundamental aspect of conflict sensitivity is to understand the context in which one operates and RWI's project document includes a brief assessment of the broader political and conflict context in which the project it is being implemented. However, RWI has not engaged itself, throughout the project, in broad consultations with key actors in society. There has been little interaction with members of parliament, political party representatives, leaders of ethnic groups and CSO representatives. One reason for this is presumably that RWI has not had a permanent presence in Yangon. As MNHRC has so far also had limited external interactions, RWI's approach may also be a reflection of its focus on building trust with the Commission.

RWI staff recognises, however, that a more inclusive, participatory, transparent and partnership-oriented approach – key aspects of a conflict sensitive methodology – is required for the future both in terms of project implementation and in terms of securing MNHRC's relevance and effectiveness more broadly. From this perspective, it is welcome that RWI is supporting MNHRC's promotion visits to the ethnic states. The original plan of translating and printing human rights materials in minority languages may also be of importance, if implemented. Gender issues have, in terms of female and male participation in activities and in terms of content of trainings, been addressed to a reasonable extent. A stronger focus on women's rights though, as several RWI staff recognise, would be desirable for the future.

Although not specifically mentioned as an activity or outcome in the 2012 project document, RWI has contributed significantly to the development of the legal framework for the MNHRC. There is broad consensus that the law creates a fairly clear and strong mandate for the commission, especially considering Myanmar's history and

the socio-political context in which it was established. However, the future of the Commission beyond elections scheduled for 2015 is uncertain. Considering the time and resources spent on providing advice on the draft law, as well as on enhancing the capacity of current and former commissioners, a revised legal mandate and composition of the Commission could significantly impact on the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project.

RWI could make better use of available staff resources by giving its qualified and experienced programme officers a more significant role in terms of capacity building of MNHRC staff. Considering the MNHRC staff members' limited knowledge of English, international human rights law and the functioning of a NHRI, the added value of instead using leading experts as trainers and coaches may be limited. From a medium- to long-term perspective it seems that it would also make sense for RWI to broaden its internal human resource base by involving more staff members in its capacity building activities. Its reliance on a small number of external resource persons and visiting professors is currently very high. For this additional support, there should be adequate financial resources available as the project has been generously funded, and was during 2013 under-spending by about a third.

It is clear that the turbulence that surrounds the institutional environment for capacity development of MNHRC will continue for some time, and as such there will be an ongoing need for reinforcing and at times even rebuilding the capacities of both the organisation and its commissioners and staff. It is therefore essential to move from the current phase of ensuring ownership, trust and a capacity to absorb support, to in the future work with new overall frameworks that ensure that these processes can continue in a flexible and adaptive manner, drawing increasingly on national and regional institutions.

RWI has, during the course of the project, changed project outputs, indicators and targets. The fact that these changes are not clearly documented and explained in narrative reports and in the annually updated results frameworks makes it unnecessarily complicated to assess to what extent original project objectives (for which funding was received) have been attained and to use the framework as basis for learning and results based management.

The 26 % overhead cost is higher than the evaluators have seen in other projects, where generally overheads charged by implementing agencies are between 7 to 11%.

# 4 Recommendations

## 4.1 RECOMMENDATIONS TO RWI

It is recommended that RWI apply a more targeted and sustained capacity and organisational development approach, and reduces its focus on raising awareness through one-off events for MNHRC commissioners and staff and for government representatives. This also implies that MNHRC prioritise what functions or sectors it needs to focus upon over the next 2 years and develop capacity building plans around them.

RWI and MNHRC should agree on a set up for residential and long-term on the job training and advice through mentoring or twinning approaches. Particular attention should be paid to targeting the assistance to MNHRC's ongoing functional and operational processes. This implies the placement of mid-level professional expertise within the Commission and twinning with more mature NHRIs that have demonstrated good practice in order to learn from them.

RWI should make better use of its human resources by allowing its programme officers to provide direct capacity building support to MNHRC staff members. Efficiency will be enhanced if at least one Programme Officer is based within the country.

RWI should assist MNHRC in exploring how staff trainings can best be institutionalised in the future. With MNHRC's total staff strength exceeding 100 and possibly reaching nearly 170 in the next 2-3 years, RWI should support MNHRC in the remaining project period to develop a cadre of trainers especially targeted at its junior and new staff.

For the longer term, RWI should assist MNHRC in developing a strategy to develop training capacity in functional and operational processes in-house.

It is recommended that RWI phases out its support to the library or resource centre, as further developments are not expected to primarily depend on outside support but on policy decisions by the Commission and actions taken by library staff.

It is recommended that RWI explores how it can more effectively promote MNHRC's cooperation with other actors and its interactions with civil society organisations, in order to engage CSOs so that they better comprehend the efforts that MNHRC is undertaking to tackle human rights abuses in the country, but also to use the CSOs' networks and outreach to promote awareness and understanding of human rights and the functions of MNHRC better amongst the public.

RWI should ensure that its progress reports, including the results framework, clearly show and explain the rationale behind any changes made to project outputs and outcomes, as well as to indicators and their targets.

## 4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS TO SIDA

Sida should look broadly at how it can contribute to ensure that structures are in place that can best support both the management capacities of MHNRC and the knowledge of human rights. These are not one-off tasks and these two aspects of capacity development differ considerably in their nature. Sida should therefore look to how this support can best be sourced, post 2016, drawing as much as possible on national and regional institutions, taking into consideration capacity building and subject matter expertise, as well as cost effectiveness. It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to assess the potential role of RWI in this process, but it would seem that the organisational development support would be most effectively managed by institutions with expertise in management, presumably with an organisation that can provide (and is accepted by MHNRC to provide) ongoing coaching as well as training. With regard to ongoing development of capacities related directly to human rights, this may be best handled through an academic partner or set of partners. RWI is well placed to advise and support this process.

If a final project evaluation will be carried out, it is recommended that the ToR include a value for money assessment comparing the inputs provided by Sida to the outcomes that the project has achieved. It should also, amongst other issues, ascertain the effectiveness of different capacity building methods i.e. classroom trainings versus on-the-job mentoring linked to the magnitude of investment made in each of them and the results that have been achieved at outcome level. The rationale behind the high overhead costs should be reviewed.

# Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

## **Background**

The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (RWI) is an independent academic institution, founded in 1984 at the Faculty of Law, Lund University, Sweden. The mission of RWI is to promote universal respect for human rights and humanitarian law, by means of research, academic education, and institutional development. In addition to research and academic education programmes, RWI has since 1990 been implementing a wide range of human rights capacity development programmes for institutions in developing countries, mainly with the support of Swedish Development Cooperation. These programmes and projects primarily target state agencies in the field of administration of justice, academic institutions and national human rights institutions (NHRIs).

