



DET KONGELIGE
UTENRIKSDEPARTEMENT

Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Evaluation Report 1/2001

Evaluation of the Norwegian Human Rights Fund



**Information from the
Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

The Ministry's Information Section provides information with regard to current foreign policy, trade policy, and development cooperation policy.

Material can be ordered from
fax no. + 47 22 24 27 87

Foreign Ministry switchboard
Tel. + 47 22 24 36 00
Fax + 47 22 24 95 80 or + 47 22 24 95 81

Information is available on the Internet at
<http://odin.dep.no/ud>

Information to the media:

The Ministry's Press Spokesperson and the Senior Information Officer on Development Cooperation can be contacted through the Foreign Ministry switchboard

Foreign journalists:

The Norway International Press Centre, NIPS, is the Foreign Ministry' service centre for foreign journalists in Norway,
tel. + 47 22 83 83 10

In countries outside of Norway, information on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs may be obtained from Norwegian embassies or consulates

Evaluation of the Norwegian Human Rights Fund

A report prepared by

The Danish Centre for Human Rights

Hans-Otto Sano
Vasudeavan Gayathri
Ayoola Modupe Obe
Gunnar Olesen
Nell Rasmussen

Responsibility for the contents and presentation of findings and recommendations rests with the evaluation team. The views and opinions expressed in the report do not necessarily correspond with the views of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Contents

Abbreviations	5
Factsheet	7
Executive Summary	9
1 Background	13
1.1 The present evaluation	13
1.2 The history of the Fund	14
1.3 The 1997 Internal Evaluation	15
1.4 The professionalisation issue	16
2 The Administration of Support	17
2.1 The secretariat	17
2.2 The applicants and the scope of support 1996–99	18
2.3 Financial management	19
2.4 The mandate and the member organisations	20
2.4.1 The Board	20
2.4.2 The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs	21
2.5 Other stakeholders in Norway	22
2.6 Communication strategies and networks in Norway	22
2.7 Conclusions	23
3 Country and Institutional Context of Assistance in India, Liberia and Nigeria ...	26
3.1 The human rights context in India, Liberia and Nigeria	26
3.2 The institutional environment of human rights organisations	28
3.2.1 Tamil Nadu	28
3.2.2 Liberia	28
3.2.3 Nigeria	30
3.3 Conclusions	31
4 The Relevance of Support and Organisational Performance	33
4.1 Classification of supported projects in India, Liberia and Nigeria	33
4.2 Relevance of support	33
4.3 Capacity and performance of recipient organisations	34
4.3.1 Professional capacity of organisations and their democracy	34
4.3.2 Professionalism in implementation	35
4.3.3 Networking and local support	36
4.3.4 Human rights orientation	37
4.4 Links between fund projects and member organisations	38
4.5 Conclusions	38
5 Assessment of Target Group and Advocacy Effectiveness and of Efficiency	40
5.1 Project target groups	40
5.2 Project objectives and realisation in relation to target groups	40
5.2.1 The numbers and social characteristics of the people benefiting from NHRF assistance	42

5.3 Project objectives and realisation regionally or nationally	42
5.3.1 Instituting human rights respect nationally and regionally	42
5.4 Appropriateness of grant size and flow	45
5.5 Cost-effectiveness	46
5.6 Conclusions	48
6 Recommendations	50
Annex 1 Terms of Reference	53
Annex 2 Interviews and Itinerary	57
Annex 3 Applications and Grants	61
Annex 4 Grants by Region, Country and Category of Project	63
Annex 5 Key Financial Data	65
Annex 6 Organisation Assessment in Relation to NHRF Projects	67
Annex 7 Category Overview of Last-financed Projects by NHRF	69
Annex 8 India/Liberia/Nigeria: Organisation Assessment	71
Annex 9 Summary of Target Effects	75
Annex 10 Organisation Strategies	77
Annex 11 Bibliography	79

Abbreviations

AFELL	Association of Female Lawyers of Liberia
AI	Amnesty International (i.e., Norwegian chapter if not indicated otherwise)
CALL	Civil Rights Association of Liberian Lawyers
CD	Campaign for Democracy
CFC	Communicating for Change
CJPC	Catholic Justice and Peace Commission
CLO	Civil Liberties Organisation
CRP	Constitutional Rights Project
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
FIAN	Food First Information and Action Network
FOCUS	Forerunners of Children's Universal Rights for Survival, Growth and Development
HRW	Human Rights Watch, Women and Children
HRL	Human Rights Centre of Liberia
HR+D	Human Rights and Democracy
Huri-Laws	Huri-Laws the Human Rights Law Service
IHRHL	Institution of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law
JPC	Justice and Peace Commission
LHRO	Liberia Human Rights Observer
LIHROF	Liberian Human Rights Organisations Federation
LIPWA	Liberia Prison Watch
MFA	Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NA	Not available
NCA	Norwegian Church Aid
NCTU	Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions
ND-Hero	Nigerian Delta Human Environmental Rescue Organisation
NETWORK	Network of Liberian Human Rights Groups
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NHRCL	National Human Rights Centre of Liberia

NHRF	Norwegian Human Rights Fund
NHRM	National Human Rights Monitor
NIHR	Norwegian Institute for Human Rights
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation
NPA	Norwegian People's Aid
NRC	Norwegian Red Cross
PEEDS	People Education and Economic Development Society
PROGRESS	Promotion of Grassroot Enlightenment and Social Security
RB	Save the Children Norway
REDC	Rural Environmental and Development Centre
SC	Scheduled Castes
ST	Scheduled Tribes
SRI	Shelter Rights Initiative
TMG	Transition Monitoring Group
ToR	Terms of Reference
UAD	United Action for Democracy
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
VRDP	Village Reconstruction and Development Project
VT	Voice Trust
WIN	Women In Nigeria
YMCA	Young Men's Christian Association

Factsheet

Institution evaluated:

The Norwegian Human Rights Fund (NHRF). The NHRF was established in 1988. The Board of the Fund is made up of representatives of seven member organisations as of the end of the year 2000: Norwegian Institute for Human Rights, Norwegian Church Aid, Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions, Church of Norway Council on Ecumenical and International Relations, Norwegian People's Aid, Norwegian Red Cross and Save the Children Norway. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Norwegian chapter of Amnesty International were observers on the Board during the evaluation period 1996–1999. Amnesty International becomes a member as of January 2001, while the Ministry remains an observer.

The objective of the NHRF:

The mandate of the Fund is to promote respect for and protection of human rights internationally. The guidelines of the Board specify that support can be given to organisations in low-income countries, primarily in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East. It is considered essential that the NHRF should provide risk-willing capital (seed capital) for new human rights organisations which do not receive support from many other sources.

Organisational set-up:

The Fund is governed by the above-mentioned Board, which meets at intervals of four to six weeks. A secretariat runs the affairs of the Fund on a daily basis. It is made up of three employees.

Way of functioning:

The Fund in most cases receives applications directly from human rights organisations. The secretariat evaluates applications, inter alia on the basis of the quality of the proposals, their human rights relevance and on the basis of information about the applying organisation, including in some cases an assessment by the secretariat of previous reporting from the applicant. When applications are rejected, the Board is informed about the causes for the rejection. Priority is given to countries where human rights work is particularly difficult. Currently, there are nine priority countries, i. e. Colombia, Brazil, Mexico, Egypt, Bhutan, India, Liberia, Nigeria and Kurdistan. However, many more countries receive support. During 1999, the Fund considered 256 applications, of which 53 were approved for support. Average amount of support is approximately USD 10 500,- The Fund demands a general audited statement of the recipient organisations.

Funding:

The total amount granted by the Fund to human rights organisations since its establishment is approximately NOK 34 million. Allocations to the Fund in 1999 amounted to NOK 4.8 million, of which approximately 70 % was provided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the rest by the member organisations. Annual allocations for the Fund have varied between approximately NOK 3 million and 6 million during the four-year evaluation period.

Executive Summary

The Norwegian Human Rights Fund has now been operational for a little more than 12 years. It has been granting assistance to human rights work in countries and territories where few other donors are inclined to support human rights initiatives. Since its inception in 1988, the Fund has supported 472 projects carried out by 345 organisations in 74 countries, primarily in Asia, Africa, South America and the Middle East. The mandate of the Fund is to provide venture capital to organisations active in the first line of defence of human rights. The Fund is owned by seven Norwegian NGOs, each of which has a representative on the Board. In addition, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Norwegian chapter of Amnesty International have observer places on the Board (from 2001, Amnesty International is a full member). The Fund is financed partly by the member NGOs which contribute one third of the budget, and partly by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs which funds the remaining two thirds of the budget.

Internal evaluations of the Fund were undertaken in 1994 and 1997. However, after more than ten years of existence, both the member organisations and the MFA requested that a comprehensive external and independent evaluation should be carried out in order to examine the effect of Fund assistance on the human rights situation in specific countries. The Danish Centre for Human Rights was commissioned to carry out this task. The main purposes of the evaluation were:

1. *To provide information on the experience of the Norwegian Human Rights Fund for the period 1996–99 in administering funds to local human rights projects in low-income countries.*
2. *To find out whether the grants have been used according to the project descriptions and whether they have had the expected effect on the human rights situation as outlined in the mandate of the Fund.*
3. *To assess the effect upon the member organisations of the Fund and whether the Fund has met expectations of its member organisations.*

Three country cases were selected for the evaluation: India, Liberia and Nigeria. In India, the Fund has mainly supported human rights work in the state of Tamil Nadu. The findings of the evaluation are clustered under three main headings.

Administration of Support. The initiatives taken after the internal evaluation in 1997 have served to strengthen the administrative procedures of the Fund. The Fund now operates to the overall satisfaction of its stakeholders among the NGOs and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Board meets regularly and provides good guidance for the secretariat. However, considering the very wide scope of human rights activities supported by the Fund, there is very little learning and competence development, either within the Fund in particular or in Norway among members and stakeholders in general. This is partly due to the fact that monitoring of project support is weak, and partly because staff capacity is barely sufficient to carry out the routine processing of an increasing number of applications. Moreover, a formula for intensified co-operation with member organisations has not yet been found. Thus, in all of the country cases, there was no co-operation between the NGOs supported and the member organisations. Co-operation between supported NGOs and embassies was evident only in Nigeria.

Some expansion of secretariat manpower is warranted. The current co-ordination of the secretariat by a manager who can only spend about 7 per cent of his working hours at the Fund seems not entirely commensurate with the ambitions of a professional operation.

The most important means to create closer ties to member organisations seems to be to involve them in joint project reviews and joint

information seminars in Norway and in joint workshops in the recipient countries. A full-time or part-time manager would be well placed to co-ordinate such tasks in addition to other administrative responsibilities.

It is important to resolve the problem of the Fund's location. In this respect, it would be worth considering that, despite intentions to move the Fund since the 1997 evaluation, it has remained in the same place since the mid-1990s. This notwithstanding, the ownership of member organisations does not seem to have been weakened by this fact. It seems possible to resolve the issue of hosting the Fund by moving it a) to a new host among the member organisations, or b) to an independent place. A third possibility is c) to settle for the current location. In any case, a decision should be made to find a permanent site for the Fund in order that the issue of placement should not take up any unnecessary energy.

As regards the focus of support provision, the decision to concentrate on priority countries has been good, whereas the continued assistance to non-priority countries seems questionable, especially where funding is only undertaken once or twice – as is the case in 25 per cent of the funding in the period 1996–99. Instead of operating both in priority countries and in other countries where monitoring is only possible to a limited extent, the Fund could decide to operate exclusively in nine to ten priority countries over a five-year period, and admit new countries only when others are abandoned. For any priority case adopted, it should be possible to have local consultants elaborate on the human rights situation and priorities.

As regards the type of support, 56 per cent of the grants have been defined as grants for human rights in general or for civil and political rights. Another 42 per cent are defined as support for economic, social and cultural rights or women's and children's rights. Though this might be perceived to be a sensible division, the overriding concern must be to allow country circumstances and the needs of the local

organisations in the difficult countries define the character of assistance.

In relation to the type of countries supported, it must be observed that the Fund has provided support to both low-income *and* middle-income countries. Given the fragile human rights situation in many middle-income countries, this seems justified. However, it is probably useful to retain some general guidelines, which require that a little more than half of the grants should be targeted at low-income countries. Secondly, the Fund has not only supported education, information and documentation work, as often emphasised in Fund documents, but a much wider range of work, including litigation. Such a diversion from stated practice is also well justified.

With regard to the financial management and support, the member organisations have generally provided a little less than one third of the funding. Administration costs have increased somewhat since 1996, but are still around 10 per cent, which seem reasonable. Likewise, the Nigerian support system, where the Norwegian Embassy in Lagos has screened applications, is considered to have worked well in that particular setting but would not function equally well in other contexts such as in South India or Liberia. It might work in other priority countries, e.g. Brazil, though this is difficult to assess without having visited these countries.

Concerning financial reporting from recipient organisations, it would be advisable to apply uniform criteria for financial reporting, especially if long-term projects are accepted in the future. It would also be advisable to monitor key financial data of the Fund in annual reports on a comparative basis to enable current financial flows to be compared to past practice. During the period under review, the large net capital accumulated during the early period has been consumed to satisfy a growing number of approved grants. This seems a sensible development, as there are no reasons why the Fund should accumulate large savings.

As the embassy in Lagos is channelling human rights support outside the framework of the Fund, and as this assistance might even increase in the future, there might be a need to distinguish between the various forms of assistance by establishing guidelines or clear divisions of labour. However, there might also be prospects for achieving economies of scale or cost sharing in the sense that the local consultant could be used for screening both Fund projects and other human rights projects. In any case, the current input by the local consultant of four workdays per month does not seem sufficient to cover the need for monitoring Fund projects. Additional resource costs including costs of travelling in Nigeria should thus be considered. The Nigerian cost of administering Fund projects should be accounted for in the general Fund administration costs. Moreover, the principle that organisations which receive donor aid in excess of USD 100,000 may not receive Fund assistance seems relevant to observe in Nigeria in order to distinguish Fund-eligible projects from other MFA human rights projects. In addition, other distinguishing criteria might also be needed.

Relevance of Support and Organisational Performance. The three case countries all represent human rights situations where the Fund can make an important impact. Generally, the types of projects supported do appear relevant against this background. Legal aid, networking, documentation, awareness-raising, and human rights education and empowerment projects are among the most important categories of projects. They seem to be relevant in the different country contexts and in line with the mandate of the Fund.

Although many of the organisations supported operate in environments that are both competitive and threatening, they have mastered important skills such as co-operating formally or informally. In terms of organisational management and democracy, consultations with staff seemed to constitute the weakest part of internal democracy in many organisations, while board meetings ensured

that there was some democratic control on project managers. As regards the gender composition of the NGOs, there was a fairly good composition of the boards in most cases, but the most visible and important jobs do still tend to be allocated to men. The greatest threat to the democratic governance of organisations seemed to be, however, when an organisation remained essentially the domain of a charismatic leader, often the founder of the NGO.

In two respects the organisational performance of organisations supported was found to be deficient. The approach to training adopted by many Indian organisations could be better defined. Secondly, many organisations would benefit from adopting project planning methodologies such as logical framework planning or strategic planning. One deficiency of project work that was symptomatic of every organisation visited was the lack of systematic monitoring of own activities. Therefore, in settings where the Fund operates for several years, one possibility would be to organise project planning workshops as joint efforts between Norwegian embassies, the Fund and its member organisations.

Effectiveness and Efficiency of Aid. The projects have contributed to the achievement of substantial target group benefits in Nigeria and South India, much in accordance with project objectives. The approach taken by many NGOs of combining legal aid and litigation with training, income generation, and documentation seems to be effective in engendering target group benefits, in some cases for a substantial number of people. Women constitute the most important target group in South India, whereas in Nigeria and Liberia organisations target disadvantaged groups more generally.

The Fund projects have contributed positively to a growing respect for human rights in two of the three case countries. The Nigerian projects have had effects both in terms of target group benefits, in terms of contributing to human rights awareness nationally, and in terms of legal and political effects. In the Liberian case,

the conclusion is that the supported projects seem to have had more effect on national politics and human rights awareness than on direct target group benefits. The effects at the national level have facilitated a less oppressive atmosphere around human rights. This has been brought about by the apparent impression made on the President and his chief advisors by human rights activism according to journalists as well as human rights activists. Nevertheless, the human rights situation in Liberia remains difficult despite these achievements.

In Tamil Nadu, the projects in general are not targeting state human rights politics directly, so it is perhaps hardly surprising that they have had little apparent effect at this level. The Fund projects operate mainly with backward linkages aimed at rights-based empowerment and income generation of marginalized groups in rural areas.

In most cases, the Fund has received good value for money provided. In terms of cost effectiveness, areas of concern are the level of spending for institutional costs, including salaries or honorariums for managing staff and office rent. Concerning the appropriateness of grant size and flow, funding has been too parsimonious in some cases, while in others, for no good reason, it has been quite lavish.

While in Nigeria and Liberia a growing emphasis on benefiting rural target groups seems warranted, in South India there seems to be a need to combine an overriding rural focus with advocacy support at the state level in Tamil Nadu and eventually Karnataka. In all of the three case countries visited, human rights defence must be combined with rights-focused improvements of economic, social and cultural rights.

Institutional capacity-building in the context of difficult human rights situations must largely be financed by donors; it therefore seems necessary to develop a more consistent practice in this area. It is recommended that an overhead of up to one third of the entire appropriation be granted for institutional support, if a convincing

budget of activities is provided. Finally, it is deemed to be important that the Fund is not only seen as a one-off provider of seeds, but as a facilitator of processes which enable young organisations to develop into mature ones. This is already the practice in priority countries evaluated, but it must be recognised explicitly as a policy with the result that differentiation as regards the duration of projects prevails. Presently, there is no systematic distinction between the funding of an organisation which is receiving its first funding, and one which is receiving its third. However, it is possible to envisage that organisations after proper accounting and reporting of their first funding could receive a grant for a three-year project, but with a mid-term evaluation based on reporting from the projects built into the process.

1 Background

The Norwegian Human Rights Fund was established in 1988 by Norwegian non-governmental organisations to protect and promote human rights internationally. The following institutions/NGOs are today members of the Fund: the Norwegian Institute of Human Rights; Norwegian Church Aid; Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions; Church of Norway Council on Ecumenical and International Relations; Norwegian People's Aid; Norwegian Red Cross; and Save the Children Norway. The Fund is a supplement to the member organisations' own aid activities, and is governed by a Board consisting of representatives from the member organisations. The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Norwegian Chapter of Amnesty International are observers on the Board, though from 2001 the latter partakes as a full member. Until 1995, the secretariat rotated between each the member organisations for three-year periods in order to sustain a sense of ownership.

The member organisations share the belief that more international support should be channelled to the first line of defence in the struggle for human rights, i.e., local, voluntary, human rights activities. Relatively small, flexible grants (USD 10,000 on average) are therefore given to organisations and groups working locally, regionally, or nationally in low or medium-income countries to promote and protect human rights, be they civil, cultural, economic, political or social rights. The organisations often work in difficult situations, both politically and materially. Applications to the Fund may be submitted at any time, and are processed continuously throughout the year. The Fund aims at answering applications rapidly.

According to the guidelines of the Fund, organisations with little or no other foreign support are given priority, and organisations are often supported in their initial phase. Due to this, and to the limited capacity of the Fund's

secretariat to follow up and visit the projects, the grants have often been characterised as "high risk" grants. However, in the last couple of years, the Fund has put more emphasis on following up reporting from the projects. A written report and an audited financial report showing how the grant was used must be submitted to the Fund. The same organisation can normally receive a maximum of three grants from the Fund, and satisfactory reporting is a stated precondition for repeated support.

One third of the Fund's budget is supposed to stem from the member organisations, with MFA contributing the remaining two thirds. In its more than ten-year-long life, NHRF has assisted 472 projects carried out by 345 different organisations in 74 countries in Asia, Africa, South America and the Middle East in their efforts to enhance human rights respect and fulfilment in recipient countries. The total amount granted to these organisations is about NOK 34 million.

1.1 The present evaluation

Internal evaluations were undertaken in 1994 and 1997. However, for 2000, both the member organisations and MFA wanted a broad external and independent evaluation that took into account the effects on the human rights situation of Fund projects in specific countries. The ToR stated the main purposes of the evaluation as being

1. To provide information on the experience of the Norwegian Human Rights Fund in the period 1996–99 in administering funds to local human rights projects in low-income countries.
2. To find out whether the grants have been used according to the project descriptions and whether they have had the expected effect on the human rights situation as outlined in the mandate of the Fund.

3. To assess the effect upon the member organisations of the Fund, and to what degree the Fund has met expectations of its member organisations. The more specific ToR are reproduced in Annex 1.

This report presents the results and conclusions of the evaluation which took place between October and December 2000 and included visits to South India, Liberia and Nigeria.

The evaluation was undertaken by the Danish Centre for Human Rights. A team of five consultants have been involved in the evaluation, the main part of which took place between early October and late December 2000.

The method adopted by the team is comparative, based on uniform approaches adopted in the three case countries. The report is based on:

- Country and institutional context reports elaborated by local consultants;
- Selection of approximately six organisations in each case country case which has received support from the Fund
- In-depth interviews with management and staff in the organisations on organisational strategy, capacity, objectives and outputs of last-funded project, operational networks, other donors, funding appropriateness, and target group focus
- Collection of documentary material from the organisations
- Interviews with particular stakeholders, such as other donors, relevant authorities, other NGOs, or Norwegian embassy personnel
- Visits to selected target groups and interviews with target group members, particularly in India and in Nigeria.

1.2 The history of the Fund

The establishment of the Fund in 1988 – the year preceding the end of the Cold War – coincided with widespread human rights violations, acute crises and wars, and limited popular and democratic participation in many parts of the world. The Fund was established with the purpose of enabling marginalized populations and people to become masters of their own fate. Such groups were seen to need resources in order to fight for human rights in their countries. Local human rights organisations were quite central in this struggle as they were seen as the vanguard in the fight for individual participation and the general promotion of human rights.

The Fund was established outside the scope of media campaigns in order to stay clear of the ad hoc character of media-created reality. It was also the result of an unorthodox alliance in the sense that church organisations, the labour movement and humanitarian organisations like the Red Cross in Norway came together in the struggle for human rights. This alliance, and to some degree its low-key approach to the media and to information work in Norway, was inspired by the experience of the combined Norwegian anti-apartheid efforts in the 1980s between the Church and the labour unions.

The Fund represented also an early model of co-operative ventures between private organisations and the Norwegian state. The Fund was supported by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but did not wish to become fully state-financed. For that reason, resourceful organisations like Norwegian Church Aid, Norwegian People's Aid, and Save the Children were invited to participate at an early stage.

Initially, funding was intended as risk capital or “seed capital” for newly established NGOs with limited access to funding from other donors. Support was thus given to projects which were not or could not be supported by other Norwegian governmental or private organisations. Over the years, funding criteria have been adapted somewhat to meet changing external circumstances. Based on an earmarked

supplementary grant from the MFA in 1996, it increased its support to human rights organisations in Nigeria, thereby putting emphasis on one country in particular.

During the 1990s, democratisation processes and transitional change headed by elected governments with a formal commitment to respect human rights, led to the emergence of new human rights NGOs in the South. Parallel to this development, human rights co-operation with partners in the South became increasingly important for Norwegian NGOs and resulted in a growing demand for funding from the Fund and increased pressure on the scarce human resources of the secretariat. Board discussions were devoted to the adaptation of activities to the changing realities, as manifested in the increase in the diversity of countries, the number of NGOs applying for funding, and changing conditions in Norway in general.

To assess whether the activities of the Fund were in accordance with the guidelines set out at its establishment, the Board in 1994 commissioned a researcher affiliated to The Institute for Human Rights to evaluate the Fund. The evaluation, finalised in February 1995, concluded that the Fund's activities corresponded with the rules and guidelines. However, the evaluation problematized the one-off grants and pointed to weaknesses in geographical and thematic delimitation and, particularly, in the Fund's monitoring of projects. The evaluation concentrated on the past activities of the Fund and less on the changing conditions in the South which would be relevant for future activities.

From its institution in 1988 and until its tenth anniversary in 1998, the Fund had received a total of 756 applications of which 45 per cent received funding. Altogether, 245 human rights organisations in 67 countries were funded with a total of USD 3.6 million. The membership organisations contributed one third of the funding, the MFA the other two thirds.

1.3 The 1997 Internal Evaluation

After assessing changing external conditions, the Board in 1997 decided to undertake an in-depth internal evaluation of the Fund. Questions were raised concerning the future need for the Fund, its role in relation to member organisations, the MFA and other Norwegian NGOs and research environments. Also, questions were raised as to the types of organisations to be funded, how and for how long, and whether the Fund should concentrate its activities geographically. Finally, the administrative implications of the growing demand for support were assessed.

The evaluation recommended the continuation of the Fund with the objective to provide economic support to human rights organisations in South. Assistance rendered by the Fund was to constitute a supplement to the member organisations' own activities. In addition, the evaluation report recommended that efforts be made to strengthen the sense of commitment and ownership among the member organisations and to work out clear procedures for the co-operation between the Fund, the member organisations, and the MFA. It was further recommended that the Fund should play a specific role in the implementation of official Norwegian human rights policy, supporting human rights work in selected countries and regions, thus contributing to the development of Norwegian competence in relation to these countries and regions. The Fund should strengthen its co-operation with other Norwegian human rights organisations and research environments, primarily through information exchange.

Moreover, it was recommended that the Fund should strengthen its profile as a donor providing funding for high-risk projects, i.e. concentrating mainly on supporting small, newly established or fragile organisations. Assistance to organisations operating in countries with a particularly difficult human rights situation ought to be prominent as well. One-off support for various individual projects should be continued, but project applications from well-established organisations and

applications that border on general development and democracy-building projects should be referred to the member organisations, the MFA, NORAD or other relevant donors. The numbers of organisations receiving support should be cut in order to ensure better Fund capacity in monitoring and quality management.

With respect to the administration of support, it was recommended that the Fund secretariat be permanently housed either at the Institute of Human Rights, the Church of Norway Council on Ecumenical and International Relations or the Norwegian Church Aid, in that order of priority. The secretariat should gradually be expanded to 1.5–2 positions. At the same time, however, it was also emphasised that the relation between the secretariat and the member organisations should be reinforced with the establishment of improved procedures for co-operation.

1.4 The professionalisation issue

While some of the recommendations of the 1997 evaluation were not implemented, pressure on the secretariat led to a swift increase of secretariat staffing to 1.8 positions. This led in turn to a number of initiatives to improve case handling by the secretariat, identifying the need for professionalisation and for improved communication with member organisations. Based on a proposal from the secretariat, the

Board adopted a plan for professionalisation of the Fund at its meeting on 18 March 1999, thereby complying with most of the proposals from the secretariat. Decisions were made concerning selection of priority countries and criteria for rejecting applications. Furthermore, it was decided to reduce the extent of documentation necessary for the Board's consideration of applications. Finally, it was decided that communication between the secretariat and the member organisations should be improved and that the member organisations should play a more active role in the dissemination of information about the Fund and in the handling of applications.

Throughout 1999, new criteria of support were discussed. Finally, at its meeting on 21 December the Board agreed on adding five new criteria to the existing guidelines in order to establish more exact criteria of support. It was agreed to limit the maximum cut-off level for future grants to USD 13,000, and that organisations with several other external donors or a budget of more than 100,000 dollars should receive lower priority. Similarly, projects with small target groups should also receive lower priority. It was furthermore decided not to fund projects dependent on co-funding from other donors. Likewise, it was agreed that applications with insufficient information should be rejected, unless special circumstances indicated otherwise. These criteria are still in force at the time of the evaluation.

2 The Administration of Support

NHRF has a small secretariat (1.8 positions), a “coordinator” (a maximum capacity of 7 per cent of a full-time position) and a Board of seven members and two observers.

The Board meets every four–six weeks according to the rules of procedure for Board meetings. In 1997, there were 11 Board meetings. As regards office accommodation, NHRF is supposed to alternate between the membership organisations every three years. However, since 1995, NHRF has been located on the premises of the Church of Norway Council on Ecumenical and International Relations although it was due to move on during 1997. No such move has taken place, however, although the recommendation set out in the 1997 internal evaluation was that NHRF should be housed at the Norwegian Institute of Human Rights. NHRF’s host organisation has provided the coordinator’ in addition to office space and accounting assistance, but has been reimbursed for these services over the Fund budget.

2.1 The secretariat

During 1999, the secretariat received 256 applications of which 53 were given support. The secretariat receives the applications, in most cases directly from the organisations in question. In the case of Nigeria, however, applications are forwarded via the Norwegian embassy in Lagos. The secretariat evaluates applications on the basis of the quality of the proposals and their human rights relevance, on the basis of whether the applications fall under NHRF’s mandate, and on the basis of information about the applicant, including an assessment of the previous reporting of the applicant. As many organisations have received funding more than once, the reporting to NHRF plays an important role in assessing applications.

Upon evaluating proposals, the secretariat solicits information from its own network of

funding institutions in Norway and internationally and from the member organisations. In this regard, the secretariat receives valuable support from the member organisations.

When applications are rejected by the secretariat, the Board is informed thereof and of the causes of rejection. Likewise, when applications are accepted by the secretariat, a summary of the recommendation is forwarded to the Board for its consideration. The Board rarely challenges the recommendations of the secretariat. However, the secretariat submits difficult cases for the consideration by the Board. The Board thus provides guidance on the overall principles of support.

The secretariat is presently composed of a human geographer and two political scientists, one of whom functions as coordinator. Presently, the secretariat masters English, Spanish, and French languages. According to the members of the secretariat, 95 per cent of their work in Norway is spent on processing applications and making follow-up queries on reports from organisations. Upgrading of staff qualifications takes place through participation at seminars in Norway and on travels to the priority countries. However, it is the perception of the secretariat is that there is too little time for institutional learning and competence development. During one year, one staff member has processed 150 applications and undertaken one follow-up journey, a workload which also reflects the fact that NHRF has received a progressively growing number of applications.

As a result of the internal evaluation of 1997, it was decided that the secretariat should undertake visits to the priority countries. NOK 70,000 was set aside for secretariat travels in 1999. The secretariat members, respectively, undertook two journeys to Nigeria and to Egypt in 1999. Reports from these visits are available in Norwegian. In 1998, the following six

countries were visited on three separate occasions, visits which also involved the current president of the Board: Liberia, Nigeria, Brazil, Colombia, Nepal and India. Reports are available in Norwegian from NHRF. Despite the reforms undertaken and the possibility of visiting priority countries, the secretariat still feels constrained in its professional work, not least because it handles applications and reports from inexperienced organisations whose reporting standards, moreover, are often lacking. The need for inclusion of new members or observers on the Board with broad development experience was emphasised as one possibility to strengthen the standards of the organisation. However, it does not seem commensurate with the ambitions of a great level of professionalisation that the current manager is only available for Fund work for what amounts to 7 per cent of a full-time position.

2.2 The applicants and the scope of support 1996–99

A growing number of applications have been received by NHRF during the period 1996 to 1999. As the table in Annex 3 shows, the number of applications increased from 114 in 1996 to 256 in 1999.

The majority of the applications derived from Asia and Africa (about 71 per cent), with the remainder from Latin America, the Middle East and Europe. In 1997, in comparison, 72 per cent came from Asia and Africa with Nigeria prevailing, while the remainder derived from Latin America and the Middle East (each 12 per cent), and Europe (3 per cent). NHRF received applications from 87 countries. Knowledge of NHRF has thus reached quite a broad group of countries, mostly in the South and the Middle East, while less information seems to be available on NHRF in the East. Thus, if the criteria for Fund support are only the human rights situation and concomitant needs for assistance, there is one area where NHRF so far has not managed to extend its support. The new independent states of the former Soviet Union, both in Central Asia and Caucasia, are

inadequately covered by current support. However, these regions are characterised by grave human rights situations.

The question remains, however, to what degree NHRF should disperse its support. In 34 countries, grants have been given twice or less. It must be stressed that the present evaluation cannot provide adequate conclusions for these countries inasmuch as the focus has been restricted to three priority countries.

As a result of the recommendations of the 1997 evaluation, it was decided to select a number of priority countries. According to the minutes of the Board meeting of 18 March 1999, priority countries are countries where the human rights work is particularly difficult and where the need for support is particularly great. Currently, there are nine priority countries: Colombia, Brazil, Mexico, Egypt, Bhutan, India, Liberia, Nigeria and Kurdistan.

In the period 1996–99, these nine countries together with major recipients Nepal, Kenya, Israel, the Palestinian territories, Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand and Peru have received almost 75 per cent of the total funding. The remaining 25 per cent, i.e. approximately USD 617,000, have been dispersed among 41 countries, an average of about USD 15,000 per country over a four-year period. It can be questioned whether this dispersal of resources, often with disbursements once or twice only in a given country, should be continued.

As to the type of human rights work supported during 1998 and 1999, 36 per cent of grants have been for human rights work in general, 20 per cent for civil and political rights, 20 per cent for economic, social and cultural rights, 13 per cent for women's rights, 9 per cent for children's rights and the remainder for other types of human rights work, including environmental support.

While the categories used might be fairly broad and the support for projects is often of an integrated nature incorporating different dimensions of human rights work, two

dimensions of the support seem particularly important to mention: 1) The nature of support is often broader than support for education, information and documentation, which sometimes is mentioned as the primary type of support, and 2) there has been considerable support for economic, social and cultural rights in recent years, i.e., for a type of human rights support which is not so common among other donors.

Lastly, it is often claimed that NHRF supports human rights work in low-income countries. This is, however, a statement which requires some modification. According to the commonly accepted definitions of low and middle-income countries employed by the World Bank, four of the current priority countries are medium-income countries, while four are low-income countries.

2.3 Financial management

As Annex 5 shows, the member organisations have contributed between 26–30 per cent of total funding. The member organisations have thus had some difficulties in meeting the one-third share of total contributions usually stated in the annual reports. The administration costs have been in the order of between 5–10 per cent of total grants (without however including the costs of administration in Nigeria). Characteristically, administration costs have increased since 1996 due to the expansion of staff since then, but administration costs at 10–15 per cent of total expenditure can hardly be said to be unreasonable given the geographically dispersed nature of grants and the poor reporting procedures of organisations. It should be realised that there is a limit to the degree to which economies of scale can be achieved with an annual turnover of NOK 5–6 million. If, as recommended in this report, greater competence-building efforts and greater involvement of member organisations are aimed at, the manpower of the secretariat should be increased somewhat.

However, within the Fund itself, there have been some difficulties in establishing a total

overview of spending and contributions for the period in question. Comparable data on spending and contributions since 1996 can be established by examining the audited accounts, but these are not immediately available to the stakeholders (see Annex 5). A monitoring framework which reported key financial data in the annual reports in a comparable manner (and in dollar denominations), might be a useful instrument for monitoring financial flows. Recently, the secretariat has taken the initiative of changing the accountant in order to gain a better insight into financial flows. This seems to be a useful initiative.