RWI initiated cooperation with the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission (MNHRC) in late 2011 and together with MNHRC jointly developed a cooperation project during 2012. In October 2012, RWI presented a funding proposal for support of the project, entitled “Bilateral Human Rights Capacity Development Support to the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission, 2012-2016”. In late 2012, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and RWI signed a sub-agreement providing for Swedish support, in the amount of MSEK 16 for the period 1 Nov 2012-31 Dec 2014, to the implementation of the project referred to as “Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar 2012-2016” (hereinafter referred to as “the Project”).

The Project has its overall objective to strengthen MNHRC, and its key partners, to more effectively implement their mandates to promote and protect human rights in Myanmar, so as to address the problem of ineffective implementation of human rights protection measures in Myanmar by focusing on the institutional strengthening of the key agency with the capacity to make a positive impact on the promotion and protection of human rights in the country. The first Project activities were carried out in the beginning of 2013. The initial two-year period of the Project predominantly focuses on building trust and laying a foundation for continued work with MNHRC, and potential other partners, in the context of strengthening MNHRC to more effectively implement its mandate to promote and protect human rights, and generally increasing awareness of the roles and functions of the Commission.

The above-mentioned sub-agreement between Sida and RWI stipulates that a Sida evaluation of the results of the Project for the period 2012-2014 shall be made, as a basis for Sida’s possible extension of the cooperation for the period 2015-2016. The sub-agreement furthermore states that the evaluation shall focus on how effective RWI has been in achieving results expected within the first two years of the project. Even if the Project currently has been implemented for less than two years, the decision has been made to proceed with the evaluation, in order for it to be completed in time for the extension of the cooperation for the period 2015-2016. The actual time period subject to evaluation will therefore be 1 January 2013– 30 June 2014.

The principal stakeholders of the evaluation are Sida, RWI and MNHRC.

### **Evaluation Purpose and Objective**

The objectives of the evaluation are to generate information on how effective the Project has been in achieving results thus far, identifying, where possible, factors influencing positive results achievement, and proposing any potential adjustments to ensure effective Project delivery for the remaining two years of the Project. The evaluation accordingly intends to serve the purpose of contributing to the dialogue between Sida and RWI on the continued operation of the Project.

Sida and RWI are the primary users of the conclusions of the evaluation, while RWI and MNHRC additionally are objects of evaluation and implementers of possible recommendations. Sida, RWI and MNCHR will cooperate in the performance of the evaluation.

### **Scope and Delimitations**

The scope of the evaluation comprises:

- Assessing results achievement, at predominantly output level, directly related to the activities set out in the 2013 Project work plan and the activities that have taken place before July 2014 as per the 2014 Project work plan. Results achieved shall additionally be considered in terms of their contribution to laying a solid foundation for future effective Project delivery, and their likelihood to lead to the achievement of expected Project outcomes; and
- Providing suggestions, in terms of lessons learned from Project implementation during the period of evaluation, for furthering effective results achievement.

Considering that the evaluation will take place in the third quarter of 2014 it is not possible to assess activities implemented, and their results, after the second quarter of 2014, the project period of which accordingly does not fall within the scope of the evaluation. Furthermore, since the evaluation, due to its timing, shall only assess the first 1.5 years of the Project, which has been designed as a four-year project, it shall take into consideration, for assessing results, that the first year of the Project was heavily focused on building trust and laying the foundation for future cooperation with MNHRC and other potential partners.

### **Organisation, Management and Stakeholders**

Sida is responsible for the evaluation, and as such a principal stakeholder. In addition, RWI and MNHRC are principal stakeholders as objects of the evaluation. Sida, RWI and MNHRC will cooperate in the performance of all phases of the evaluation. Sida and RWI are the primary users of the conclusions of the evaluation, while RWI, and also MNHRC, additionally are implementers of possible recommendations. In the performance of the evaluation, the evaluators shall at all times remain in close contact and consult with Sida and RWI for purposes of relaying the work done and receiving feedback and input on the ongoing work.

Moreover, the results of the evaluation shall benefit the stakeholders in terms of information for future effective Project delivery and results achievement as well as lessons learned in this respect from Project implementation during the period of evaluation.

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

### **Evaluation Questions and Criteria**

The evaluation shall generate information on how effective the Project has been in achieving its expected results during its first 1.5 years of implementation, identifying, where possible, factors influencing positive results achievement, and proposing any potential adjustments to ensure effective Project delivery for the remaining two years of the Project.

#### Evaluation Questions:

The evaluation shall address questions related to the effectiveness of the Project. In addition, it shall, on this basis, endeavour to provide suggestions in order to enhance Project delivery in the future.

With regard to effectiveness, and guided by the objectives and purpose of the evaluation, the following questions shall be addressed:

1. To what extent have Project activities led to the following results:
  - Increased knowledge and understanding, among Commissioners and MNHRC staff on international human rights law and the role and functions of NHRIs in promoting and protecting human rights in Myanmar
  - Increased capacity of the MNHRC library enabling it to use available resources for the benefit of staff, Commissioners and the public
  - Increased skills and capacities of MNHRC to exercise its functional capacities and operational capacities
  - Increased awareness of the roles and functions of the Commission in promoting and protecting human rights in Myanmar
  - Improved cooperation among and between the MNHRC and relevant stakeholders
  - Improved knowledge on human rights topics and areas of cooperation that concern both MNHRC and relevant stakeholders
2. To what extent has advice provided under the project contributed to an effective legislative mandate for the Commission?
3. To what extent have results achieved contributed to laying a solid foundation for future effective Project delivery, and what is the likelihood that they will lead to the achievement of expected Project outcomes?

In addition, and considering the success/failure of the Project in relation to achieving the above-mentioned results, the evaluation should address what main factors should be in place/or are currently in place to positively contribute to results achievement, and what main factors, if any, have likely prevented or will substantially challenge achieving further results. On the basis of this, suggestions shall be provided for future effective Project delivery.

In answering the evaluation questions and in providing suggestions, the evaluators are asked to take particular note of issues of gender, conflict sensitivity and social marginalisation. Due to the scope and timing of the evaluation, impact and sustainability are not criteria that will be applied or shall be considered in this evaluation.

In terms of relevance, the Project was developed by RWI together with MNHRC based on close consultations and in-depth planning, which fed into the design and direction of the Project. Considering that the Project, on this basis, was assessed as relevant to support, the assumption is that relevance factors remain, given the short life-span of the Project at the time of evaluation. Accordingly, relevance is not a criterion that will be applied or that shall be considered in this evaluation. It should be noted that the Project was conceived and assessed by Sida prior to the launch of the results strategy for Sweden's international development cooperation in Myanmar 2013-2017 (July 2013), and that the relevance of continued Sida support will be assessed in relation to the results strategy.

With regard to efficiency, given that it is too early to assess results achievement beyond direct output level, it is only possible to assess on a general level if the Project has been managed with reasonable regard for efficiency and there is accordingly no specific evaluation question in this regard.

### **Conclusions, Recommendation and Lessons Learned**

Well-informed and reliable conclusions shall be provided as a result of the evaluation in relation to the evaluation questions. The conclusions shall contribute to the dialogue between Sida and RWI on the continued operation of the Project. They shall provide suggestions, in terms of lessons learned from Project implementation during the time period of evaluation, for furthering future effective results achievement, enabling RWI and MNHRC to act accordingly on any such suggestions/ recommendations. This presumes close consultation with RWI and MNHRC as to the rationale and feasibility of any such suggestions made.

### **Approach and Methodology**

The evaluation shall be carried out according to an inclusive and participatory approach. This shall comprise a design that draws on and mobilises the knowledge and experiences of the Project implementing partners, i.e. RWI and MNHRC, and that is, for the evaluation conclusions, based on a shared understanding among the evaluation stakeholders and evaluators as to what affects and constitutes effective Project delivery within the scope of the Project. The evaluation shall accordingly support – in process and outcomes – the evaluation stakeholders in their efforts to meet Project objectives.

For information and data collection concerning the Project and its implementation, and so as to address the evaluation questions, the evaluators are expected to conduct interviews with stakeholders and to review existing Project documentation (including, RWI workplans and Result Summary Framework, RWI/MNHRC planning workshop documents, RWI/MNHRC Capacity Development Plan, Project progress reports, and strategic advices provided to MNHRC). For the purpose of stakeholder interviews, the evaluators are expected to conduct a field visit to Myanmar. In addition, concerned (current and past) Sida and RWI staff respectively shall be met with at their respective locations.

In addressing the evaluation questions, focus should be kept on the time period of evaluation and the fact that for the main part of this period emphasis has been on building trust and laying the foundation for future cooperation with MNHRC, and other potential partners. At all times, it shall be taken into account that it is only part of broader and longer project that is being evaluated. The evaluation must be stakeholder inclusive in order to make an informed assessment in relation to the evaluation questions. Such an assessment can only take place if the evaluation recognises and takes into account the unique and in-depth expertise and

knowledge (of the role and functions of NHRIs and the various capacity development strategies thus required specifically for NHRIs) that the Project is based on.

On the basis of the above-mentioned, the evaluators are expected to elaborate on the proposed methodology in the tender and/or inception report. The evaluation shall, in all relevant parts, conform to OECD/DAC's quality standards.

### **Time Schedule and Evaluation Process**

The evaluation process is composed of the following steps (indicative time in parenthesis):

Step 1: Initial review of available Project documentation (one week, including writing of inception report.)

Step 2: Inception report to Sida and RWI

Step 3: Data collection process, including field visit (two weeks)

Step 4: Data processing and analysis (two weeks, including writing of draft report)

Step 5: Submission and discussion of draft report to Sida and RWI

Step 6: Subsequent to comments from Sida and RWI, submission of final report (one week)

The estimated total time of the assignment is six weeks, to be divided among the members of the evaluation team. Ideally, the evaluation should commence XX and be finalised before 31 October 2014.

### **Reporting and Communication**

The evaluators are expected to deliver a draft inception report. The inception period shall include an initial review of available Project documentation as well as a dialogue between RWI and the evaluators regarding the approach and methodology to be used, in accordance with these Terms of Reference. In the inception report, the evaluators shall list the risks that may be faced during the evaluation process and the assumptions which may have an impact on the evaluation process, and propose alternatives for facing those risks.

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

Following data collection, processing and analysis, a draft evaluation report shall be prepared and submitted to RWI and Sida. The aim is to make it possible for RWI and MNHRC to comment on any factual errors and misunderstandings, and for Sida as well as RWI to assess if the draft has reached an acceptable standard in relation to the terms of reference and accurately addresses the evaluation questions. Comments shall be submitted to the evaluators within ten days, whereupon the final report shall be submitted to Sida within one week.

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

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

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

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

Expected deliverables in English language accordingly include:

- Inception Report
- Draft Evaluation Report
- Final Evaluation Report (maximum 20 pages, including an executive summary, but excluding annexes)

Annexes, at minimum, should include:

- Terms of Reference;
- Data gathering instruments (observation guides, interview questionnaires, etc.);
- Names and contact information of stakeholders met/interviewed (to the extent it does not violate considerations of confidentiality).

## **Resources**

The estimated total time of the assignment is six weeks, to be divided among the members of the evaluation team.

## **Evaluation Team Qualification**

The evaluation team shall be composed of two persons. Between them, they shall possess the following competences:

- Solid and diversified experience in international human rights law
- Good knowledge of the common law system
- Good knowledge about evaluation methods and techniques
- Experience of evaluating human rights capacity development projects, and projects in support of NHRIs in particular
- Thorough knowledge about and capacity to analyse a legal, political and institutional context such as that within which the Project operates
- Good knowledge of the historical, political, legal, and social context of Myanmar, including specific knowledge of the human rights situation in particular
- Good knowledge of and practical experience of gender equality and gender integration analysis
- Good knowledge of and practical experience of conflict sensitivity approaches
- Fully conversant with the principles and working methods of results based management, and ‘theory of change’ principles
- Cultural sensitivity and strong communication and interpersonal skills
- Fluency in English, and preferably Burmese as well as excellent report writing skills

One person shall be designated to be the team leader, and shall be responsible for all stakeholder contacts. This person must have sound knowledge about evaluation methods and experience from NHRI human rights capacity development projects and evaluations.

The evaluators shall exercise reasonable skill, care and diligence in the performance of services and shall carry out responsibilities in accordance with recognised professional standards.

The evaluators must be independent of the evaluated activities and have no stake in the outcome of the evaluation.

### **References**

- “Looking Back, Moving Forward”, Sida Evaluation Manual, 2<sup>nd</sup> revised edition. Sida. Stefan Molund, Göran Schill. 2007.

DAC Principles of Evaluating Development Assistance, 12

[www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork](http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork)

# Annex 2 – Inception Report

## 1. The Evaluated Intervention

In late 2012, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and the Raoul Wallenberg Institute (RWI) entered into a sub-agreement agreement providing MSEK 16 for the period 1 Nov 2012 to 31 Dec 2014, to implement the project “Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar 2012-2016”.

The overall objective of the project is to strengthen the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission (MNHRC) and its key partners to “more effectively implement their mandates to promote and protect human rights in Myanmar, so as to address the problem of ineffective implementation of human rights protection measures in Myanmar by focusing on the institutional strengthening of the key agency with the capacity to make a positive impact on the promotion and protection of human rights in the country.”