NHRF demands a general audited statement of the recipient organisations, i.e. a statement, which can also include accounts of other activities of the organisations apart from those of NHRF. However, in Nigeria, the organisations have been slow to provide proper accounting and the Fund has indulged with a less strict reporting practice due to the difficult position of the organisations fighting for human rights. The political situation in Nigeria has now changed with a more tolerant attitude of rulers towards human rights, and NHRF and the embassy have agreed to institute strict demands on organisations in accordance with practices in other recipient countries, i.e., that new funding cannot be obtained before proper audited accounts have been submitted. This would seem a proper approach, the message being that good governance and accountability must go hand in hand with human rights for both public institutions as well as for NGOs.

The balance between prudent management and risk-taking has not always been easy to strike. In some cases, for instance in Tamil Nadu, India, NHRF has simply been too cautious, at least in two project cases (e.g., Voice Trust and Rural Reconstruction and Development Project). Funding from NHRF was so small in light of the project objectives that in order to fulfil their stated goals, the organisations had to subsidise Norwegian-funded activities with means from other projects. In these cases, risk-taking was overwritten by conservatism. In the case of other organisations in Tamil Nadu (e.g., FIAN

and later PROGRESS, Tamil Nadu), the spending has been quite generous from the start.

2.4 The mandate and the member organisations

According to the statutes of NHRF, its objective is to promote respect for and protection of human rights internationally. The Board's guidelines emphasise that support can be given to organisations in low-income countries, primarily in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East, but it is also pointed out that organisations in Eastern Europe may receive support. The mandate is summarised in the ToR for the present evaluation: "The member organisations share the belief that more international support should be channelled to the first line of defence in the struggle for human rights: local, voluntary human rights activities." These formulations border on what is also stressed as central in NHRF's mandate: that NHRF should provide risk capital for new human rights organisations (seed capital) which do not receive support from many other sources. However, some uncertainty may still prevail as to the exact translation of the mandate into a firm practice, an issue that is considered in greater detail below.

2.4.1 The Board

The original intention that NHRF should provide complementary human rights support to the human rights work of its member organisations is still endorsed by the Board. However, while some Board members warned against competition from NHRF, others stressed the importance of taking risks and performing human rights work in problematic countries where few other donors venture systematically. However, only one Board member questioned in any depth the dispersed, and, in some cases, isolated grants that were disbursed only once or twice in a particular country. Others expressed some hesitation as to the dispersal of funding, but maintained nevertheless that early human rights support in oppressive or marginal countries is vital.

Another tenet to which Board members sometimes referred was the notion that NHRF should support early organisational development, possibly over three consecutive periods, after which the member organisations would take over a more consolidated type of partnership co-operation. However, there were few actual cases of this model thinking being turned into practice.

The Board members expressed an ownership relation with NHRF. Representatives of organisations which do not themselves work narrowly with human rights projects felt that they benefited from sitting on the Board in terms of achieving greater knowledge of human rights work. The example of the Norwegian Refugee Council, which developed from an NGO-owned organisation, into an independent NGO, lingered on in the formulations of Board members. However, despite the characterization of NHRF as "our organisation", most Board members emphasised that the actual institutional links between NHRF and its member organisations were weak, above and beyond the work of the Board itself. Board members would thus all admit that knowledge of NHRF in their member organisations was limited and they added that the recent efforts of the secretariat in arranging seminars (which had happened once in 1998), publishing a newsletter (which had not been sustained), and creating a special information file on NHRF for each member organisation, had not had much effect in strengthening institutional linkages.

Good intentions to strengthen links in project work in the recipient countries were expressed, but also in this context, it was readily admitted that actual co-operation was weak or non-existent beyond the provision of references by Board members for the assessment work of the secretariat.

However, in these conversations all Board members expressed an interest in strengthening co-operation. One proposal which was forwarded in these talks, was the possibility of undertaking joint project support reviews, i.e., reviewing Fund projects in missions in

which members of the Board also participated. This would seem to be a realistic way of strengthening member organisations' knowledge of Fund work as well as of gaining enhanced information about the overall effect of Fund support.

Concerning the institutional and organisational development of the Fund, the Board members expressed a general satisfaction with the work of the secretariat and the way in which Board meetings were prepared. Members who had previously served on the Board during the mid-1990s, felt that improvements had taken place in relation to the preparation of meetings, country information, and the control of spending and grants, but the prevailing feeling was also that too little was known about the results of the support. Also, a number of Board members felt that some of the Fund's activities, which were supposed to be experimental and take place in high-risk situations, had diminished somewhat in importance. "We are not very good at taking chances", one member said.

Members of the Board agreed that some strengthening of the secretariat might be needed, but they underlined that the goal was not to create a new institution. The Board lay little importance on the effects of networking and Fund co-operation.

Two issues could be said to remain unresolved in the minds of the current Board members:

- 1) As regards the location of the Fund, previous debates had shown that unanimity could not be reached on this issue. Currently, Board members expressed no explicit or strong opposition to a permanent location for the Fund, but joint ownership nevertheless remained an important aspect of that particular discussion. Some organisations would also argue that they did not have the capacity to host the Fund.
- 2) As regards a more focused approach to the support of the Fund, ambiguity prevailed among Board members. One reason for this is that Board members preferred not to take

a stand on this point until the present evaluation had taken place.

Finally, the Board members raised the question of whether the right member organisations were represented on the Board although they did not come up with any specific proposals. The idea of having NORAD on the Board as an observer organisation was generally positively received.

2.4.2 The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

The MFA has an observer role on the Board like Amnesty International (up to 2001 when the latter becomes a full member). However, Amnesty International preferred not to take part in the evaluation as it had only played a limited role during the period of the evaluation.

Previous MFA observers on the Board stressed the importance of complementarity and risk-willingness when discussing the mandate of the Fund. They saw the Fund as relieving MFA of the burden of having to handle many small applications, which would otherwise have to be treated by the Ministry. Moreover, the Fund provided an opportunity of channelling support in situations where the Ministry would have difficulties in doing so. The Fund was seen as providing vital assistance on occasion in situations in which MFA could not take risks or political sensitivities constrained action. Thus, the importance of small-scale support, of risk-willingness and of politically operational channels was emphasised in the statements of MFA.

Some MFA observers agreed that NORAD should be given observer status on the Board, among other reasons to promote similar development standards of sustainability and monitoring support as in development aid. However, as with the member organisations, it was generally emphasised that the Fund should operate in countries where NORAD was not present. As to the possibility of increasing allocations to the Fund, the MFA representatives expressed no clear policy. Obviously, this was an issue on which they preferred to wait until more careful discussions

had been undertaken within the Ministry. What they did assert, however, was that the Fund provided an important alternative channel of support which was appreciated by MFA both for political reasons and the relief it provided in terms of Ministry workloads.

As regards the specific arrangement in Nigeria, Fund operations constituted a much appreciated area of activities at the Norwegian Embassy in Lagos inasmuch as they allowed Embassy personnel to gain a better understanding of the profound political changes going on in the country. The Embassy's First Secretary was in charge of the administration assisted by a Nigerian consultant hired to assess and monitor projects four days a month. However, both the consultant and the first secretary saw the monitoring part as the weak link, especially outside Lagos. Additional resources seem to be required, but such costs should possibly also be seen in the context of the other human rights activities at the Embassy, which could become quite substantial in the future.

2.5 Other stakeholders in Norway

A very important additional source of knowledge and information in the Norwegian human rights landscape is NORAD. A division of labour between the Fund and NORAD in human rights work was originally established in the sense that the Fund was to constitute an alternative to the human rights assistance channelled via NORAD.

However, such a division should not preclude the mutual exchange of knowledge and experience. While some exchange had taken place between the Fund secretariat and the NORAD Division for Human Rights and Democracy, there was little knowledge in NORAD about the specific work of the Fund. In addition, however, the criteria often used in development assistance of sustainability, capacity and institutional development, log-frame analysis, etc. did not always seem to play a significant role in the considerations of the Board or the secretariat. Thus, mutual benefits could be derived from enhanced cooperation

between Fund operations and NORAD assistance in HR+D. One possibility could be to invite NORAD as an observer on the Board of the Fund.

2.6 Communication strategies and networks in Norway

In the context of its tenth anniversary in 1998, a seminar was organised by the Fund for membership organisations and other stakeholders in Norway and a small number of representatives from recipient organisations. Apart from that, and from the attempt to create a newsletter, little has been done to inform the Norwegian public about the work of the Fund. During its first years in operation, human rights support was more controversial than currently. A low profile was believed to be the most appropriate strategy without necessarily hiding information from the public. However, with the increasingly prominent position gained by human rights work during the last seven years of the 1990s such a position seems no longer warranted. Today, it seems rather that the main constraint in making the Fund more known in Norway is Fund and member organisation capacity. Targeted and specialised communication is likely to be in most demand since the public might be generally well informed about human rights work abroad. However, targeted information for a specialised audience requires some preparation which the Fund and the member organisations can only reasonably be expected to provide at intervals of two to three years.

Capacity is therefore a real constraint in this regard. Needless to say, the Fund does have a specific information mandate in relation to human rights work and situations in the more marginal regions and countries (knowledge-wise and economically) in which it works. The general public may not constitute the most appropriate target for such information work, but the membership organisations themselves, the social science research community, development NGOs and humanitarian stakeholders are appropriate targets for this type of information work. It seems thus that

seminars of the type organised in 1998, but with a specific focus on human rights work in fragile and unstable conditions, could represent a setting for useful information work at three-yearly intervals, though bearing in mind that the Fund has little capacity for such arrangements. In these contexts, it might be fruitful to liaise with the membership organisations

2.7 Conclusions

1. The Fund has strengthened its administration of support in recent years. Improvements have taken place since the internal evaluation in terms of administrative procedures and guidelines, the preparation of board meetings and with respect to monitoring the reporting of recipient organisations. The Fund operates professionally and to the overall satisfaction of its stakeholders among the NGOs and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
2. However, for the very wide scope of human rights activities that the Fund supports, there is very little learning and competence development either within the Fund or among Norwegian stakeholders. This is partly due to the fact that the monitoring of project support is weak – an issue we treat below – but also because staff capacity is only sufficient to attend to the handling of growing numbers of applications, with the exception of the biannual visits paid to priority countries by staff. But learning and competence development suffer also because a formula for strengthened co-operation with member organisations has not yet been found.
3. It seems thus justified to suggest that the Fund should have a secretariat that is coordinated by a manager able to work *at least* for 50 per cent of a full-time position. A full-time manager could be well justified, but the expansion of the secretariat is also a political decision to be taken by the Board, in line with its visions for the Fund. Staff expansion is nevertheless called for, but whether to employ a part-time or a full-time manager is a debatable issue. A full-time manager would mean increased administration costs to around or beyond 15 per cent administration. Irrespective of the level of staff expansion, the additional administrative input should be used for 1) organisation of seminars in Norway with a focus on the human rights situation in some of the more challenging countries in which the Fund operates; 2) organisation of joint monitoring and evaluation visits to recipient organisations by Fund personnel, member organisations, and local consultants; 3) additional input to follow-up activities in relation to the reporting of recipient organisations.
4. Although the efforts to enhance professionalisation have been successful, there is agreement among member organisations that the Fund should not develop into a new NGO. Thus the major stakeholders are unanimous that the current overriding structure of a fund owned by member NGOs should be retained. However, in this respect the accommodation issue seems particularly important to resolve. It seems worth considering that, despite intentions of moving the Fund since the internal evaluation, it has been housed in the same place since the mid-1990s. Yet the ownership of member organisations does not seem to have weakened by this fact. It should be possible to resolve the Fund's housing problem by a) either settling for the current place, or b) moving it to either an independent office or to one of the member organisations. In the latter case, however, this should be done only if the new location is a permanent one in order to avoid the issue recurring at a future date and wasting unnecessary energy.
5. As regards the focusing of the funding support, the decision to concentrate on priority countries has been important and good, but the continued assistance to non-priority countries is questionable especially where funding is only undertaken once or

twice, as is the case in 25 per cent of the funding 1996–99. The case studies below show that networking and coalitions constitute vital elements in areas of first line of defence of human rights, but also that long-term support is warranted. It seems quite clear that with the dispersal of one-off or twice-off funding among 41 countries over a four-year period, any monitoring and regular follow-up are virtually impossible, or very costly in comparison with total grants to the country. There is and will remain a certain conflict between providing human rights support to most countries of the world and undertaking a well-prepared project assessment and proper monitoring of the projects selected. Such a choice of concentration, however, should not be seen as a change in the Fund's mandate. The mandate itself is quite appropriate. The problem is in its implementation in such a vast number of countries.

6. In addition, it must be observed that the selection of priority countries has not been prepared in a very thorough manner. Two recommendations arise from these observations. Firstly, the Fund could decide to operate exclusively in nine to ten priority countries over a four-year period and only to admit new areas when others are abandoned. Secondly, for any priority case adopted, it should be possible to have local consultants assess the human rights situation and priorities, much in line with what has been done for this evaluation report in Nigeria, Liberia and India.
7. As regards the type of support, 56 per cent of the grants have been defined as grants for human rights in general or for civil and political rights, while 42 per cent are defined as support for economic, social and cultural rights or women's and children's rights. Given the findings in the chapters below, this seems a sensible division, but the overriding concern must be to let the context and the needs of the organisations in the countries in question define the character of assistance. However, two

observations are important in this context. Firstly, the Fund has provided support to low-income countries as well as to middle-income countries. Given the fragile human rights situation in many middle-income countries, this seems justified. Moreover, we believe it would be useful to retain the general guideline that a little more than half of the grants should be targeted at low-income countries. Secondly, the Fund has not only supported education, information and documentation work as often emphasised in Fund documents, but a much wider range of work including litigation.

8. As regards financial management and funding, the member organisations have generally provided a little less than one third of the total funding. Better financial monitoring of total spending and contributions must be established, a fact which seems to be recognised within the secretariat already. Administration costs have increased somewhat since 1996, but are still around 10 per cent, which seems reasonable. During the period under review, the large net capital accumulated during the early period has been consumed in order to satisfy a growing number of grants. This seems to be a sensible development as there are no reasons why the Fund should accumulate large savings.
9. Concerning financial reporting by recipient organisations, we recommend the application of uniform criteria of financial reporting, not least if a more concentrated effort is chosen to limit assistance to ten priority countries. Within the Fund itself, there have been some difficulties in establishing a total overview of spending and contributions for the period in question. Comparable data on spending and contributions since 1996 can be established by examining the audited accounts, but these are not immediately available to the stakeholders (see Annex 5). A monitoring framework which reported key financial data in the annual reports in a comparable

manner (and in dollar denominations) might be a useful instrument for monitoring financial flows. Recently, the secretariat has taken the initiative of changing the accountant in order to gain a better insight into financial flows.

10. Concerning the Nigerian support arrangement whereby the Norwegian Embassy in Lagos has screened applications, this arrangement has worked positively in that particular setting, but could not have been applied in other contexts such as South India or Liberia. It might work in other priority countries such as Brazil, but we feel unable to comment specifically on arrangements in countries that we have not visited. As the embassy in Lagos is channelling human rights support outside the framework of the Fund, and as this assistance might even increase in the future, there might be a need to distinguish between the various forms of assistance by

establishing guidelines or clear divisions of labour. However, there might also be prospects for achieving economies of scale or cost sharing in the sense that local consultants are used for screening both Fund projects and other human rights projects. In any case, the current input of the local consultant of four person-days per month does not seem sufficient to cover the need for monitoring Fund projects.

Additional resource costs including costs of travelling in Nigeria should thus be considered. The Nigerian costs of administering Fund projects should be accounted for in general Fund administration costs. Moreover, the already defined principle that organisations which receive donor aid in excess of USD 100,000 cannot receive Fund assistance should probably be observed in Nigeria in order to distinguish Fund-eligible projects from other MFA human rights projects. In addition, other distinguishing criteria might also be needed.

3 Country and Institutional Context of Assistance in India, Liberia and Nigeria

Often-applied evaluation criteria are that the assistance must be *efficient*, not least cost-effective, *effective*, i.e., achieving project goals; and it must have a positive *impact*, i.e., the long-term intended or unintended implications of aid must be positive; *relevancy*, i.e., it must address and improve conditions that are important in the context; and it must be *sustainable*. This chapter provides some of the background information that is used in the following chapters for assessing the relevance of aid and the effectiveness and efficiency of organisational strategies in dealing with national or local human rights problems. The issue of sustainability is only assessed generally since it was not part of the ToR for this work.

3.1 The human rights context in India, Liberia and Nigeria

The human rights situations in the three case countries are all distinct, yet they are united in defining a continuous need of support for first line human rights defence. While in *India* there has been a growing interest in and awareness of human rights in the political rhetoric at the national level and in the very outspoken press since the mid-1990s, violations of human rights by state forces are still rampant. Despite extensive constitutional and statutory safeguards, India continues to have significant human rights abuses. Abuses prevail in areas with insurgency movements such as Jammu and Kashmir, in areas with caste clashes, as in the states of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, and Tamil Nadu, and finally in areas where the livelihood of indigenous groups or tribal populations is threatened by population pressures, agricultural expansion and investments by private companies. The Dalit (scheduled castes) and tribal populations have been recognised and protected by the so-called SCST legislation which ensures positive affirmation and compensatory measures for the scheduled

castes and scheduled tribes.¹ However, these measures are far from ensuring that discrimination does not occur. The combined effect of globalisation and “Brahminisation”, i.e., the upsurge of Hindu nationalism, has affected these groups negatively according to some of the observers.

The selection of Tamil Nadu State as the main focus of the Fund’s support seems a very good choice inasmuch as the State represents one of the areas with very severe human rights violations. Karnataka, which is the other neighbouring state where the Fund is also operating, is probably equally justified, but so far the Fund has only supported one project in Karnataka in comparison with ten in Tamil Nadu.