At outcome level, the project is expected to achieve:

- Improved capacities of the MNHRC to implement its mandate;
- Improved capacities of relevant stakeholders (e.g.,: justice sector institutions, academia, relevant government ministries and media.) to promote and protect human rights in Myanmar; and
- Improved cooperation among and between the Myanmar NHRI and relevant stakeholders (bridging objective)

An underlying assumption for the project is that both human rights capacity and operational capacity – including IT, leadership, organisation structure, strategic planning, human resource and knowledge management and financial management – are prerequisites for the MNHRC to be able to effectively carry out its functional capacities relating to advising the government, education and promotion of human rights, monitoring and investigation of alleged human rights violations, interaction with the judiciary, and cooperation with national and international organisations. If the human rights capacity and operational capacity are in place, they will in the long run greatly contribute to MNHRC’s ability to fulfil its mandate and to its ambition to reach and stay in compliance with the Paris Principles. An additional assumption is that increased capacity of the MNHRC, and improved cooperation between MNHRC and other relevant stakeholders, will also have an effect on a number of other institutions and organisations in implementing their duties.

The project will therefore focus on attaining the following outputs:

- Increasing the knowledge and understanding, among Commissioners and staff on international human rights law and the role and functions of a NHRI in promoting and protecting human rights in Myanmar.
- Increased capacity of the MNHRC library enabling it to use available resources for the benefit of staff, Commissioners and the public.
- Increasing the skills and capacities to exercise the MNHRC’s functional and

operational capacities.

- Increasing awareness among other stakeholders of the roles and functions of the Commission in promoting and protecting human rights in Myanmar.

In terms of attaining these outcomes, the following methods are being used:

- Analysis – regarding MNHRC’s human rights, operational and functional capacities.
- Advisory services – consisting of technical advice provided by NHRI practitioners on the MNHRC’s functional capacities.
- Training and education – targeting selected participants to build up human rights and functional capacities.
- Study visits and exchanges – involving visits to different NHRIs to learn from peers and colleagues.
- Networking – involving the creation and facilitation of networking initiatives and partnerships within and between different countries and sectors.
- Material support – in particular support to MNHRC’s library and provision of books and other publications to enhance institutional knowledge development in human rights.

Futhermore, the project is characterised by the following strategies:

- Providing long-term capacity development support;
- Building on the experience RWI has in combining theory and practice; using an extensive pool of NHRI practitioners;
- Ensuring local ownership and context-specificity;
- Treating gender as a cross-cutting issue; and
- Applying a comprehensive capacity building approach.

## 2. The Assignment

The sub-agreement states that an evaluation focusing on the results for the period 2012-2014 shall be carried out for the purpose of serving as a basis for a possible extension of the project for the period 2015-2016.

Even though the project has been operating for less than two years, it has been decided that an evaluation should be carried out and completed in time for a possible extension. The evaluation should cover the period 1 January 2013 – 30 June 2014.

Sida has, according to the Terms of Reference, initiated the evaluation to “generate information on how effective the Project has been in achieving results thus far, identifying, where possible, factors influencing positive results achievement, and proposing any potential adjustments to ensure effective Project delivery for the remaining two years of the Project.” The evaluation should “contribute to the dialogue between Sida and RWI on the continued operation of the project.”

The evaluation is expected to deliver:

- An assessment of results achieved, predominantly at output level
- Suggestions for furthering effective results achievement

We would like to provide the following reflections on the Terms of Reference:

The TOR is very clear and specific as to what is expected from the evaluation. We recognise and appreciate that MNHRC is itself a young organisation, newly established in September 2011. The Raoul Wallenberg Institute began its engagement with the Commission shortly after the Commission's inception.

Activities under the evaluated intervention began in early 2013 and the Evaluation Team recognises that the project's focus has so far primarily been on building trust and creating a stable foundation for continued cooperation. Activities carried out include the following:

- Workshops and training courses on human rights and the specialized functions of national human rights institutions (NHRIs) for MNHRC's commissioners and staff, and members of other stakeholders such as relevant ministries.
- Development of a human rights library at MNHRC.
- Study visit to the Australian and New Zealand Human Rights Commissions.
- Translation and publication of human rights material.
- Development and publication of MNHRC's website.

As can be observed from the above, the project's focus has so far largely been on:

- capacity building, primarily of the Commission but also of other stakeholders, and
- awareness raising among relevant stakeholders regarding the roles and functions of the Commission.

It is clear to the Evaluation Team that both the duration of existence of MNHRC and the length of its cooperation with RWI have been short. No major outcomes are expected at this stage and we understand that the focus of the evaluation should be on immediate outputs and the likelihood that they will contribute to expected outcomes.

The key OECD-DAC criteria against which assessment should be made is thus effectiveness, defined as “the extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance”.<sup>5</sup> In the case of this evaluation, given what we have stated above, this refers to the quality and quantity of outputs, and also as the TOR states “their contribution to laying a solid foundation for future effective Project delivery, and their likelihood to lead to the achievement of expected Project outcomes”.

The TOR also emphasises and we recognise that the evaluation needs to bear in mind the rights based approach of Swedish development cooperation and that particular attention should be paid to gender, conflict sensitivity and social marginalisation.

---

<sup>5</sup> Sida Evolution Manual (2nd revised edition)

The TOR emphasises the participatory approach the evaluation should take, and the need to have continuous dialogue with both Sida and RWI during the exercise. This is acknowledged, as it will enhance both the credibility of the findings and their ownership and utility by the three principal stakeholders. As will be observed in the methodology proposed below, we will ensure this through a variety of means: meetings and communication which have already taken place during the inception phase, sharing of and feedback on the inception report which details how the evaluation will be conducted and what specific issues will be focussed upon, interviews with MNHRC, RWI and Sida during the data collection and field work phase, a consultative workshop with MNHRC, RWI and Sida towards the end of the in-country visit. An additional debriefing session will be held with relevant RWI staff in Lund where key findings and recommendations will be discussed. Finally the draft report will be shared with all three principal stakeholders to obtain inputs and comments before finalisation. At all stages, further discussions with RWI and Sida can also be arranged if the need arises.

### 3. Evaluation Questions

The ToR lists three broad evaluation questions, which are set out in the matrix below. The matrix also includes tentative indicators that will help answer the evaluation questions. The various methods and sources of information that the Evaluation Team expects to use to obtain the data for the indicators are also listed.