The suppression of human rights in Tamil Nadu is systemic in the sense that government forces, especially the police, and the social elite are allied in what can be termed routine suppression of Dalits (scheduled castes), scheduled tribes, and landless labourers or other marginalized and vulnerable groups. Therefore, despite the prevalence of laws to prevent discrimination, social and cultural practices discriminate against these groups. Discrimination occurs with regard to access to specific public services for these groups as well as in terms of police brutality. Women and children are particularly vulnerable to such discrimination. Child labour is a specific problem in certain areas of Tamil Nadu.

In police stations and prisons, methods of police interrogation are highly questionable. Torture and ill treatment are common with the result that extra-judicial killings and deaths due to maltreatment often take place in police custody. Such treatment continues despite reporting in the press. It remains systematically biased

1) The term scheduled castes and tribes refers to the designated castes and tribes that are eligible for preferential treatment in terms of education or seats in Parliament or on local councils.

against the disadvantaged social groups mentioned above.

The human rights situation in *Liberia* during this period must be seen in the context of a country still struggling to emerge from seven years' civil war and which is even now, at the time of writing, engaged in combat in some border regions. Liberia has a long tradition of ethnic discrimination and cleavage dating back to 1847 when slaves liberated from the United States established a state for themselves disenfranchising thereby the bulk of the indigenous population for much of the post-independence period, and with little or no provision for their welfare and education by successive governments. Currently, levels of illiteracy and ignorance of basic rights – particularly in the rural areas – remain daunting, with abuses perpetrated not only by government agents, but by citizens themselves, particularly against children, who are subject to forced labour and conscription by warring parties, and against women, who are subject to routine domestic violence, abduction as “wives” as well as forced labour.

It is widely agreed that the period between President Taylor's accession as elected president in 1997 and September 1998 was marked by gross human rights violations. Many former rebel fighters were integrated into the official security forces, but it proved difficult for them to shed attitudes acquired through seven years of fighting, when they ruled and as their own lives were ruled by brute force. Despite statements made by the President to the effect that human rights would be respected, as far as we could see, not only was there an apparent lack of political will to honour these commitments, but the protection of those close to the President who had been involved in human rights violations suggested that the attitudes of the war lord had not been shed at the highest level, which of course had an impact on the behaviour of subordinates.

The present human rights situation is therefore one with a continuing need to institute a fundamental respect for human rights among

government forces which may still behave according to traditions of a warlord regime. In addition, the situation regarding economic and social rights remains extremely poor. A major watershed was past in the area of civil and political rights in 1998 when human rights groups succeeded in bringing habeas corpus acquittals for arrested soldiers of the former vice-president and achieving the acquittal in the subsequent court case of four of the nine persons arrested. However, gains on the human rights front in Liberia – where impunity has been the norm – continues to be very fragile.

Nigeria represents the most radical case in the review period during which an increasingly oppressive military regime was succeeded on the death of General Abacha by an elected government in 1999. Abacha's death and the advent of civilian rule led to an immediate improvement in the human rights situation with a release of almost all political detainees as the most immediate sign of progress. However, human rights abuse continues in cases where the military is involved (abuse of young militarised Ijaw by the armed forces) and also in such a case as the extension of Shari'a law into criminal cases with ensuing introduction of flogging and amputations introduced as punishments by the Zamfara State government at the end of 1999.

However, the most pertinent problems facing the human rights stakeholders presently seem to be to consolidate the operation of human rights law in the civil and political field as well as in economic and social areas. Political participation beyond voting at elections, the instituting of fair trials and human rights jurisprudence, the continuous curbing of police brutality and the brutality of armed private guards in the oil fields together with improved conditions in prison and detentions remain some of the more important problems in the civil and political field. In the economic and social field, the fight against poverty, sex discrimination and abuse of young women (circumcision) and widows are important social human rights problems. Access to education and health care is also below the minimum core

rights as defined under the Convention of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, especially in the northern states.

3.2 The institutional environment of human rights organisations

3.2.1 Tamil Nadu

In Tamil Nadu, as in other parts of Asia, there is a significant number of development-oriented NGOs operating, with a focus on rural areas. Many of these organisations focus on specific geographic areas and have little impact on state policy implementation. As regards human rights NGOs, there are at least five organisations that have some leverage and have adopted an advocacy mode of operation that implies wider impact than the localised scope of support. Typically, these five organisations have grown out of either a development background like for instance *Legal Resources for Social Action* which was formed in 1994 as an arm of the *Rural Development Society*, or *People's Education for Action Liberation*, which started human rights work in 1993, or the organisations have been started specifically with a human rights perspective.

Other organisations, such as *Human Rights Advocacy and Research Foundation*, started in 1994, were established with a specific human rights mission as their focus. This goes for the *Human Rights Forum for Dalit's Liberation* started in 1997 whose genesis was the National Campaign for Dalit Human Rights. Finally, the human rights monitoring organisation *People's Watch* also commenced work in 1995 with a specific human rights perspective.

Organisational development in Tamil Nadu around human rights thus dates back to the early or mid-1990s. These major organisations interact with either state government or even with institutions such as the National Human Rights Commission in New Delhi. They are more reluctant to respect and to seek assistance from the state Human Rights Commission in Chennai – an institution that does not seem to enjoy the same kind of reputation as the one in New Delhi. As regards the interaction with

governments these organisations seem to be tolerated.

In addition, the major human rights organisations do co-operate informally among themselves in several special networks e.g., the National Campaign for Dalit Human Rights, and they also have backward links to local human rights work in the rural areas of the state.

Apart from these major organisations, several hundred NGOs work to promote human rights in rural Tamil Nadu, often with a narrow geographical remit. Many of these organisations combine human rights work, environmental and rural development activities. They have often been founded by a charismatic leader who still heads the organisation. A board exists but tends to meet irregularly, and the organisation is mostly run without a membership constituency and with foreign donor money as the most important funding source. These organisations are exceptionally well connected to larger state-wide NGOs or to other agents of change, such as trade unions. These “small benevolent enterprises” are rarely endowed with a formal internal democracy and a strong professional capacity apart from that of the head. However, this does not necessarily mean that they lack a strong local grounding in their target groups and that they do not provide important services for these target groups, because they do.

3.2.2 Liberia

As regards, the institutional environment in Liberia, human rights activity in the country started against the background of the brutal civil war and uncertainties of that period. Human rights groups are required to register as non-profit associations under Liberian law. The oldest and largest human rights group in the country is the Justice and Peace Commission of the Roman Catholic Church. Founded in 1991 in response to abuses by armed groups fighting in the country during the civil war, particularly as regards the abduction of women, conscription of children, and forced labour, it monitors, documents and reports human rights violations. In addition, it provides human rights awareness

education and assistance to those whose rights are violated and it actually remains the major individual human rights organisation in the country.

There has been continuing recognition of the desirability for co-operation and co-ordination among human rights groups because human rights advocacy is perceived as disjointed, uncoordinated and individualised. The first network of human rights groups in Liberia was the Liberian Human Rights Organisations Federation (LHROF). However, this network, of which the NHRF-funded Human Rights Monitor is a member, is largely dormant, apparently due to the amount of time that its leader now has to devote to his law practice. It does not appear to offer any particular benefits to its members.

The United States and agencies such as UNICEF were instrumental in urging Liberian human rights groups to establish a formal network as the country prepared for the 1997 elections which brought President Charles Taylor to power. Two networks emerged. The first was the National Human Rights Centre of Liberia (NHRCL), which comprises eight human rights groups.

The second network, the Network of Liberian Human Rights Groups (NETWORK), was formed in the wake of the NHRCL when it became apparent that not all groups were going to be able to join the NHRCL. There was a feeling that the groups which joined the NETWORK had had to do so because they were refused membership of the NHRCL. The exact membership is uncertain, but it comprises at least eight human rights organisations.

There is some co-operation among the members of the two groups and they attend each other's workshops. A recently formed network is the Association of Grass Roots Human Rights Organisations. Only the NHRCL appears to offer its members anything other than the comfort of numbers, the others offer little in the way of training, facilities or logistical support.

Although the Liberian government established a National Human Rights Commission, this was apparently mere lip service to international commitments, as the Commission was given no funds to support its work, and the activist members who wanted to make the Commission's work a success appear to have been either sacked or, in the case of one member, beaten up at a check point and forced into exile. Although the Commission is still functioning, its latest major public function was the organising of a demonstration against the United States, for which its chairman was said to have received USD 100,000 from the President.

The funding base of Liberian human rights groups is extremely thin, the relatively small amounts contributed by the Norwegian Human Rights Fund in fact constituting a large proportion of the total support for human rights activities in the country. Major donors include the United States of America which provides funds for specific projects, but, at the present time, relations are tense between the two countries and, with elections coming up, the government alleges that the funds provided to the groups by the US government are designed to make it unpopular. Other leading donors are the Dutch Inter-Church Fund and Amnesty International (Dutch Section). There are also small grants from time to time for specific projects from some of the UN bodies. There is a clear need for institutional support, and long-term funding.

Finally, it should be noted that although political parties do exist, they hardly speak on behalf of human rights issues, and it is therefore left to civil society organisations and human rights NGOs to take up issues relating to the rights of ordinary citizens. As a result, human rights defenders in the country operate under an atmosphere of some fear and uncertainty, as supporters of the government still feel entitled to threaten to retaliate when faced with adverse comments and reports. While human rights organisations see themselves as speaking up for the people of the country, government perceives them as being anti-government. Perhaps the most noticeable evidence of the

precarious situation in which human rights defenders find themselves, is that everyone who is able to, carries around a portable radio which they use to instantly summon help if they feel in imminent danger or are actually being attacked.

3.2.3 Nigeria

In *Nigeria*, organised human rights work commenced in 1987 with the establishment of the Civil Liberties Organisation (CLO) which, in 1995, had several thousands members all over the country. Other human rights organisations followed in 1989 while Women in Nigeria (WIN), founded in the early 1980s, took on an increasingly human rights posture.

Under the regime of Ibrahim Babangida, which ended in 1993, these groups and others had come together to form the Campaign for Democracy (CD). By 1995, however, CD had split. As a result, the CLO spearheaded attempts to forge a new coalition of pro-democracy NGOs and political movements. Eventually, United Action for Democracy (UAD) was formed, with a much wider base than the CD, and it is this coalition which led the demonstrations – including the Five Million Man March in 1998 – which galvanised Nigerians into voicing their opposition to Abacha's plan to prolong his presidency.

UAD's success meant that many of its leaders were targets of the Abacha regime, while groups which had remained outside the coalition until now, wished to come under the umbrella. Groups determined to work to ease the transition, came together under the Transition Monitoring Group (TMG), and this is the largest and most widespread coalition, not least because many women's groups and organisations based in the northern part of the country joined up.

TMG played a significant role during the presidential elections. It was able to deploy 10,000 monitors who could operate parallel to and assist the international observers. At the end of the transition, although many of the larger and more established groups felt that it should dissolve, the smaller groups that had

been empowered by the TMG were anxious for it to continue, particularly as it was widely agreed that the transition to democracy was only just starting. As the departure of the larger groups was likely to weaken the coalition, many agreed to remain within the TMG which now redefined its goal to build and strengthen democracy. The TMG still exists, although it has yet to adopt a formal constitution, a circumstance that has hindered admission of new members.

Despite the repressiveness of the Abacha regime, more human rights groups were formed during this period, such as Shelter Rights Initiative, Centre for Law Enforcement Education of Nigeria, and the Justice Development and Peace Committee all of which were CLO off-shoots. Others, such as the Legal Resource Development Centre and women's rights groups such as Gender Awareness and Development Action, Baobab and the Women's Law and Development Centre, had independent beginnings.

Very few of the groups formed during the period, however, were membership organisations, and the internal politics and democratic demands of both members and employees – which they had previously observed in groups such as the CLO or the Committee for the Defence of Human Rights – meant that most of them started life with an executive director or chief executive firmly in charge, and often with an infrequently convening advisory board of governors with little more than nominal powers. Recently, there has been some concern among Nigerian human rights organisations about an influx of particularly United States-based NGOs. There have been cases where local groups have presented proposals for funding to US government funding bodies which, after rejection of the proposals, have supported similar projects carried out by recently established US-based NGOs in Nigeria. The activities of these foreign NGOs are locally perceived as disempowering as they tend to attract local staff or close off access to elected representatives.

Box 1. The Ford Foundation in Nigeria

The Ford Foundation in Nigeria has been the biggest funder of human rights projects over the past ten years. During 1999, it provided USD 4.1 million for NGOs of which 3 million was for human rights (and good governance).

The following concerns were raised concerning the human rights environment:

1. Donor dependence: it is now possible to obtain domestic inputs.
2. Legal enforcement is necessary. Previously there was an emphasis on exposure and public rallies, but now there is a need to give more priority to litigation and to embark on less confrontational strategies.
3. Donors are unprepared to provide more than project support, while institutional capacity-building is crucial. NGO management and outreach are very important.
4. Too many donors are let in, and there is too little co-ordination. Transparency is necessary between the growing number of foreign donors and the Nigerian NGOs, the latter ones being those who have struggled during the difficult times.
5. Nigerian NGOs are called "Labangos" and "Cibangos", i.e., Lagos- and city-based human rights organisations. Only five of the fifteen major human rights organisations are sustainable.

Source: Interview with Ford Foundation, Lagos, office for West Africa, 20 October 2000

3.3 Conclusions

1. In summary, the context in India is one of fighting against the systemic oppression of particular social groups, the context in Liberia is a struggle against generalised impunity, while the context in Nigeria is one of consolidating gains achieved in a country where impunity and oppression have ruled for quite long periods. In all of these three countries, the defence of human rights must be combined with rights-focused improvements of economic and social conditions.
2. Although human rights advocacy and monitoring are taking place in Tamil Nadu, the defining characteristic of the Tamil Nadu institutional environment is one of small, locally based organisations most of which combine a rights-based approach with rural development activities and empowerment. The donor base in Tamil Nadu is fairly narrow, with only a few international donors supporting human rights work.
3. In contrast, the donor funding of human rights in Nigeria is broader and international donors have started to operate in the country. The result is the emergence of competition between Nigerian and

foreign-based organisations, particularly over the last years.

Generally, the Nigerian human rights community grew quite strong during the 1990s, but a defining characteristic is that it remains stronger in the South than in the North of the country. In addition, the Nigerian human rights community, in contrast to the Tamil Nadu one, is urban rather than rural.

4. The three case countries incorporate all of the different types of human rights situations on which the Fund can make an important impact. During the period 1996–99, the erection of a first line of defence for human rights was a vital issue in these social settings. In Nigeria, the situation may now be changing to the better, but consolidation of gains achieved in reducing impunity and oppression is still vital. In Liberia the struggle is still one against general impunity and of taking human rights concern beyond the capital. In South India, in Tamil Nadu, systemic oppression and discrimination against particular social groups prevail to a degree that surprised the evaluation team. In all of the countries, the defence of human rights must be combined with rights-focused

improvements of economic, social and cultural rights.

5. While NGOs in any of the case countries are rarely organisations with large

memberships, some of the Nigerian NGOs have increasingly begun to base themselves on membership groups. However, in terms of funding, all NGOs visited depend strongly on donor allocations.

4 The Relevance of Support and Organisational Performance

The performance of the recipient organisations is closely related to the fact that human rights organisations must operate in environments where respect for and implementation of human rights are as much a matter of politics as of the rule of law. The performance of recipient organisations must be measured against this circumstance. They must also operate in conditions of poverty, reaching out to marginal populations with only an embryonic human rights jurisprudence to help them, and they often have to interact with unwilling government authorities. Moreover, the relevance of assistance must be assessed against the specific human rights context of the recipient countries and against the Fund mandate that assistance be directed towards the first line of defence for human rights. In the following, the performance of recipient organisations is discussed and aid relevance is assessed against the background of the human rights environment in the three case countries India, Liberia and Nigeria.

4.1 Classification of supported projects in India, Liberia and Nigeria

In connection with the current evaluation, seven projects have been visited and assessed in Nigeria, six in Liberia and six in South India. The assessments are based on visits to the main offices of the organisations, in some cases including visits to the target groups and local fields of operation, assessment of information of the project organisations, and interviews with local stakeholders including other donors, authorities or networking organisations. The classification of projects below is based on the characteristics of the latest-funded project of the Fund and not on the overall focus of work of the organisation in question.

Annex 7 provides a classification overview of project support by the Fund to the different organisations. In Nigeria, legal aid is prominent together with networking and awareness-raising. In Liberia, networking and human

rights education, targeting women and children in particular, are important activities. One project aims at documentation of prison conditions. In India, training combined with income generation motivation in women's groups and/or with litigation and legal aid for specific rural-based groups were the most important types of projects. In addition, the Village Reconstruction and Development Project engaged in a far-reaching research and documentation for tribal groups.

4.2 Relevance of support

Generally, the type of projects supported seems very relevant. Legal aid for vulnerable groups and networking are crosscutting themes, although not all networking activities are of equal importance. One of the projects in Nigeria, SRI, has specialised in litigation and legal aid for slum communities, which seems a highly relevant type of assistance under the circumstances in urban Nigeria. Concerning the networking initiative of Huri-Laws, while networking is of tremendous importance in Nigeria, the particular project financed seems of lesser relevance inasmuch as it is concerned with networking within ECOWAS, the West African economic community. This project might rather be seen as a second line of defence for human rights than a first line. What seems also of particular importance in Nigeria are projects which aim at providing legal aid and information about human rights in rural areas. Projects such as ND-Hero and IHRHL belong to this category although the latter project may not yet have found the exact formula for its paralegal support programme.

In Liberia, the network support to the Human Rights Centre of Liberia has proven extremely relevant in reinforcing human rights monitoring and advocacy. The prison monitoring project of LIPWA is one of the few projects in Liberia to provide solid documentation on prison conditions; similarly, the legal aid provided by the CJPC is relevant and much appreciated by

victims of human rights abuses. The human rights education targeting women by HRW is also a relevant project, not least because of its outreach in local counties, whereas LHRO's civic education workshops might be of lesser relevance because of a less well-defined approach to human rights.

In India, the VRDP effort to document tribal communities seems very appropriate, not least because of the meticulous approach adopted. Generally, the combination of awareness-raising

through training and legal assistance seemed more effective in developing a rights-based approach compared to the approach whereby organisations combined training with income generation. However, in general, the rural foundation of most projects was highly relevant, not least as rural poverty and suppression prevail. What could be useful to integrate with this rural focus of Fund projects, though, would be to include support for one of the organisations with greater influence at the state level in Tamil Nadu in the funding portfolio.

Box 2. Training Support in India

Human rights education is by far the largest single item in NHRF funding. However, the approach to training differed widely in the practical implementation of the NGOs. Thus, for example, REDC conducted four and five days' board and lodging courses and distributed a comprehensive training manual to trainees. In other cases, education consisted in local meetings of a few hours' duration.

Considering the importance and the relative size of this activity, the team would find it appropriate for the NHRF to be more explicit in the criteria for what good training is and how it should be defined in applications to the Fund.

It is recommended that the following training requirements should be met:

- The substance of the training given to specific target groups should be clear;
- The training methods should be explained, including pedagogical considerations related to the target groups;
- It should be clear who is to have responsibility for the training, and their qualifications should be made known;
- Practical requirements regarding timing and venue should be clear;
- Training material adapted to the needs of the target group should be elaborated.

4.3 Capacity and performance of recipient organisations

In chapter 6 below, organisational performance in terms of target group and advocacy effect is considered. In the remainder of this chapter, we focus on institutional capacity of organisations and their effectiveness in implementing human rights projects.

4.3.1 Professional capacity of organisations and their democracy

Lawyers play an important role in the human rights organisations in both Nigeria and Liberia, whereas in India, with the rural and developmental history of some of the organisations, a broader scope of academic disciplines are represented by the organisation

directors, such as engineers, theologians, historians, and social workers (see also Annex 8).

In Annex 6, we rank organisations according to their professional capacity. What has been important in this assessment is not only the relevance of the qualifications held by the management of the organisations, but also the presence of qualified staff in addition to the managing director. Some organisations, especially in India, have a charismatic leader at their centre and a small staff with no or little academic background to balance the omnipotence of the director. This is the background for the low scoring awarded to the first two organisations in South India. In Nigeria, while organisations often included several academic staff on their teams, in one

case there was only one person to represent the organisation in external networks or in a non-local context, with a weakening of overall institutional development as the likely result. This seemed to be the case with IHRHL. In contrast, an organisation like the SRI seemed to be able to integrate multi-functions among the academic staff enabling the organisations to master activities not only in Lagos but also in Abuja.

Under Liberian law, all human rights organisations, which register as non-profit organisations, must have a structure that includes a board of governors, directors or trustees – generally between five and nine in number. In general, board members seem to be chosen by the executive officers, although the selection may be based on support offered by well-meaning individuals in times when no foreign grants have been forthcoming. Once composed, the boards seem to function in a fairly democratic way, although the infrequency of some of the meetings leaves executive directors free to do as they choose, since there seems to be little feeling that the staff should be consulted to any degree on matters of policy.

Consultation with staff seemed also to be the weak part of the internal democracy in the Nigerian and South Indian organisations. When asked about internal democracy, most organisation leaders started to talk about their board of trustees or they simply had difficulties in understanding what was meant by the question. While the notion of good governance is well known, at least in Nigeria, organisational leaders tended to refrain from referring to their own organisations when the subject was raised.

As regards gender composition, groups in all the countries showed a fairly good gender balance in the composition of their boards and even of their staff, but the most visible and important jobs still tend to belong to men. In South India, none of the organisations supported had a female managing director, but most of them had women on their staff in important positions.

4.3.2 Professionalism in implementation

How professional are the organisations in achieving their goals? The criteria applied in the assessment of implementation (see Annex 6) relate to the correspondence between activities and goal attainment. The underlying data can be found in Annex 7–9. Additionally, an assessment of strategy coherence is also included as part of Annex 6. The coherence of strategies relates to the overall organisational strategies, the biggest problems of which seem to be that many of the organisations are operating with fairly broad sets of activities but lack a strong focus. Funding for one set of activities in one year may be succeeded by a different type of funding the following year. Broad approaches are typical in Southern India and may be justified in the sense that organisations address both rural development and human rights, but with a growing density of human rights support and with a growing importance of advocacy and networks as for instance in Nigeria and Liberia, divisions of labour and focused strategies become vital.

In India, high scores on professionalism in implementation were given to YMCA and VRDP. The YMCA project in Karnataka combined a strategy of legal action, mobilisation of rural labourers to occupy land, income generation of landless women labourers, and rights training in a carefully balanced project which matched the resources of the organisation at any given time. The latter VRDP project aimed at establishing documentation on human rights violations in tribal areas. For that purpose, the project elaborated a lengthy questionnaire with the help of a well-known research centre in Bangalore, trained staff as enumerators, selected a large number of villages for study, co-operated with another, bigger NGO on legal expertise on the legal analysis of particular case studies selected during the village interviews, and decided jointly with the research centre in Bangalore on procedures to analyse questionnaire data. All this could have almost been financed by the Fund's grant of USD 4000 to the project, including the publication of the findings. However, it turned out that the project had to

subsidise the Norwegian activities with other donor funds.

In comparison, the CFC in Nigeria also scored above average because of its well-targeted approach to different audiences involving expert panels, television coverage, journalists, and ordinary people.

In Liberia, the NHRCL has received high marks for its approach to networking. It is the prime mover in creating a network for human rights co-operation in the country. It offers workshops and training to members and non-members alike. It also offers facilities and office space when needed and also allows members to share their experience and capacity with each other, as well as fostering dynamic partnerships among its members. Thus the CJPC, which is the largest and most experienced member of the NHRCL, shares capacity with other less well-endowed members, thereby empowering and strengthening them. For example, it took part in a joint investigation into forced labour practices with FOCUS. NHRCL has also brought about the clearly logical arrangement between CALL and LIPWA, whereby CALL lawyers take cases of prolonged detention without trial identified by LIPWA to court.

These examples of some of the most professional organisations show that many of the organisations supported by the Fund, though operating in environments that are both competitive and difficult, have mastered at least three important professional skills. One is the capacity to organise the work processes effectively within a comparatively short span of time. Another is the capacity to co-operate with other stakeholders even though they might be competitors for donor money. The third is target group contact and effect, a subject to which we return in the next chapter.

However, in three respects, we found organisational professionalism deficient. One problem is the lack of a focused strategy: organisations such as CLO in Nigeria seem still to encompass a very wide set of activities from women's rights to legal advocacy, general

awareness-raising and documentation. A second problem is that the approach to training adopted by many Indian organisations tends to be rather scattered, with unclear lines of responsibility (see Box 2). Thirdly, in extension of this, many organisations, especially in India, would benefit from project planning methodologies such as logical framework planning or strategic planning. One deficiency of project work, which was common to every organisation visited, is the absence of a system for monitoring results (see Annex 8). To many activist lawyers monitoring is associated with monitoring of government human rights observance, whereas the monitoring of their own projects is an unknown field. Thus, the systematic definition of project outputs and results is not undertaken, although one-year funding may make this difficult. In relation to this, some of the project organisations would probably benefit from an introduction to project planning thinking concerning distinctions between project objectives, outputs, and activities. Such a training effort would even be advantageous in terms of refining strategic thinking in the organisations and the establishment of coherent strategies. Therefore, in settings where the Fund operates over several years, one possibility could be to organise workshops on project planning strategies as a joint effort between Norwegian embassies, the Fund and its member organisations.

4.3.3 Networking and local support

Networking is a strong feature of organisations in Liberia reflecting the fact that frontline human rights work cannot take place effectively by one organisation alone. The strongest and most attractive network seems to be the Fund-financed National Human Rights Centre of Liberia which comprises eight human rights groups. However, two other networks operate in Liberia, of which one seems largely to be dormant. The local base of the Liberian NGOs seems weaker as most NGOs are concentrated in Monrovia and have only a limited number of activities in rural areas or in regions outside Monrovia and its environs.

According to donors, the TMG in Nigeria mentioned previously is not a particularly active group presently. However, an organisation like Nigerian CLO participates in quite a number of networks on gender issues, prison reforms, and on legal advocacy. This organisation has 25,000 members. SRI belongs to five NGOs and has a membership group of 1000 people. A locally based organisation like ND-Hero in Port Harcourt is member of one popular movement and of three local research NGOs. It has a membership group of 10,000 members. These memberships contribute to the funding of their respective organisations. For instance, in the latter case, they have paid 15 Naira per head. However, payments do not seem to be very regular.²

The point here is that, despite the fact that the major TMG network has become somewhat less active, the southern Nigerian NGOs seem comparatively well integrated in formal and informal groupings and they appear to have embarked on member recruitment campaigns and funding in ways that can be developed. The Nigerian NGOs' rural links remain, however, a weak point and it seems that service provision in the form of legal aid, political support, and channelling of information and skills to member groupings and to marginalized groups should continue to be an important dimension of the Nigerian NGO work.

A second characteristic of the Nigerian and Liberian NGOs is that most of them are adapted to or trained in advocacy, lobbying, and legal aid case work. Although donors thus complain that "Few NGOs have managed to go beyond their traditional activities and do not yet have an outlook to work with government institutions",³ we find this a somewhat rash statement given the experience Nigerian NGOs have had in surviving and struggling under a quite brutal military regime.

While advocacy and lobbying may be a strong feature of Fund-financed Nigerian and Liberian

NGOs, the South Indian Fund-financed NGOs exhibit stronger experience in local service provision and in demands for entitlements than in state level Tamil Nadu or Karnataka advocacy and lobbying. For some of the organisations, this is the result of a conscious choice like that made for instance by the Karnataka-based YMCA organisation in Dodballapur: "We are not strong enough yet to take up wider confrontation", they say. For others, like REDC in Dharmapuri in Tamil Nadu, the major interaction with government agencies and the formal economy was mainly in the form of co-operative schemes on savings rather than political representation or lobbying on behalf of the disadvantaged groups.

However, few of the Fund-supported NGOs were isolated from other NGOs or other donors. Although they are not membership NGOs, their local connections were extensive, not least because their fields of intervention often comprise both rights and development. The most professional of them, such as VRDP in Salem, seemed also to constructively engage in joint projects.

4.3.4 Human rights orientation

The human rights focus of Nigerian and Liberian NGOs was quite strong. With a growing emphasis by donors on democratisation and governance in Nigeria, there might be a risk that some of the organisations might dilute their efforts from an often already too broad human rights focus to an even broader HR+D approach. As Annex 6 shows, the Nigerian and Liberian NGOs score relatively well in terms of human rights orientation, while the Indian ones have a somewhat less profiled human rights orientation. This reflects the fact that human rights work in South India represents a more recent field of activity for the NGOs.

2) 100 Nigerian Naira equalled USD 0.896 on average during November 2000 (1 USD=111.61 Naira).

3) United Nations Assessment Team. Post-Electoral Assistance to Nigeria. 4 June 2000, p. 3.

4.4 Links between fund projects and member organisations

In none of the three country cases was there any co-operation between the NGOs supported by the Fund and other Fund member organisations. For instance, although Norwegian Church Aid have local offices in the state of Karnataka in South India, there was no contact between them and the Young Men's Christian Association in Dodballapur which had received Fund assistance in 1999.

As regards co-operation with the Norwegian embassies, this was a feature of the Nigerian context. Thus, organisations that had once received Fund support, such as the Constitutional Rights Project, were now receiving embassy support. However, in Nigeria, there seems to be a obvious need to define somewhat more exactly the kind of projects that should be eligible for Fund support and those which could be supported by the other very substantial resources available for human rights work in the country from the Norwegian MFA. A guideline established by the Fund is that organisations with an annual support of more than USD 100,000 from foreign donors are no longer eligible for Fund support. This seems a useful guideline inasmuch as it indicates that well-consolidated organisations which have established strong connections with other donors, are no long eligible for Fund resources. In Nigeria, this would mean that CLO and CRP would fall outside the mandate of Fund support. In addition, the Fund decision to discontinue support after three rounds of assistance could also be upheld, especially if and when more differentiated possibilities of support are in sight.

4.5 Conclusions

1. Generally, the type of projects supported seems relevant. Legal aid, networking, documentation, awareness-raising, and human rights education and empowerment are among the most important categories of projects. They seem relevant in the different contexts and appropriate under the Fund mandate. While in Nigeria and Liberia a growing emphasis on benefiting rural target groups seems warranted, in South India there seems to be a need to combine an overriding rural focus with advocacy support at state level in Tamil Nadu.
2. As regards the professional performance of organisations, although many of them are operating in environments that are both competitive and threatening, they have mastered important skills such as co-operating formally or informally. However, many organisations are characterised by fairly broad strategies, the focus of which might need to be changed somewhat in the future given the growing importance of human rights work.
3. In terms of management and democracy, consultations with staff seemed to be the weak part of internal democracy in many organisations, though board meetings ensured that there was some democratic control of project managers. As regards gender composition of the NGOs, it was fairly good in most of the boards, but the most visible and important jobs do still tend to belong to men. The greatest threat to democratic governance of organisations seemed to be, however, when an organisation remained essentially the domain of a charismatic leader, often the founder of the NGO in question.
4. Many organisations would benefit from courses in project planning methodologies such as logical framework planning or strategic planning. One deficiency of project work, which was common to almost every organisation visited, was the lack of a systematic monitoring of activities. One remedy, in settings where the Fund operates over several years, might be to organise project planning workshops as joint efforts between Norwegian embassies, the Fund and its member organisations.

-
5. Although donors in Nigeria complain that “few NGOs have managed to go beyond their traditional activities and do not yet have an outlook to work with government institutions”, we find this a somewhat rash statement. The Nigerian NGOs seem comparatively well integrated in formal as well as informal groupings and they may have embarked on member recruitment schemes in ways which can be developed.
 6. The human rights focus of Nigerian and Liberian NGOs was strong. With a growing emphasis by donors on democratisation and good governance in Nigeria, there might be a risk that some of the organisations might adopt a less focused approach. The Indian organisations were somewhat less profiled in their human rights orientation. This reflects the fact that human rights work in South India represents a more recent field of activity for the NGOs.
 7. In neither of the country cases, there was any co-operation between the NGOs supported and other member organisations. As regards co-operation between NGOs and embassies, this took place in Nigeria. However, in Nigeria there seemed to be a need to define somewhat more exactly what activities should be eligible for Fund support and which could be supported by the other quite substantial resources available from MFA for human rights work.

5 Assessment of Target Group and Advocacy Effectiveness and of Efficiency

The Fund projects have both forward and backward linkages, the latter feature in their representation of target groups and in their efforts to ensure that target groups are endowed with the rights to which they are entitled and the means to claim them. Forward linkages relate to advocacy and lobbying of government legislative and executive arms, to information campaigns directed towards the public in general or specific media. Finally, some of the project activities target the court system aiming at legal settlements.

In short, this chapter addresses the projects financed as intermediary ventures between marginalized and disempowered target groups and formal powerholders, whether in government or the judiciary. However, the role of project organisations as intermediaries and creators of a human rights culture also forms part of the discussion. Briefly, then, what impacts or effects do the projects have locally or nationally? In answering this question, a clarification is necessary concerning the distinction between effect and impact. As used in the remainder of this chapter, “effect” relates to the immediate result of a project, while impact relates to the longer-term project consequences, negative or positive, intended or unintended. In the following, we restrict our discussion mainly to a discussion of project effects, both locally and nationally. Our discussion is not sufficiently broad and thorough to provide insights into the project impact.

A further distinction has to be made, and that is between project outputs and project effect. Project output relates to activities performed, e.g., training in civil and political rights for a group of a given number of persons. “Project effect” measures the impact of these activities on beneficiaries or authorities, i.e., the kind of benefits or actions which result from the training.

5.1 Project target groups

The target groups defined in the projects supported vary from prison populations and widowhood networks to Dalit groups and landless labourers. Very specific groups such as the Ongoni 19 imprisoned in Nigeria during 1994–95 in the aftermath of the execution of Ken Saro Wiwa and eight others of the Ongoni group also figure among the target groups together with such broad categories of people as “rural uneducated women”. Some of the target groups are defined in caste terms, such as the Dalits in South India, or in terms of the Indian legislative categories such as the scheduled tribes. Moreover, one of the Liberian projects targets other NGOs specifically.

Generally, the projects are not defined in terms of ethnic categories, but on our visits to the organisations we found that NGO staff in some cases had a specific language background (SRI, Nigeria), that particular religious groups might receive a noteworthy level of support, and that having a Dalit caste background was almost a *sine qua non* factor among the staff in the tightly focused PEEDS work in South India. Given the nature of the work undertaken with its focus on particular communities and a very localised field of action in many cases, as seen in the case of the Niger Delta Hero Project in eastern Nigeria for instance, it is hardly surprising that biases and emphases prevail.

5.2 Project objectives and realisation in relation to target groups

Most of the projects supported define more or less specific target groups which should benefit from the realisation of project objectives (see also Annex 7). In Annex 9, the major target activities and effects are summarised. There are three main groups of outputs from projects: 1) legal aid; 2) awareness-raising, training, and information on rights; and 3) elaboration of documentary material. These outputs apart,

there are also institutional capacity-building efforts and income-generation activities.