Questions raised in ToRs	Tentative indicators to be used in Evaluation	Methods & Sources
<p>To what extent have project activities led to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- increased knowledge and understanding, among Commissioners and MNHRC staff on international human rights law and the role and functions of NHRIs in promoting and protecting human rights in Myanmar;</li> <li>- increased capacity of the MNHRC library enabling it to use available resources for the benefit of staff, Commissioners and the public;</li> <li>- increased skills and capacities of MNHRC to exercise its functional capacities and operational capacities;</li> <li>- increased awareness among relevant stakeholders of the roles and functions of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Have baseline assessments been conducted to measure the awareness and skills related to human rights of both the direct and indirect target group? (Baselines are required under the sub-agreement of November 2012 with Sida.) What is the appropriateness and quality of the baseline assessments? To what extent have the baseline assessments been used to monitor progress?</li> <li>○ Are satisfaction and knowledge surveys conducted of participants of trainings and study tours?</li> <li>○ Are appropriate tools and procedures in place to monitor results?</li> <li>○ Has a risk analysis and correlating mitigation plan been developed as required under the sub-agreement of November 2012 with Sida? Are the risks analyses and mitigation plans regularly updated?</li> <li>○ What routines are in place to monitor and respond to the risks?</li> <li>○ To what extent has a participatory approach been used for project and activity planning?</li> <li>○ Have activities been undertaken on time and within budget?</li> <li>○ To what extent has gender been mainstreamed in the project? Have specific training sessions on women's rights been organized or planned? What has been the results of such mainstreaming or training been on the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Desk review, primarily of documents listed under 4.2.1 but also of specific documents requested and obtained from RWI and MNHRC during the course of the evaluation.</li> <li>○ Key informant interviews, primarily with individuals listed under 4.2.2 but also with others who may be identified during the course of the evaluation.</li> <li>○ Interviews with participants in the various trainings and other activities carried out under the project, using the interview questionnaire set out under 4.2.2.</li> </ul>

<p>Commission in promoting and protecting human rights in Myanmar;</p> <p>- improved cooperation among and between the MNHRC and relevant stakeholders; and</p> <p>- improved knowledge on human rights topics and areas of cooperation that concern both MNHRC and relevant stakeholders?<sup>6</sup></p>	<p>attitudes and practices of MNHRC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To what extent has MNHRC the required operational capacity in terms of manpower, adequate funds for its daily operations, and financial, HR and administrative management systems to function as a NHRI?</li> <li>○ Have appropriate steps been taken to ensure that by the end of the project there has been progress in terms of following the Paris Principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a clearly defined and broad-based mandate based on universal human rights standards</li> <li>- autonomy from government</li> <li>- independence guaranteed by legislation or the constitution</li> <li>- pluralism, including membership that broadly reflects their society</li> <li>- adequate resources</li> <li>- adequate powers of investigation?</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ To what extent have the following project activities been positively perceived by participants, resource persons and key informants and what evidence of learning and changes of behaviour are there from these activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ‘Business and Human Rights’ for MNHRC, representatives from the business community and government ministries. (Workshop held January 2013)</li> <li>- ‘International Human Rights and the Roles and Functions of National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs)’ for MNHRC (March and November 2013)</li> <li>- Study tour to the Australian Human Rights Commission and the New Zealand Human Rights Commission for MNHRC (April 2013). Does MNHRC continue to communicate with these two NHRIs? Has the participants in these study tours taken step to disseminate lessons from the tours?</li> <li>- ‘Content and processes of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights’ for MNHRC and Ministry representatives (May 2013).</li> <li>- ‘International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights’ for the MNHRC and the relevant ministry representatives. (September 2013)</li> <li>- ‘Human Rights and the Media’ for MNHRC and the Ministry of Information (October 2013)</li> <li>- ‘Prohibition and Prevention of Torture and Ill-treatment’ for the MNHRC and the relevant ministry representatives. (March 2014)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ To what extent do MNHRC staff and commissioners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Verification seminar involving MNHRC, RWI and Sida</li> </ul>
--	---	--

<sup>6</sup> In RWI's 2012 project proposal, these relevant stakeholders are defined as "relevant ministries, the justice sector, academia and media stakeholders..."

	<p>perceive that they “own” the project?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What is the turnover among MNHRC staff and commissioners?</li> <li>○ Are there indications of ongoing improvement in MNHRC’s capacity to exercise the following functional capacities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reception of complaints</li> <li>- investigations</li> <li>- education and promotion of human rights review of existing legislation and proposed bills.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ To what extent has a culture of trust emerged between MNHRC and RWI?</li> <li>○ How aware are relevant ministries, the judiciary, the prosecution service, the police, the court system, academia, and media stakeholders of the role and functions of MNHRC?</li> <li>○ Has awareness of MNHRC’s role and functions and of human rights in general increased through the distribution of MNHRC’s publications as well as through its web presence?</li> <li>○ Have more efficient and effective mediums such as radio been used for awareness raising of MNHRC’s role and functions? Have other creative ways such as drama and debate been tried out?</li> <li>○ Has RWI provided essential assistance to MNHRC in the development of its website? Is the website easy to navigate? Is it updated? Is it increasingly being used as a source of information by government institutions, civil society and the general public? Is the information posted on it relevant? Is the website administrator qualified and efficient?</li> <li>○ Is the library of MNHRC open to users, sufficiently staffed, organised, easily searchable, holding relevant and updated material, having a budget for further purchases, cooperating with other libraries and possessing a conducive reading environment? To what extent is it being used by MNHRC commissioners, staff and others? What other sources of information are used by the Commissioners and staff?</li> <li>○ Does MNHRC have productive and informed relationships with other bodies in society (the judiciary, academia, media, civil society etc.)?</li> <li>○ Is there coordination with actors such as OHCHR and APF? Are established procedures in place for ensuring regular and effective coordination?</li> </ul>	
<p>To what extent has advice provided under the project contributed to an effective legislative mandate for the Commission?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To what extent has RWI been involved in providing advice?</li> <li>○ What were the processes and methods followed in providing the support?</li> <li>○ What was the main content of the advice provided?</li> <li>○ How has the advice been received and perceived?</li> <li>○ To what extent are there indications that the advice has been taken into account in the drafting process?</li> <li>○ To what extent is the law in compliance with the Paris Principles?</li> <li>○ To what extent is the law deemed appropriate for the context in which it is to be implemented?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Interview with RWI’s visiting professor involved in providing advice.</li> <li>○ Interviews with other key informants listed under 4.2.2, but also with others who may be identified during the course of the evaluation.</li> <li>○ Desk review of legislation and advice provided.</li> <li>○ Verification seminar</li> </ul>

		involving MNHRC, RWI and Embassy of Sweden Section Office in Yangon.
To what extent have results achieved contributed to laying a solid foundation for future effective Project delivery, and what is the likelihood that the results will lead to the achievement of expected Project outcomes?	Indicators for the above evaluation questions are relevant also for this question.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Findings relating to the indicators for the two evaluation questions above.</li> <li>○ Theory of change assessment.</li> <li>○ Verification seminar involving MNHRC, RWI and Embassy of Sweden Section Office in Yangon.</li> </ul>

## 4. Proposed Approach and Methodology

Methodologically the assessment can be divided into the following three main phases:

- Inception
- Data collection
- Reporting

### 4.1 INCEPTION

The inception phase will end once the Embassy has approved this inception report. It is envisaged that the report—once approved—will regulate the scope, focus and methodological approach of the evaluation.