How do these outputs then translate into effects or benefits for the target populations? Firstly, it seems quite obvious that litigation very often results in important benefits to the beneficiaries, either in the form of amnesty, in terms of establishing precedence for large groups of people, or in terms of retrieving land or obtaining compensation. From other parts of the world, we know also that the establishment of paralegal centres in communities can become powerful tools in empowering communities to realise and fulfil their rights.

Secondly, the processing of documentary material as done in Liberia on child labour or prisons, on press freedom in Nigeria, and presently also in the tribal areas of South India, often prove to be important instruments of human rights monitoring. However, such efforts of documentation and monitoring are often more important as a background for advocacy and lobbying than as a means to create immediate target group benefits. The target group benefits from documentation processes may derive from the process of conscientization, which follows from provision of information on human rights violation in research processes.

As regards awareness campaigns and rights training, the effect of such activities is the most difficult to assess. In South India, the team interviewed a number of (mainly women's) groups that had received training. These interviews indicated that the training had a receptive audience when combined with other activities such as income generation or legal aid. These additional activities meant that projects had regular contacts with the groups formed, but questions of positive and durable effects must remain unanswered concerning the effect of training as an isolated activity. Thus, only two of the Indian projects have received the highest scores for their target group effect, and this was due to their ability to combine litigation with training, a strategy which proved itself in both of the cases in terms of substantial benefits. A

second observation which is important to emphasise is that attributing benefits to the Norwegian assistance in isolation would be wrong in most cases as other donors have also been involved in the provision of, e.g., institutional support, thereby making intervention possible. Thus, target effects are summarised as "contributions to" a particular effect.

To summarise, the project activities have taken part in achieving the following positive effects for target groups:

- Contributing to amnesty being granted for 11 prisoners
- Bringing access to justice through the establishment of paralegal advice centres in rural communities
- Contributing through legal processes to the payment of compensation to community victims of oil spillage and human rights violations
- Contributing to litigation for housing rights, obtaining prolongation of grace periods before the demolition of urban slums
- Contributing to assistance to indigent prisoners and also to growing public awareness of the plight of prisoners
- Contributing to the retrieval of land for Dalit and landless people, and to compensation being paid to some families
- Contributing to the saving schemes of rural self-help women's groups and to their empowerment through rights training
- Contributing to the empowerment of tribal communities by recording human rights violations committed against these communities

5.2.1 The numbers and social characteristics of the people benefiting from NHRF assistance

It goes without saying that the exact number of people benefiting from the Fund assistance is very difficult to estimate. In some cases, as in the case of legal action for squatters, a substantial number of people are involved (3 million people are mentioned by the organisation itself), while in other cases it is possible to establish how many families have obtained new land and how many families compensation (in most cases in South India; such very concrete results accrue to numbers less than ten). However, the indirect benefits to communities from individuals obtaining land or receiving compensation might be positive for quite large numbers of people. Similarly, larger numbers of women benefited from the combined effect of legal training and income generation/savings schemes in rural communities visited by the team in South India.

The determination of numbers is thus largely a methodical issue which relates to the fact that the number of beneficiaries cannot always be attributed to Norwegian assistance in isolation. Also, assessment of numbers is difficult because benefits are both material and psychological.

Concerning the social characteristics of beneficiaries, three categories of beneficiaries may be identified: 1. Vulnerable or disadvantaged groups in general such as Dalits, tribal populations, landless labourers and small peasants, slum dwellers, prisoners and detainees; 2. Female and also children populations within the groups of disadvantaged people; and 3. Citizens generally.

Of these three categories, the two former are the most important. Women are the most important target group in South India, whereas in Nigeria and Liberia, organisations may target disadvantaged groups more generally. As a rule, however, human rights work in these societies and first lines of defence is socially defined.

5.3 Project objectives and realisation regionally or nationally

Apart from discussing the benefits to particular groups and individuals, the political, legal and cultural project effects should also be assessed. The projects operate in adverse human rights environments, due either to political culture, specific power coalitions, or to the values prevailing in society. Indeed, the very meaning of a first line of defence for human rights is that the environment is adversarial.

Given these conditions, project effects must be measured in terms of their political and legal results, and in terms of their impact on societal values or behaviour. To what degree, then, are the projects supported instrumental in instituting human rights respect on part of the authorities, and to what degree do they contribute to an increasing human rights awareness?

5.3.1 Instituting human rights respect nationally and regionally

Among the organisations supported and visited for the present evaluation, all of the *Nigerian* organisations are involved in advocacy. Four of them can be said to be very active at the national level (CLO, Huri-Laws, and CRP, SRI), i.e. lobbying for legislative change or trying to reinforce the rule of human rights law through litigation. Three of the Nigerian organisations are involved in regional awareness-raising and advocacy (CFC, IHRHL, ND-Hero), two of these through litigation and legal aid (see Annex 10).

Some of the above organisations were leading in the struggle for human rights during the period of military dictatorship, and some of them experienced harassment by the military forces. One example is the CRP in Nigeria, where the receipt of funding during 1996 for press freedom initiatives enables the organisation to research the laws of press freedom and make journalists aware of their legal rights. The organisation thus became a leading voice for journalists at a time when the human rights and democratic opposition to the military regime was growing in the country: a radio programme was banned and members of the staff of the

organisation were arrested, though the managing director himself escaped. This caused several other organisations to take up the issue of media freedom.

The effects of the work of these organisations can thus be measured through the strength with which the human rights issue has become a focal point in the struggle for democratisation in the Nigerian society. Currently, they must be seen as being among the most important voices in the consolidation of human rights legislation in the country. A number of these organisations are currently too big for the kind of funding which the Fund should offer, but their efforts to strengthen human rights nationally in Nigeria during the second half of the 1990s have been crucial.

At the local level, for instance in eastern Nigeria, where some of the organisations have currently targeted their work (IHRHL, CFC, Huri-Laws), there seems to be a persistent need for monitoring through watchdog actions, awareness-raising, and legal action. It is, however, difficult to assess the concrete impact of work performed by the organisations of this type on local politics, legislative reforms or public opinion.

Generally, the most prominent results achieved in Nigeria have been in the area of civil and political rights (press freedom, detention and fair trial, extra-judicial killings), whereas progress in economic, social and cultural rights and women's and children's rights has been less clear. For these reasons, the strategies of organisations like SRI on housing rights, women's organisations and the community support and actions of organisations like ND-Hero and IHRHL, will continue to be crucial. It is vital to maintain vigilance in the defence of civil and political rights.

In contrast to the Nigerian experience, legal aid and legislative lobbying are not as prominent in *Liberia*, while monitoring, documentation, watchdog functions, civic education, and awareness-raising are among the central

strategies of the Liberian organisations (see Annex 10).

While it is difficult to assess specific regional effects of the Liberian human rights support (e.g. in different areas of the country), the national effect is positive. The latter assessment must be seen, however, against a very poor background of human rights respect on part of the government. The improvement is measurable in terms of a less oppressive atmosphere for human rights activists in the recent past.

On the face of it, the relationship between the recipient organisations and the authorities in Liberia is generally poor. Despite repeated efforts to emphasise their pro-people rather than anti-government sentiments, the activities of human rights groups in exposing the many atrocities committed by warring factions and rebel fighters, many of whom have now found their way into the security forces, have aroused the hostility of government officials. The timidity of some members of the judiciary when faced with applications for bail or writs of habeas corpus made by human rights organisations also stems from adverse and hostile comments from the President and other top government functionaries. The slapping of a \$10 million action on the CJPC and FOCUS – both non-profit organisations – in response to their reports on forced labour also suggests a desire to drive such organisations out of business.

Human rights groups attempt to overcome this hostility by emphasising that their object is to assist the government to improve its human rights record, but the government generally persists in complaining about the singer, not the song, and acting as though the gross and continuing human rights violations would not exist if they were not reported and broadcast to the world. The government also tries to stir up hostility against human rights groups by telling the public that the adverse criticism of these groups is what is preventing the country from attracting international aid and investments for projects such as restoration of electricity and water supply or assistance for hospitals and

schools. (Although it should be noted that the chief cause of international displeasure with the government is the perception that it is aiding rebel incursions into Sierra Leone and Guinea, and that it is trading in diamonds smuggled from Sierra Leone, and funnelling funds received from this trade to such rebels.)

There is, however, a growing, if not grudging respect on the part of the government for the human rights groups. All of the human rights groups felt that some of the oppressive atmosphere under which they had been working had improved. The President now warns members of his government that they must take particular actions or refrain from them “– because the human rights people will talk!” If this has won no friends for the groups, it has at least brought about some improvement in the behaviour on the part of government officials, and an increased respect for the rule of law, although it is generally felt that the courts can be bent to the will of the government when important matters are at stake. Government officials may also acknowledge the benefits of the work done by some groups. For example, until LIPWA carried out a nation-wide survey of prisons and detention centres with funds from the NHRF, the relevant Ministry had no facts or figures on the number of prisons or detention centres in the country. LIPWA was also able to conduct a round-table conference and dialogue with circuit court judges, prison superintendents and police commanders, and, by emphasising that their aim was to assist the government in improving its human rights record, LIPWA was able to secure permission to visit the jails and detention centres across the country, although they experienced obstruction at some of the jails which they try to visit.

As in Nigeria, the major achievements of human rights organisations so far seem to be in the civil and political field. Persistent attention on economic and social rights and women and children’s rights seems also to be crucial in the Liberian context.

In India, and more specifically in *Tamil Nadu*, the progress achieved at state level is still open

for discussion. Based on the way in which newspapers report on human rights atrocities and violations, progress has been achieved in creating a political and public awareness of the importance of human rights. One team member participated in the celebrations to mark the success of a campaign for the introduction of human rights education in schools in the second largest city (with a population of more than one million people) of Tamil Nadu in which one member of the National Human Rights Commission at New Delhi was present, together with a number of politicians and police representatives from the state. Clearly, public awareness about and concerns for human rights have progressed to the extent that human rights education is considered a subject for all schools in Tamil Nadu.

However, at the level of practice, the situation does not seem to have improved much in Tamil Nadu. There is a growth in custodial violence since 1991 according to the human rights monitor People’s Watch. During the last six months, eight custodial deaths were reported. Reports of police torture and inhuman treatment in prisons, especially against Dalit groups and other disadvantaged people, are common. One member of the team had the chance to look through the photograph albums of a forensic expert in Tamil Nadu. These pictures showed violence in towns and villages by the police, violence and torture in prisons and police stations. Together with this expert’s evidence, they also confirmed the impression of a system, which only works selectively according to its legislation.

If we look at the effect of human rights work funded by NHRF in Tamil Nadu, the projects have not generally targeted human rights policy at the state level. One exception might be the VRDP project, but it does not yet seem to have had any effect. In some cases, Fund projects are instrumental in supporting litigation, e.g., on behalf of the Dalits, and in helping to organise rallies on behalf of the Dalits.

Fund projects are mainly operating with backward linkages aimed at the empowerment

of and income generation for marginalized groups. These types of projects are well justified not least when considering that the human rights are fairly new as a means of empowering rural and marginal populations. Such projects provide opportunities for furthering the integration of economic, social and cultural rights with civil and political rights. However, it might be useful in the future funding of human rights work in Tamil Nadu to combine funding of these rural projects with support for organisations which seek to monitor and advocate human rights at the state level.

5.4 Appropriateness of grant size and flow

Among the three cases studied, the danger to human rights workers and NGOs was greatest in Liberia. Thus, networking and mutual reinforcement were deemed vital. However, in this situation the wide scope of human rights work was only embryonic, partly because human rights work was new to the country, partly because conditions in some areas were unsafe. In India and Nigeria, the problems of outreach, organisational development and management capacity were equally daunting. Making a strong impact in South India is a tremendous challenge because of the centuries-long culture of apartheid in society.

Three main points can be drawn from these observations. Firstly, Fund support must be seen as part of a process of strengthening human rights cultures where one-off funding is insufficient for more sustainable impacts. Secondly, organisational capacity-building is an important dimension in the support, and this should be acknowledged. Thirdly, the Fund and its member organisations should play a more systematic role in facilitating support within a given area.

The Fund mandate of providing seed money is very appropriate – a fact proven in the quality of work of many of the organisations visited. Organisations are achieving good results from the modest amounts of money disbursed. But the Fund rarely limits itself to one-off funding in priority countries as the three case countries.

Some organisations in Nigeria have received funding several times, but they have also documented that this has enabled them to become increasingly professional and skilled. The Fund should therefore see itself not only as a one-off seed provider, but also as a facilitator enabling young organisations to develop into mature ones.

Secondly, since the Fund is often going to be operating in environments like Tamil Nadu or Liberia where there are few other donors, and where the population generally is very poor, the chance for civil organisations to mobilise resources locally is limited, especially when human rights work is associated with fear.

Donors must therefore largely finance organisational support. The Fund, in combination with other donors, must be prepared to shoulder this task. This is evident in the present funding scheme, but apparently without a consistent practice being followed. In some project cases in India, projects have been given a level of funding which is barely enough to cover the intended activities, while other organisations have received substantial amounts. Hence, it is recommended that an overhead up to a maximum of one third of the entire appropriation should be granted, provided that a convincing description of needs is given.

Moreover, funding could take place over several rounds – as is presently also the case, but with a differentiated practice as regards the numbers and duration of projects. Currently, organisations receive funding for one-year projects irrespective of the fact that some of them are sufficiently skilled to administer two-to-three year projects. Presently, there is no systematic distinction between the funding of an organisation that is receiving its first assistance and an organisation that is receiving its third. However, if the Fund is to be seen as a founder of processes of human rights reinforcement and not only as a one-off planter of seeds, there could very well be some differentiation between a first and a second or third round of funding. In other words, it is possible to envisage a system

in which organisations receive funding for a three-year project after the first funding and after having met proper accounting and reporting procedures, and a mid-term evaluation based on reporting from the project built into the process carried out.

A general conclusion is therefore that although the funding has been relevant, part of it has also been inappropriate in the sense that short term and low budget funding has sometimes impaired organisational development and has meant that organisations have had to subsidise Norwegian-funded activities with resources from other donors in order to achieve a proper result. It must also be stressed, however, that quite a number of “young” organisations are quite satisfied with the level of funding and its flow.

5.5 Cost-effectiveness

A consistent assessment of cost-effectiveness is difficult inasmuch as Fund spending is often interwoven with other categories of spending in the reporting of organisations. However, the general observation is that the Fund has received good value for its money in the majority of cases. A number of examples already provided (VRDP, YMCA, PEEDS, India, CJPC, NHRCL, LIPWA, Liberia, and SRI, CFC, and ND-Hero Nigeria) are illustrative of a high level of performance for small amounts of resources to the right type of organisations.

Based on an examination of audited accounts in the Indian and Liberian projects, certain changes in the applied appropriation practices appear to be relevant. A few examples may provide an insight into the current practices. In the case of FIAN/Tamil Nadu & PROGRESS (the same organisation), this project is targeting rural disadvantaged people together with college teachers and students in an effort to spread information on economic, social and cultural rights.

From the accounts, it appears that

- 45 % of the spending has been directed towards college teachers and students at seminars and training sessions and for their travelling expenses.
- 15 % of the spending has been allocated to training at village meetings, farmers’ group meetings, etc.
- 40 % of the spending has been for the recurring costs of office accommodation, salaries of office staff, including the managing director (amounting to nearly 18 % of total spending).

Another project for which audited accounts have been examined is PEEDS, located in the same town in Tamil Nadu. This project targeted advocacy and legal aid for Dalit victims of violations:

- 30 % was spent on training, travel and transport equipment (moped and cycle)
- 29 % was spent on legal and emergency medical assistance
- 40 % was spent on office-related costs, including the salary of the managing director

Both projects are located in the same town, but in the former case Rs. 120,000 (18 %) was set aside for honorarium of the chief functionary, while in the latter case Rs. 74,000 was spent on fees to unspecified persons.⁴

In the case of Liberia, financial statements from two organisations illustrate some of the problems involved in financial accountability and cost-effectiveness. The organisation Human Rights Watch, Women and Children has provided a detailed financial statement for its spending of Fund money of altogether USD 11,000:

4) 100 Indian Rupees equalled 2.141 USD on average during November 2000 (1 USD=46.70 Rs).

- 23 % of the appropriation was spent on salaries and contractor fees
- 7 % was spent on space and utilities
- 32 % was spent on office stationary and supplies, equipment and furniture
- 36 % was spent on other direct costs

However, the detailed breakdown of the financial statement allows a clearer distinction between field activity funding and institutional support. Thus,

- 44 % of the appropriation was spent directly on activity-related funding such as civic education, radio programmes, bill-boards and monitoring
- 56 % was spent on office equipment, staff salaries, and office rent, of which about 8 % was spent on senior staff, i.e., executive director, programme officer and administrative officer.

In contrast, another organisation in Liberia, the National Human rights Monitor, has also provided a financial statement for its spending of USD 11,600 during the same period:

- 11 % of the spending went on salaries at regional offices
- 36 % of the spending went on office rent in Monrovia and regionally
- 34 % was spent on office supplies and equipment
- 11 % was spent on local travels, human rights education and research, while
- 9 % went for professional fees, including auditors' fees.

In this latter case, it seems that activity-related costs were very low, so a more detailed breakdown of, for instance, figures on office supplies and equipment might be warranted.

Four main observations can be drawn from these accounts: Firstly, the latter Liberian financial statement is not sufficiently detailed to allow a good understanding of costs for office supplies and equipment, for instance. Secondly, in the former Indian project too much spending is directed towards college teachers and students and their upkeep at seminars and not enough on the target group in most need. A similar concern may also be raised in relation to the Liberian project. If institutional costs could be restricted to 33 per cent of total expenses, leaving the rest for activities (with a reasonable allowance for project staff costs being charged to activities), this might produce practices more in line with the Fund mandate.

Thirdly, in both of the Indian projects, recurring office costs reached as much as 40 per cent, based on a varying remuneration of managing directors and varying office rents, with PROGRESS being more expensive in both cases. It therefore seems reasonable to suggest that the Fund secretariat informs itself of the current practices of remuneration of management staff in the context, thus adopting an acceptable level. Practices in Liberia are clearly distinct in this respect inasmuch as management staff do not burden project accounts in the same manner.

Fourthly, the costs of office rents vary a great deal and even though allowance should be made for the proportionally different costs of office space in capitals and rural areas, the very high office rent in the Liberian case does not seem reasonable.

In the field of training, one found that "unit-costs" vary quite considerably, even though reporting practices make it impossible to give an exact picture. Based, however, on observations made at REDC, which seemed to have arrived at a well-justified level in training implementation, it was found the amount of Rs. 150 was spent per person/day on board and lodging courses, including venue, transport and trainers' fees, but excluding training materials. This appears to be a reasonable ceiling which could be applied for the appropriations.

Accordingly, a normal price for a five-day board and lodging course for 30 participants would be approximately Rs. 20,000. The costs of the production of training material are additional. The unit price for a simple compendium comprising basic texts, but without a pedagogical layout, appears to be Rs. 150–250. A unit-price ceiling of Rs. 250 is to be recommended, provided that a much needed pedagogical edition of the material is undertaken, considering the inexperience of most of the target group with academic undertakings, and sometimes illiteracy.

When applications are convincing and meet the above criteria, it is recommended, as a general rule, not to cut applications arbitrarily. It is possible that the application of the above criteria may lead to a higher average size of appropriations. This, however, in the eyes of the team, is much to be preferred in order to obtain a higher quality of the implementation of the project and sustainability of work of the NGOs in general.

5.6 Conclusions

1. The target groups defined in the projects supported vary from prison populations, widowhood networks to Dalit groups and landless labourers. Very specific groups such as the Ongoni 19 are among the target groups together with such broad categories as “rural uneducated women”.
2. There are three main categories of outputs from projects: 1) legal aid; 2) awareness-raising, provision of training, and information on rights; and 3) elaboration of documentary material. In addition, there are institution-building efforts.
3. Projects have therefore contributed to substantial benefits for target groups in accordance with project objectives, as indicated in section 5.2. The approach taken by many NGOs of combining legal aid and litigation with training, income generation, and documentation seems to be effective in engendering target group benefits, in some cases, for substantial numbers of people.
4. The determination of the numbers of people benefiting from project activities is difficult since the number of beneficiaries cannot always be attributed to Norwegian assistance alone and because benefits are both material and psychological.
5. Concerning the social characteristics of beneficiaries, three categories of beneficiaries may be identified: 1. Disadvantaged or vulnerable groups in general, such as Dalits, tribal populations, landless labourers and small peasants, slum dwellers and prisoners and detainees; 2. Female and also children populations within the groups of disadvantaged people; and 3. Citizens generally. Among these categories, the two former ones are the most important. Women are the most important target group in South India. In Nigeria and Liberia organisations may target disadvantaged groups more generally. As a rule, basic human rights work in these societies is socially defined.
6. The Nigerian projects have had effects both in terms of target group benefits, in terms of contributing to human rights awareness nationally, and in terms of legal and political effects. Although legal effects have been obtained by, for instance, CPR and ND-Hero, it is yet too early to speak of legislative effects of Fund-assisted projects.
7. In the Liberian case, the conclusion is that the Fund-supported projects seem to have had more effect on national politics and human rights awareness than in terms of direct target group benefits. The project effects at the national level have also implied a growing awareness around the rule of law, and the projects have, together with other human rights projects, contributed to a less oppressive climate for human rights workers in a context which remains, nevertheless, very problematic. Some observers allege that human rights

activism has made a certain impression on the President and his main advisors. This notwithstanding, the human rights situation in Liberia remains difficult despite these achievements. Obstruction of justice and political interference with the courts are still the rule rather than the exception.

8. Concerning the effect of human rights work funded by NHRF in Tamil Nadu, the projects are generally not targeting state human rights politics, and they do not yet seem to have any effect at this level. In some cases, Fund projects are instrumental in supporting litigation and arranging rallies on behalf of the Dalits, but these activities remain restricted to a more narrow local level. Fund projects are mainly operating with backward linkages directed at the empowerment of and income generation schemes for marginalized groups. These types of projects are well justified, especially considering that the human rights field is fairly new as a means of empowering rural and marginal populations. Such projects provide opportunities for furthering the integration of economic, social and cultural rights with civil and political rights. However, it might be useful when funding human rights work in the future in Tamil Nadu to combine funding of these rural projects with support for organisations which seek to monitor and advocate human rights at the state level.
9. Looking at the appropriateness of grant size and flow, in some cases funding has been too parsimonious while in others, for no good reasons, it has been quite lavish. Institutional capacity-building in the context of a difficult human rights situation must largely be financed by donors; it seems therefore necessary to develop a more consistent practice in this area. It is recommended that an institutional overhead up to a maximum of one third of the entire appropriation can be granted, providing that a convincing budget of activities is submitted.
10. It seems also important that the Fund is not only seen as a one-off provider of seeds, but as a facilitator of processes that enable young organisations to develop into mature ones. This is already the practice in priority countries such as the three chosen for this evaluation, but it must be recognised explicitly as a policy so that differentiation is accepted as regards the duration of projects. Presently, there is no systematic distinction between the funding of an organisation that is receiving its first funding and one that is receiving its third. However, it is possible to envisage a system in which organisations receive funding for a three-year project after the first funding after proper accounting and reporting procedures have been met, and a mid-term evaluation based on reporting from the project built into the process carried out.
11. In most cases, the Fund has received good value for money provided. However, more detailed financial statements are necessary from some of the organisations in order that disbursement of funds may become transparent. In terms of cost effectiveness, areas of concern are the levels of spending for recurrent costs – including salaries and honorariums for managing staff and office rent. It seems also well advised to develop consistent practices around the costs of training. For India, more detailed recommendations can be found in the report.

6 Recommendations

It seems justified to suggest that the Fund should have a secretariat that is co-ordinated by a manager able to work *at least* for 50 per cent of a full-time position on the daily management. A full-time manager could be well justified, but the expansion of the secretariat is also a political decision to be taken by the Board, in line with its visions for the Fund. Staff expansion is nevertheless called for, but whether to employ a part-time or a full-time manager is a debatable issue. A full-time manager would mean increased administration costs to around or beyond 15 per cent administration. Irrespective of the level of staff expansion, the additional administrative input should be used for 1) organisation of seminars in Norway with a focus on the human rights situation in some of the more difficult countries in which the Fund operates; 2) organisation of joint monitoring and evaluation visits to recipient organisations by Fund personnel, member organisations, and local consultants; 3) additional input to follow-up activities in relation to the reporting of recipient organisations.

Within the Fund itself, there have been some difficulties in establishing a total overview of spending and contributions for the period in question. Comparable data on spending and contributions since 1996 can be established by examining the audited accounts, but these are not immediately available to the stakeholders (see Annex table 5). A monitoring framework, which reported key financial data in the annual reports in a comparable manner (and in dollar denominations), might be a useful instrument for monitoring financial flows. Recently, the secretariat has taken the initiative of changing the accountant in order to gain a better insight into financial flows. This seems to be a useful initiative.

It seems possible to resolve the issue of hosting the Fund by moving it; a) to a new host among the member organisations, or b) to an independent place. A third possibility is, c) to settle for the current position. In any case, the

decision should be to find a permanent site for the Fund in order that the issue of placement should not take up any unnecessary energy.

Concerning the dispersal of funding, instead of operating in priority countries as well as in other countries where only limited monitoring is feasible, the Fund could decide to operate exclusively in nine to ten priority countries over a five-year period, and to admit new countries only when others are abandoned. For any priority case adopted, it should be possible to have local consultants assess the human rights situation and priorities. The defining characteristic of the notion of first line of human rights defence is that it takes place under conditions adversarial to human rights; this can be associated with high levels of violations of civil and political rights and with systemic discrimination according to gender or social group. In this respect it is noted that the Fund has currently put little emphasis on the human rights situation in Eastern Europe and Central Asia.

In relation to the type of countries supported, it must be observed that the Fund has provided support to both low-income *and* middle-income countries. Given the fragile human rights situation in many middle-income countries, this seems justified. However, it would probably be useful to retain the general guideline that a little more than half of the grants be targeted at low-income countries. Secondly, the Fund has not only supported education, information and documentation work, as often emphasised in Fund documents, but a much wider range of work, including litigation. Such a diversion from stated practice is also well justified.

Concerning financial reporting from recipient organisations, it would be advisable to apply uniform criteria for financial reporting, especially if long-term projects are accepted in the future. Honorariums to management staff and costs of office rent, training or workshop

expenses and costs of human rights activities are some of the important items to report.

As the embassy in Lagos is channelling human rights support outside the framework of the Fund and as this assistance might even increase in the future, there might be a need to distinguish between the various forms of assistance by establishing guidelines or clear divisions of labour. However, there might also be prospects for achieving economies of scale or cost-sharing in the sense that local consultants are used for screening both Fund projects and other human rights projects. In any case, the current input by the local consultant of four workdays per month does not seem sufficient to cover the need for monitoring Fund projects. Additional resource costs including costs of travelling in Nigeria should thus be considered. The Nigerian cost of administering Fund projects should be accounted for in the general Fund administration expenditure. Moreover, the principle that organisations which receive donor aid in excess of USD 100,000 may not receive Fund assistance should be observed in Nigeria in order to distinguish Fund-eligible projects from other MFA human rights projects. In addition, other distinguishing criteria might also be needed.

In two respects the organisational performance of organisations supported was found to be deficient. The approach to training adopted by many Indian organisations could be better defined. Secondly, many organisations would benefit from project planning methodologies such as logical framework planning or strategic planning. One deficiency of project work, which was symptomatic of every organisation visited, was a lack of systematic monitoring of their own activities. Therefore, in settings where the Fund operates for several years, one possibility is to organise project planning workshops as cooperative efforts between Norwegian embassies, the Fund and its member organisations. The approach taken as regards monitoring of project outcomes in such diverse settings is not an easy one; one would be well advised to consult with member organisations working in similar fields during joint reviews.

While in Nigeria and Liberia, a growing emphasis on benefiting rural target groups seems warranted, in South India there seems to be a need to combine an overriding rural focus with advocacy support at the state level in Tamil Nadu and eventually Karnataka. In all of the three case countries visited, human rights defence must be combined with improvements of economic, social and cultural rights.

Institutional capacity-building in the context of difficult human rights situations must largely be financed by donors; it is therefore necessary to develop a more consistent practice in this area. It is recommended that an overhead of up to a maximum of one third of the entire appropriation can be granted for institutional support if a convincing budget of activities is provided. It seems also well advised to develop consistent practices related to the costs of training.

Finally, it seems also important that the Fund be seen not only as a one-off provider of seeds, but as a facilitator of processes that enable young organisations to develop into mature ones. This is already the practice in priority countries such as the three chosen for this evaluation, but it must be recognised as an explicit policy that permits variation in project duration. Presently, there is no systematic distinction between the funding of an organisation that is receiving its first funding and one that is receiving its third. However, it is possible to envisage a system in which organisations receive funding for a three-year project after the first funding after proper accounting and reporting procedures have been met, and a mid-term evaluation based on reporting from the project built into the process carried out.

Annex 1 Terms of Reference

EVALUATION OF THE NORWEGIAN HUMAN RIGHTS FUND

1. Background

The Norwegian Human Rights Fund (hereafter called “the Fund”) was established in 1988 by Norwegian non-governmental organisations to protect and promote human rights internationally. The following institutions/NGOs are today members of the Fund: the Norwegian Institute for Human Rights (NIHR), Norwegian Church Aid (NCA), Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions (NCTU), Church of Norway Council on Ecumenical and International Relations, Norwegian People’s Aid (NPA), Norwegian Red Cross (NRC) and Save the Children Norway (RB). The Fund is a supplement to the member organisations’ own aid activities, and is governed by a board consisting of representatives from the member organisations. The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and Amnesty International, Norwegian Section, have observer status on the Board of the Fund.

The member organisations share the belief that more international support should be channelled to the first line of defence in the struggle for human rights: local, voluntary human rights activities. Relatively small, flexible grants (USD 10,000 on an average) are therefore given to organisations and groups working locally, regionally or nationally in low-income countries to promote and protect human rights; be it civil, cultural, economic, political or social rights. The organisations often work in difficult situations, both politically and materially. Applications may be submitted at any time, and are processed continuously throughout the year. The Fund aims at answering applications rapidly.

Organisations with little or no other foreign support are given priority, and organisations are often supported in their initial phase. Due to this, and to the limited capacity of the secretariat

to follow up and visit the projects, the grants can be characterised as “high risk” grants. However, in the last couple of years the Fund has put more emphasis in following up reporting from the projects. A written report and an audited financial report showing how the grant was used must be submitted to the Fund. The same organisation can normally receive a maximum of three grants from the Fund, and satisfactory reporting is a precondition for repeated support.

Grants are mainly given to documentation and information activities and to human rights education. Grants may also be provided for work to influence national legislation to incorporate international human rights agreements, to victims of human rights violations and occasionally to important court proceedings where human rights are at stake. Grants cannot be given to projects that are otherwise covered by Norwegian assistance.

One third of the Fund’s budget stems from the member organisations, while the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs contributes the remaining two thirds. In its more than ten years of existence, the Human Rights Fund has assisted approximately 472 projects carried out by 345 different organisations in 74 countries in Asia, Africa, South America and the Middle East in their efforts to promote human rights in their countries. The total amount granted to these organisations is about NOK 34 million.

2. Purpose of the Evaluation

Internal evaluations have been undertaken in 1994 and 1997. For 2000 a broad external and independent evaluation is wanted both by the member organisations and by the Ministry. The main purpose of this evaluation is:

1. to provide information on the experience of the Norwegian Human Rights Fund for the period 1996–1999 in administering funds to

local human rights projects in low-income countries

2. to find out whether the grants have been used according to the project descriptions (as described by the implementing organisations) and whether they have had the expected effect on the human rights situation as outlined in the mandate for the Fund
3. to assess the effect upon the member organisations of the Fund, and to what degree the Fund has met expectations of its member organisations. The extent to which participation in the Fund has contributed to an increased awareness of human rights issues in general or in specific countries in the organisation at large, should be studied. Whether membership in the Fund has led to other forms of cooperation between the member organisations and certain human rights organisations in other countries, should also be studied.

Through an assessment of the selected projects and the development in the Fund's funding policies in general during this period, the evaluation should seek to find out to what extent the supported projects have had the desired effect, and recommend how the Fund best could administer support to human rights projects in the future.

3. Scope and Method

The evaluation should cover the overall assistance provided by the Fund for the period 1996–99, for which the Ministry's grant (two thirds of total expenditure) has amounted to about NOK 13.1 million.

As general **background material** the evaluation should study all relevant written material in the Ministry and in the Fund, such as evaluations, annual and other reports, and interview key people in the Ministry (included employees in relevant embassies) and the Fund's Board and secretariat, as well as in the member organisations in Oslo. In addition the

evaluation should include **in-depth studies** of selected projects in three countries where the Fund has provided considerable support: India, Liberia and Nigeria, in the form of field visits. India (projects in the states of Tamil Nadu and Karnataka), and Liberia are chosen because they are considered representative countries on their respective continents, as regards the general mode of support from the Fund, (i.e. support to grassroots organisations with small amounts, with limited possibilities for the Fund's secretariat to follow-up). Nigeria, on the other hand, is chosen because it is the country that received the highest amounts during the period to be studied, and because of a special mode of support, where the embassy in Lagos has been heavily involved and the support is given to bigger and more established organisations than is the case in most other countries where the Fund is involved.

An assessment of the **administration** of this type of support, i.e. the handling of the grant at the Ministry level and the Ministry's overall collaboration with the Fund, the functioning of the Board of the Fund and its secretariat, and, where relevant, at the Norwegian embassies and the local offices of the member organisations, as well as at the recipient organisations in the countries to be visited. How was the financial management of the programme? How did the applicant organisation get to know about the Fund, and how does the Fund ensure that it reaches relevant organisations? Should one consider additional information channels for the Fund in order to reach other potential applicants? How is the management of applications at the Fund's secretariat? Are the grants appropriate to achieve a change in the human rights situation in question? Was the reporting from the recipient organisations regular and appropriate?

The **quantitative elements** of the different projects should be stated in the evaluation: The number of projects that have been supported in this period, distributed by country, continent and type, and the types should be characterised by the following labels (according to the Fund's categories):

- human rights in general
- civil and political rights
- economic, social and cultural rights
- women's rights
- youth and children's rights
- environmental rights
- other (specify)

Most of the above information is already available at the secretariat of the Fund.

For the projects that will be studied in-depth: The number of individuals that have been reached, their age/gender and ethnic/religious identity should be listed if and when relevant, as well as the number and kind of publications and other material and the way in which it has been disseminated and whether the activity has led to legal measures been taken at national level. The cost-effectiveness of each of the projects that are visited should also be studied.