### 4.2 DATA COLLECTION

The data collection and analysis phase of the evaluation will start once the inception report has been approved. It will be based on (i) a continued desk study, (ii) participant and key informant interviews, and (iii) two verification seminars.

#### 4.2.1 Continued desk study

A desk study has been carried out already during the inception stage. Further data collection from project related documents will take place, however, during the data collection phase. Documents reviewed include:

#### ***Raoul Wallenberg Institute***

Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar 2012 – 2016 by Raoul Wallenberg Institute (August 2012)

Summary of RWI Annual Progress Report 2013

Narrative Report ‘Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar 2012-2016 for the period November – December 2012 (August 2013)

RWI Annual Progress Report, Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar 2012-2016 (August 2014)

Mission and Travel Reports by RWI staff for the years 2013 and 2014

Summaries of evaluations of workshops conducted by RWI for MNHRC in 2013 and 2014

MNHRC Capacity Assessment Questionnaire (2013) (used as baseline)

The Project Plan

Concept note of the Planning Meeting between the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission (MNHRC) and Raoul Wallenberg Institute (RWI)

Concept Note – Working with Academic Institutions in Myanmar

Workplans for 2012, 2013 and 2014

Budgets for 2012, 2013 and 2014

Risk Management Plans for the period of 1 November 2012 – 31 December 2016 and 1 Jan 2014 – 31 December 2016 of the ‘Strengthening Human Rights in Burma 2012 – 2016 project’

Comments on the Draft Myanmar National Human Rights Commission Law, 29 July 2013

### ***Embassy of Sweden***

Sub-agreement between the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (RWI) on a cooperation project called “Strengthening Human Rights in Burma, 2012-2014.” (November 2012)

Decision on Appraisal on ‘Strengthening Human Rights in Burma through Raoul Wallenberg Institute (RWI)’ by Embassy of Sweden (October 2012)

Decision on Contribution of ‘Strengthening Human Rights in Burma’ by Embassy of Sweden (November 2012)

Appraisal of intervention of ‘Strengthening Human Rights in Burma’ by Embassy of Sweden (October 2012)

Quality control of Draft Decision & Draft Agreement of ‘Strengthening Human Rights in Burma through Raoul Wallenberg Institute (RWI)’ by Embassy of Sweden (November 2012)

Results Summary of ‘Strengthening Human Rights in Burma’ by Embassy of Sweden (October 2012)

Risk Analysis Register of ‘Strengthening Human Rights in Burma’ by Embassy of Sweden

Beslut om insats: Strengthening Human Rights in Burma (November 2012)

### ***Other***

The Myanmar National Human Rights Commission Law, 28 March 2014

#### 4.2.2 Informant interviews

Following the desk study, interviews will be carried out to help answer the evaluation questions and to verify information collected during the desk study phase. Interviews will initially be carried out with RWI staff engaged in the project, of which the majority is based in Lund.

For the purpose of interviewing key informants and participants in the various workshops, training sessions and exchange visits organised under the project, the Evaluation Team will undertake an in-country visit to Myanmar from 6 to 14 October. While the Evaluation Team originally proposed that the in-country visit would take place in September, the dates have been moved to October on request from MNHRC. It is proposed that the visit start, if possible, with separate meetings with representatives of the Swedish Embassy, RWI and MNHRC on 6 October.

All key informant interviews will be semi-structured and adapted to reflect the respondent's expected area of experience and knowledge. Interviews with RWI's project staff will have a special focus on unpacking the interventions theory of change. While most interviews will be face-to-face interviews, additional interviews may be carried out by telephone or Skype. Key informants and other actors that the Evaluation Team expects to interview include those whose names are listed in the table below:

Contact person, position	Position	Institution
U Win Mra	Chairperson	MNHRC
U Nyunt Swe,	Commissioner	MNHRC
U Hla Myint,	Commissioner	MNHRC
Daw Than New	Commissioner	MNHRC
U Sit Myaing	Secretary	MNHRC
U Zaw Lwin Htoo	Staff member	MNHRC
Daw Phyo Thiri	Staff member	MNHRC
Saw Harrison	Staff member	MNHRC
Brian Burdekin	Visiting professor	RWI
Miriam Estrada	Visiting professor	RWI
Jason Naum	Head of NHRI unit	RWI
Sue Anne Koh	Programme officer	RWI
Emily Hanna	Programme officer	RWI
Lena Olsson	Expert on Library Management and Information	RWI
Abigail Booth	Head of Asia Programme	RWI
David Holmertz	Senior Programme Manager/Policy Advisor	Sida
Tomas Lundström	Country Coordinator	Sida
Anette Dahlström	Country Coordinator at HQ	Sida
Anders Emanuel	Programme Manager/Policy Advisor	Sida
Daw Thi Dar Oo		Attorney General Office
Kyaw Win Thein	Police Colonel	Home Ministry

Aung Khin Thein	Lt Col	Ministry of Defence
		Ministry of Social Welfare
		Ministry of Information
Michael Shaihk	Human Rights Officer	OHCHR
		Asia Pacific Forum
Dave Mathiesen	Senior Researcher	Human Rights Watch
Saman Zia-Zarifi/ Kyaw Min San	Regional Director/National Legal Adviser	International Commission of Jurists
Naing Raw	Programme manager	Shalom Foundation
Aung Myo Min	Executive Director	Equality Myanmar
Zaw Oo	Executive Director	Myanmar Development Resource Institute
Vicky Bowman	Director	Myanmar Center for Responsible Business
Shihab Uddin Ahamad	Country Director	Action Aid Myanmar
		UNICEF
		UNDP
Khin Maung Win	Deputy Executive Director	DVB Multimedia Group
Soe Myint	Executive Director	Mizzima

In additions to these key informants, the Evaluation Team also expects to interview further staff members of the Commission as well as other participants in the activities carried out under the project. The Evaluation Team has requested assistance from the Commission in identifying and setting up meetings in Yangon and Naypyidaw with such participants. Examples of questions or issues that will guide participant interviews are set out in the table below.

Questions	Notes
1. What was the purpose of the training/event you attended?	
2. What expectations did you have of the training/event?	
3. Did the training/event meet your expectations?	
4. Was the level of the training/event appropriate?	
5. Was the training/event relevant to your work? If yes, which aspects were most relevant and which were less relevant?	
6. In your own work, will it be possible for you to apply what you learned/experienced? If	

yes, what and how?	
7. Have you already put into practice anything your learned during the training/event. If yes, what and how?	
8. Have you passed along any knowledge or skills from the trainings/events to others in your organisation?	
9. Would you recommend the training/event to others?	
10. Do you have any other comments about the trainings that you would like to share?	

### 4.3 ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

In connection with the Evaluation Team's visit to Myanmar, it is proposed that major findings and preliminary conclusions are presented and discussed at a verification seminar with representatives of MNHRC, RWI and the Embassy of Sweden Section Office in Yangon. The seminar should give the Evaluation Team an opportunity to verify findings and an opportunity for the participants to provide their reflections on these and to contribute to the analysis. An additional verification seminar will be organized with RWI staff in Lund before the draft report is finalized.

The data collection and analysis will result in a report written in English not exceeding 20 pages, including executive summary but excluding annexes.

It is envisaged that the report will contain findings, conclusions and recommendations structured around the three evaluation questions. It is tentatively expected that the report will have the following outline:

#### **Executive summary**

##### **1. Introduction**

- Background to the assignment
- Purpose and scope
- Approach and methodology
- Structure of the report

##### **2. The evaluated intervention**

##### **3. Findings**

- Attainment of objectives
- The Commission's legislative mandate

##### **4. Conclusion**

- Foundation for future project delivery

##### **5. Recommendations**

##### **Annex I: Terms of Reference**

**Annex II: Documents****Annex III: Persons Consulted****Annex IV: Interview Questionnaire****Annex V: Inception Report**

The draft report will be submitted to the Embassy of Sweden and RWI no later than 31 October. In accordance with the ToR, any comments shall be submitted to the Evaluation Team within ten days. Within one week of after receiving the comments, a final version will be submitted to the Swedish Embassy.

The final report will reflect any verbal and written feedback received on the draft report. Any omissions or factual errors will be corrected and any substantive disagreements will be acknowledged. A response matrix will be prepared in order to ensure that each comment received is duly considered and that information about how it has been handled is clearly presented. This matrix, which will be submitted to the Swedish Embassy together with the final report, will list all comments received, state the Evaluation Team's responses to each comment and explain what changes, if any, have been made in the final report. The table below shows the format that will be used.

<b>MNHRC/RWI/Embassy Comment</b>	<b>Team Response to Comment</b>	<b>Final Changes</b>

## 5. Risk Assessment and Mitigation Issues

The Evaluation Team has identified the following risks and mitigation issues for the evaluation:

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Risk level</b>	<b>Mitigation strategy</b>
Different expectations regarding the focus and comprehensiveness of the evaluation	Medium	Medium	Proposal and inception phase consultations between the main stakeholders to promote common understanding, as well as discussions during the initial briefing sessions between the evaluation team and the Embassy of Sweden, RWI and MNHRC. The inception report should itself serve to clarify the scope, focus and priorities of the evaluation.
Difficulties getting access to relevant staff at RWI and MNHRC, as well as resource persons	Medium	High	The dates for the Evaluation Team's visit to Myanmar has been moved to fit the schedule of MNHRC. The Team can meet RWI staff in Lund as well as in Yangon. Preliminary dates for interviews in Lund has been discussed with RWI and scheduled.
Difficulties getting access to participants in project organised events	Medium	High	MNHRC has been asked to help in identifying and setting up meetings with the participants.
Difficulties getting access to appropriate outside observers who are sufficiently aware of the work of MNHRC to provide	High	Low	The Evaluation Team members have reasonably well established contacts among actors expected to be relevant. MNHRC will be asked to help identify

relevant reflections.			furhter relevant actors. The majority of the evaluation questions can be comprehensively answered, however, without input from outside observers.
Difficulties getting access to relevant documenation	Low	High	While the Evaluation Team has already received most project related documents, there are some concerns that some documenation relating to the draft law and the comments made by RWI is considered confidential or too sensitive to share. The issue has been raised with RWI already during the inception period.
Lack of follow-up and lasting benefit from the Evaluation	Medium	High	RWI will be involved all stages of the evalaution and has been able to influence its relevance. A utility focus is being applied throughout the evaluation.

## Annex 3 – Persons Consulted

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution</b>
Aung Khin Thein	Lt Colonel	Ministry of Defence
Aung Myo Min	Executive Director	Equity Myanmar
Aye Aye Aung	Lower Divisional Clerk, Library	MNHRC
Bawi Tha	Consultant	MIID
Burdekin, Brian	Visiting professor	RWI
Chit Su Wint	Lower Divisional Clerk, International Relations Division	MNHRC
Emanuel, Anders	Programme Manager/Policy Advisor	Sida
Estrada, Miriam	Visiting Professor	RWI
Fitzpatrick, Kieren	Director	APF
Hallenborg, Johan	Minister Counsellor/ Head of Office	Embassy of Sweden, Section Office Yangon
Hanna, Emily	Programme Officer	RWI
Holmertz, David	Counsellor	Embassy of Sweden, Section Office Yangon
Htet Htet Aung	Deputy Human Rights Officer, Protection Division	MNHRC
Jason Naum	Head of NHRI unit	RWI
Khin Maung Lay	Commissioner	MNHRC
Khin Maung Win	Deputy Executive Director	DVB Media Group
Khin Ohmar	Director	Burma Partnership
Khine Khine Win	Deputy Director, Promotion & Education Division	MNHRC
Koh, Sue Ann	Programme Officer	RWI
Kyaw Kyaw Naing	Deputy Director	Attorney General's Office
Kyaw Nanda	Staff Officer	Attorney General's Office
Lei Yee Mon	Lower Divisional Clerk, Education & Promotion Division	MNHRC
Mathieson, Dave	Senior Researcher	Human Rights Watch
Maung Maung Aye	Director of Prisons Yangon	Ministry of Home Affairs
Myat Su Cheat	Lower Divisional Clerk, Finance Division	MNHRC
Myint Than	Deputy General Manager	Myanmar Economic Corporation

Nyan Zaw	Commissioner	MNHRC
Nylin, Louise	Programme Advisor	UN Women
Nyunt Swe	Commissioner	
Olsson, Lena	Resource Person	RWI
Palmstrom, Becky	Radio producer and trainer	BBC Media Action
Petra, Azwa	Human Rights Officer	OHCHR
Phyo Thiri Win	Human Rights Officer, Legal Division	MNHRC
San Aung	Assistant Director	Ministry of Immigration & Population
Soe Myint	Editor-in-Chief	Mizzima
Su Su Hlaing	Legal section	MNHRC
Swan Yee Ya	Assistant Director	Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement
Than New	Commissioner	MNHRC
Thandar Htwe	Assistant Director	Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement
Thida Oo	Director	Attorney General's Office
Tin La Pyae Win	Deputy Human Rights Officer, Protection Division	MNHRC
Tin Maung Oo	Deputy Director	Ministry of Immigration & Population
Tluang Lian Hnin	Researcher	Lahva Research Group
Vicky Bowman	Director	Myanmar Center for Responsible Business
Win Min Aye	Lower Divisional Clerk, Administrative Division	MNHRC
Win Mra	Chair	MNHRC
Witt Yi Win	Human Rights Officer, International Relations Division	MNHRC
Ye Htet Ko	Lower Divisional Clerk, Administration Division	MNHRC
Zaw Lwin Htoo	Assistant Director, Promotion & Education Division	MNHRC
Zay Yar Lin	Assistant Director, Legal Division	MNHRC

## Annex 4 – References

### **Raoul Wallenberg Institute**

Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar 2012 – 2016 by Raoul Wallenberg Institute (August 2012)

Summary of RWI Annual Progress Report 2013

Narrative Report ‘Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar 2012-2016 for the period November – December 2012 (August 2013)

RWI Annual Progress Report, Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar 2012-2016 (August 2014)

Mission and Travel Reports by RWI staff for the years 2013 and 2014

Summaries of evaluations of workshops conducted by RWI for MNHRC in 2013 and 2014

MNHRC Capacity Assessment Questionnaire (2013)

The Project Plan

Concept note of the Planning Meeting between the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission (MNHRC) and Raoul Wallenberg Institute (RWI)

Concept Note – Working with Academic Institutions in Myanmar

Workplans for 2012, 2013 and 2014

Budgets for 2012, 2013 and 2014

Risk Management Plans for the period of 1 November 2012 – 31 December 2016 and 1 Jan 2014 – 31 December 2016 of the ‘Strengthening Human Rights in Burma 2012 – 2016 project’

Comments on the Draft Myanmar National Human Rights Commission Law, 29 July 2013

RWI Management Response to System-Based Audit of RWI commissioned by Sida and carried out January-April 2014 by Professional Management AB (June 2014)

### **Embassy of Sweden/Sida**

Sub-agreement between the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (RWI) on a cooperation project called “Strengthening Human Rights in Burma, 2012-2014.” (November 2012)

Decision on Appraisal on ‘Strengthening Human Rights in Burma through Raoul Wallenberg Institute (RWI)’ by Embassy of Sweden (October 2012)

Decision on Contribution of ‘Strengthening Human Rights in Burma’ by Embassy of Sweden (November 2012)

Appraisal of intervention of ‘Strengthening Human Rights in Burma’ by Embassy of Sweden (October 2012)

Quality control of Draft Decision & Draft Agreement of ‘Strengthening Human Rights in Burma through Raoul Wallenberg Institute (RWI)’ by Embassy of Sweden (November 2012)

Beslut om insats: Strengthening Human Rights in Burma (November 2012)  
Sida, Looking Back, Moving Forward, Sida Evaluation Manual (2nd revised edition, 2007)

**Myanmar National Human Rights Commission**

Activities of the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission, (5 September 2011 to 31 January 2012)

Statements issued by the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission (September 2011 – February 2014)

Strategic Plan 2014 - 2016

**Other**

Burma Partnership and Equality Myanmar, Burma: All the President's Men, in: The Asian NGO Network on National Human Rights Commissions, 2014 ANNI Report on Performance and Establishment of National Human Rights Institutions in Asia (September 2014)

Lina Lenefors and Arne Svensson, System-Based Audit of the Raoul Wallenberg Institute, Professional Management (March 2014)

Ian Christoplos et. al., Capacity Development Literature Review, UTV Working Paper 2014:1, Sida, 2014

The Myanmar National Human Rights Commission Law, 28 March 2014.

# Annex 5 – Trainings

## Participants in MNHRC training events till June 2014 (Trainings in gray were events supported by RWI)

No.	Name of training or workshop	Month held	Year held	No. of days	MNHRC participants		Other participants		Total participants		Total participants
					Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
1	Workshop on Child Rights	Nov	2011	1							35
2	Workshop on Human Rights subjects for Government officials	Nov	2011	1							32
3	Workshop on Child Rights	Jan	2012	3							75
4	Human Rights Training workshop for the officials of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar and the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission	Mar	2012	3	11	3	10	20	21	23	44
5	Seminar on Good Practices in Achieving Compliance with Paris Principles on National Human Rights Institutions	Aug	2012	2	9	4	15	16	24	20	44
6	Discussion on Convention on the Rights of the Child Day	Oct	2012	1							14
7	Discussion on Convention on the Rights of the Child Day	Nov	2012	1							12
8	Convention on the Rights of the Child Day	Nov	2012	1							300
9	Training Workshop on Business and Human Rights	Jan	2013	2	12	4	18	10	30	14	44
10	Human Rights Training for MNHRC Staff	Mar	2013	5	7	20	-	-	7	20	27
11	Website Training for MNHRC Staff	Apr	2013	2	3	3	-	-	3	3	3
12	Training on International Convention on Economic, Social and Cul-	May	2013	2	7	4	12	8	19	12	31

# ANNEX 5 - TRAININGS

No.	Name of training or workshop	Month held	Year held	No. of days	MNHRC participants		Other participants		Total participants		Total participants
					Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
	tural Rights (ICESCR)										
13	Training of Trainers Workshop on Human Rights	Jun	2013	5							31
14	Seminar on Universal Periodic Review	Jun	2013	2							31
15	Training on International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)	Sep	2013	2	6	6	15	5	21	11	32
16	Training on Human Rights and the Role of Media	Oct	2013	2	10	5	4	1	14	6	20
17	Human Rights Training for MNHRC Staff	Nov	2013	11	14	25	-	-	14	25	39
18	Training on Capacity Building for MNHRC Officers and Academia	Jan	2014	5							31
19	Training on the Prohibition and Preservation of Torture and ill Treatment	Mar	2014	3	9	2	13	4	22	6	28
20	Disability Inclusive Development Workshop on MNHRC	Apr	2014	2	4	16	-	-	4	16	20
21	Human Rights and the Roles and Functions of NHRIs	Apr	2014	10	6	20	-	-	6	20	26



## Evaluation of the Raoul Wallenberg Institute's project "Strengthening Human Rights in Myanmar"

This mid-term review looks at the support that Raoul Wallenberg Institute (RWI) has provided to the strengthening of human rights in Myanmar during the period November 2012 to June 2014, specifically the support it has provided to the strengthening of the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission (MNHRC) and its key partners. During the partnership between RWI and MNHRC, a high degree of trust has emerged between the two institutions and the project has contributed to increasing the understanding of human rights and the role of National Human Rights Institutions (NHRI) amongst both MNHRC commissioners and staff members. Greater engagement of other national stakeholders in the process, and a more targeted and sustained capacity and organisational development approach will ensure greater effectiveness and sustainability of RWI's work.

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](mailto:info@sida.se). Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