The **qualitative impact** of each project should be studied individually against those of the criteria mentioned below that are seen relevant in each case:

- First and foremost the aims and objectives for each project (as described by the implementing organisation) should be used as a baseline against which the effect can be measured
- In order to assess the effect on individual users of the project, their human rights situation as they entered the project should be used as a baseline (if at all available)
- How big is the outreach of and how democratic is the recipient organisation? Has contact with the Fund and implementation of the supported project led to a change in this respect within the organisation?
- To what extent has the assistance contributed to the recipient organisation's influence on the human rights situation locally or in the country in which it operates, and has it been timely and met a need for human rights promotion locally and/or nationally?
- Was the grant appropriate to achieve a change in the human rights situation in question?
- To what extent has the project facilitated direct human rights advocacy for vulnerable groups, i.e. led to hearings or meetings being organised, spread information to the public, taken up special cases legally or similar efforts?
- To what degree has the project contributed to networking and cooperation between different human rights organisations and led to further activities in this field?

The evaluation shall identify general lessons learnt that can be used for future policy development as concern human rights projects.

4. Evaluation Team

The evaluation should be undertaken by a team of 3–4 people with legal, social science and/or human rights competence. A human rights activist background would be an asset. Among them the team should possess particular competence and knowledge on India, Liberia and Nigeria. Language requirements within the team are English, Norwegian and as many of the relevant local languages as possible for the field visits.

5. Timing and Reporting

The evaluation should start in October 2000. The final report should be submitted by January 26, 2001.

Annex 2 Interviews and Itinerary

Oslo 9.10–12.10.2000

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Assistant Director General Jan Dybfest
Senior Adviser Sigurd Endresen, Evaluation
Section
Principal Officer Merete Brattested
Adviser Johan Sørby
Adviser Hilde Austad
Higher Executive Officer Heddy Astrup

Norwegian Human Rights Fund

Director Hans Morten Haugen
Senior Executive Officer Trond S. Skarpeteig
Senior Executive Officer Tale Longva
Senior Executive Officer Erik Sevrin

Norwegian Red Cross

Special Advisor Bente MacBeath, International
Department

Save the Children Norway.

Regional Coordinator Kari Thomassen

Church of Norway Council on Ecumenical and International Relations

Manager of NHRF Hans Morten Haugen

Norwegian Church Aid

Stein Villumstad

Norwegian Institute of Human Rights

Researcher Bård-Anders Andreassen

Norwegian People's Aid

Laila Nicolaisen

Nigeria 14.10–20.10.2000

Royal Norwegian Embassy

Ambassador Jan Nærby
First Secretary Kristin Teigland

Civil Liberties Organisation (CLO)

President, and member of team Ayo Obe
Executive Director Mr. Abdul Oroh

Participation in conference on administration of
justice, meeting:

- Femi Fala, Legal practitioner
- Clement Nwanko, Constitutional Rights
Project
- Olawale Fapohunda, Managing partner, Legal
Resources Consortium
- Laure-Hélène Piron, Governance Officer,
Department for International Development
(DFID),
- Melissa Brown, Democracy and Governance
Officer
- Abdul Oroh, Executive Director, Civil
Liberties Organisation

Meetings:

- Eze Onyekpere, Lawyer,
- Dom. Okoro, Geologist,
- Ph.D., Ray Onyegu, Lawyer,
- Chigozi Ojiaka, Lawyer, all Executive
Committee, Shelter Rights Project

Constitutional Rights Project

Executive director Clement Nwankwo
Research and Publication Officer Samson Bako

Communication for Change (CFC)

Executive director Ms. Sandra Obagio

Nigeria Delta Human and Environmental Rescue Organisation (ND-Hero)

Administrative Secretary Aroboh Jeremiah,
Accountant Charles Opuama.

Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (IHRHL)

Program Administrator Ndidi Emenyeounu,
Barrister Chris Isiodu, program officer women
and empowerment
Lois Ititiuno, and program officer, civic
education
Ifioma Anya, Community paralegal
Harry Asuru, Eleme Village
Executive director Anyakwee S. Nsirimovu.

Legal/Company Support Services

Ms. Nkoyo Rapu

The Ford Foundation

Failed appointment with Mr. Akwesi
Representative for West Africa, Acacia ai doo

Huri-Laws

Programme Officer Joyce Ogunyemi,
Legal Officer Bona God-win Okigbo,
Project accountant, Ralph Irekponor,
Legal Officer Uche Omelonye,
Legal Officer, Will Momoh,
Intern Marshall Ifeanyi.

Liberia 21.10–23.10.2000*Catholic Justice and Peace Commission, (JPC)*

Monitor Mr. Ville Varney,
Field monitor, Mr. Moses K. Sumo

National Human Rights Centre of Liberia (NHRCL)

Acting director, Mr. Aloysius Toe of the Human Rights Centre, also representative of Movement for the Defence of Human Rights, Inc.(MODHAR), member organisation on the Board.

Human Rights Consultant, Mr. Tata Ofosu.
Board members and representatives of member organisations: Mr. George Barolle, United Methodist Church Human Rights Monitor. (UMCHRMU) Executive Director, Mr. Anthony Boakai, Fore-Runners of Children's Universal Rights for Survival, Growth and Development, (FOCUS). Lawyer, Mr. Fredrick Jaywea: Civil Liberties Organisations of Lawyers, (CALL), vice chair. Also present, Mr. Milton Taylor, Liberia Prison Watch Inc., (LIPWA)

Press Union of Liberia

President, Mr. Swah Dedeh

Amnesty International, Dutch Chapter
Coordinator for the special programme on Africa, Mr. Peter van der Horst

Liberia Human Rights Observer (LHRO)

Executive Director, Mr. Abib Zack.

Liberia Prison Watch, (LIPWA)

Executive Director Dixon Psio Glah

Civil Rights Association for Liberian Lawyers (CALL)

Fredrick Jaywe

Human Rights Watch, Women and Children (HURWWC)

Executive Director Alfred E. Fallah

National Human Rights Monitor, (NAHRIM)

Acting Executive Director, Precious Nicol.

Association of Female Lawyers of Liberia. (AFELL)

Chair, Elizabeth Boyenneh.

Liberia Human Rights Observer, (LHRO)

Executive Director Abi Zack.

India 24.11–4.12.2000*Human Rights Advocacy and Research Foundation*

Chief Co-ordinator K.S. Bhagyalakshmi
Managing Director Ossie Fernandez

Village Reconstruction and Development Project (VRDP), Salem

Managing director A. Renganathan
19 staff of VRDP

8 data-collectors of VRDP (staff members)

Mr H. Typhagne, Director, People's Watch, Madurai

Meetings beneficiaries (women's sangham and evening tuition class for children) in Umbilikampati Village and one self-help group.

Rural and Environmental Development Centre, Dharmapuri

Director, Mr K. Avaneedra
Programme Coordinator, Mr Poul Raj
Members of women's local sangham

Mr Trond S. Skarpeteig, NHRF

Mr E.V. Paul, Director, YMCA, Dodballapur, Karnataka

Meeting beneficiaries (women's sangham) in the village of Kumbari

Voice Trust

Director, Ms. A. Jecinta

Managing trustee, D. Saravanan

Technical staff, A. Shivakumar, R. Kavitha,
Sangham programmer, and S. Arulnathan,
M.A.

Visit to Uthamarseeli Village, meeting with two
sangham groups.

People's Watch, Madurai

Director, Mr H. Typhagne, and administrator

*People Education and Economic Development
Society*

Director Mr V. Baskaran

12 staff

*Promotion of Grassroots Enlightenment and
Social Security (Progress) and FIAN, Tamil*

Nadu Director Mr D. Gurusamy

Network member-organisations and
beneficiaries.

Participation in opening function in human
rights school exhibition

Report drafting

*Suffering People's Education and Environment
Network (SPEED), Ayelur*

Director Ms Valarmethi

Field Officer Chitra

People beneficiaries, women's sangham in
Ayelur village

*Muthamil Education and Rural Development
Society (MERDS), Uluppagudi*

Director Mr. Chandrasekaran

Women's sangham, MERDS

Indian National Human Rights Commission Mr
V. Dayal

Annex 3 Applications and Grants

Number of applications, number of grants and average amount granted in USD by the Fund 1996–1999.

	Applications	Grants	Average grant (USD)
1996	114	56	12317
1997	130	60	8727
1998	171	74	10270
1999	256	53	10787

Source: Annual Reports of the Norwegian Human Rights Fund, 1996, 1997, 1998 and 1999.

Annex 4 Grants by Region, Country and Category of Project

Grants by Regions, Countries, and Category of Project 1996–99

<i>Country and continent</i>	<i>grants US dollars</i>	<i>category of project</i>
Western Europe		
Denmark	1400	human rights in general
France	7400	na
Sweden	9000	human rights in general
United Kingdom	57700	economic, social and cultural rights and human rights in general
Total Western Europe	75500	
Balkan		
Romania	12000	civil and political rights
Total Balkan	12000	
The Mediterranean and the Middle East		
Algeria	15000	na
Tunisia	15000	na
Turkey	13000	economic, social and cultural rights
Egypt	115700	civil and political rights, economic, social and cultural rights, women's rights, human rights in general
Iraq	13000	human rights in general
Israel	114350	human rights in general, economic, social and cultural rights
Palestinian territories	42600	youth/children's rights, women's rights
Palestinian territories/Israe	56000	human rights in general
Yemen	27120	human rights in general
Total Mediterranean and Middle East	411770	
Great Lakes – East Africa		
Burundi	22000	civil and political rights
Eritrea	10000	civil and political rights
Ethiopia	30000	human rights in general
Kenya	73400	civil and political rights
Sudan	22100	human rights in general
Tanzania	35600	youth/children's rights, women's rights, civil and political rights
Uganda	31700	human rights in general
Total Great Lakes/East Africa	224800	
West Africa incl. Chad		
Cameroon	18710	civil and political rights
Chad	22000	na
Congo-Brazzaville	13000	human rights in general
Gambia	24400	human rights in general
Ghana	10000	Women's rights
Liberia	148600	youth/children's rights, women's rights, human rights in general, economic, social, and cultural rights, civil and political rights
Mali	13500	na
Nigeria	415970	youth/children's rights, women's rights, human rights in general, environmental, economic, social and cultural rights, civil and political rights

<i>Country and continent</i>	<i>grants US dollars</i>	<i>category of project</i>
Total West Africa	666180	
Southern Africa		
Botswana	15000	civil and political rights
Malawi	15000	na
South Africa	5000	human rights in general
Zambia	7000	Women's rights
Zimbabwe	13000	youth/children's rights
Total Southern Africa	55000	
Australia & South East Asia		
Australia	29400	human rights in general
Indonesia	52000	economic, social and cultural rights
Philippines	61400	economic, social and cultural rights, human rights in general
Thailand	61000	human rights in general
Total Australia and South East Asia	203800	
South Asia		
Bangladesh	9000	Women's rights
Bhutan/Nepal	7700	na
India	138800	human rights in general, economic, social and cultural rights, women's rights
Nepal	134840	human rights in general, women's rights, economic, social and cultural rights, civil and political rights
Pakistan	10000	civil and political rights
Sri Lanka	33000	youth/children's rights, human rights in general
Tibet	7000	na
Total South Asia	205500	
North America and Central America		
Belize	13000	civil and political rights
Dominican Republic, The	14760	civil and political rights, youth/children's rights
Haiti	48000	civil and political rights, human rights in general
Mexico	67168	human rights in general
Nicaragua	13000	Women's rights
USA	22000	na
Total North and Central America	177928	
South America		
Argentina	11200	na
Brazil	59500	economic, social and cultural rights, human rights in general
Chile	28500	economic, social and cultural rights, youth/children rights
Colombia	142066	youth/children rights, civil and political rights, human rights in general
Ecuador	8000	civil and political rights
Paraguay	13000	youth/children's rights
Peru	91532	economic, social and cultural rights, civil and political rights, women's rights, human rights in general
Uruguay	15000	na
Venezuela	24700	na
Total South America	393498	
Grand total all Countries	2425976	

Annex 5 Key Financial Data

Key Financial Data 1996–99 in NOK 1000

	<i>Contributions</i>			<i>Expenditure</i>		<i>Balance</i>	<i>Capital</i>
	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Member organisations	Other income	Grants	Administration expenditure	Surplus	Net capital
1996	3740	1370 (27 %)	85	4452	250 (5 %)	492	1381
1997	2740	970 (26 %)	140	3088	335 (10 %)	427	1808
1998	3740	1520 (29 %)	142	5957	663 (10 %)	-1217	691
1999	3380	1440 (30 %)	26	4751	547 (10 %)	-452	239

Source: Audited Financial Accounts 1997–99. According to this source, the net capital balance of 1998 is NOK 691,000, whereas, subtracting the net capital amount of 1808,000 for 1997 with the deficit balance of 1217,000 for 1998 would result in a net capital of NOK 591,000. This discrepancy of NOK 100,000 seems to be due to the fact that, whereas the auditors estimated the net capital to be NOK 1808,000 as per end 1997, they report a net capital at the beginning of 1998 of NOK 1908,000 in their report of 1998. It is impossible from the audited statements to explain why this discrepancy occurs. Thus, the auditors are not entirely consistent in estimating net capital during 1997 and 1998 respectively. We have adhered to the reporting of the auditors of the year in question, and not to the later revisions; we therefore report a net capital of NOK 1808,000 during 1997, and not NOK 1908,000.

Annex 6 Organisation Assessment in Relation to NHRF Projects

Organisation	Coherence of strategy	Overall staff capacity	Local grounding / network	Human rights orientation	National / regional effect	Target population effect
India						
People Education and Economic Development Society (PEEDS)	above average	below average	average	above average	average	above average
Promotion of Grassroot Enlightenment and Social Security (PROGRESS)	average	below average	below average	average	below average	below average
Rural Environmental and Development Center (REDC)	average	average	average	above average	below average	average
Village Reconstruction and Development Project (VRDP)	above average	above average	average	above average		average
Voice Trust (VT)	average	average	average	average	below average	average
Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA)	above average	average	average	average	below average	above average
Liberia						
Catholic Justice and Peace Commission (CJPC)	above average	above average	above average	above average	above average	above average
Human Rights Watch, Women and Children (HRW)	average			above average	above average	average
Liberia Human Rights Observer (LHRO)	average		above average	average	below average	
Liberia Prison Watch (LIPWA)	above average		above average	above average	above average	above average
National Human Rights Centre of Liberia (NHRL)	above average	above average	above average	average	above average	above average
National Human Rights Monitor (NHRM)	average		above average	above average	average	
Nigeria						
Civil Liberties Organisation (CLO)	average	above average	above average	above average	above average	above average
Communicating for Change (CFC)	above average	above average	average	average	above average	below average
Huri-Laws the Human Rights Law Service (Huri-Laws)	average	above average		above average	average	below average
Constitutional Rights Project (CRP)	above average	above average	above average	above average	above average	below average
Inst. of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (IHRHL)	average	average	average	above average	average	average
Niger Delta Human Environmental Rescue Org. (ND-Hero)	above average	average	average	above average	average	above average
Shelter rights initiative (SRI)	above average	above average	above average	above average	above average	above average

NB. The first three criteria refer to the general organisation capacity in implementing NHRF projects, while the last three criteria refer to the last financed NHRF project. The assessment is contextual, not absolute, in the sense that evaluation performance is assessed against the background of the specific projects in the country in question.

Annex 7 Category Overview of Last-financed Projects by NHRF

Organisation	Category and objectives of last financed project	Activities and Target Groups
India		
People Education and Economic Development Society (PEEDS)	<i>Training, advocacy, legal aid.</i> "To provide Dalits with rights in public property and ownership of Panchami lands. To promote self-reliant community".	Training of cadres in 39 villages, fact-finding, legal aid and legal action. Targeting Dalit groups and communities.
Promotion of Grassroot Enlightenment and Social Security (PROGREES)	<i>HR education and empowerment.</i> "To promote the right to food and the knowledge about economic, social and cultural rights among different sectors of the society in Tamil Nadu"	Training of university teachers and students and in order for them To train rural disadvantaged groups.
Rural Environmental and Development Centre (REDC)	<i>HR training and income generation.</i>	Rural uneducated women
Village Reconstruction and Development Project (VRDP)	<i>Research and documentation.</i> "To study and bring out monographs on human rights violations in tribal areas and to pressurise Tamil Nadu government to declare the tribal areas that can be brought under 5 th schedule.	Targeting tribal communities and authorities dealing with them through research and documentation.
Voice Trust (VT)	<i>Awareness raising, legal training.</i> "To free bonded labourers and to inform them about their livelihood rights".	Staging of cultural programs, legal and leadership training for disadvantaged groups in three villages.
Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA)	<i>Mobilisation and training.</i> "To promote the rights of Dalit bonded labourers in rural Karnataka".	Training, awareness-raising, legal aid, and mass-mobilisation of Dalit bonded labourers
Liberia		
Catholic Justice and Peace Commission (CJPC)	<i>Legal aid.</i> "Defending the report on forced child labour in south-eastern Liberia."	Human rights, civic education, civil society building, legal aid and human rights monitoring, documentation and reporting.
Human Rights Watch, Women and Children (HRW)	<i>HR Education.</i> "HR education programme on women's and children's rights."	Women and children in local communities
Liberia Human Rights Observer (LHRO)	Civic education. "Consolidating sustainable grassroots Democracy through good governance."	The public in general
Liberia Prison Watch (LIPWA)	<i>Prison monitoring.</i> "Documentation, reporting and education on prison conditions."	Prison populations and prison guards
National Human Rights Centre of Liberia (NHRL)	<i>Networking.</i> "Support and capacity-building projects for human rights organisations."	Human rights organisations
National Human Rights Monitor (NHRM)	<i>Information, documentation,</i> "To enable the organisation to run and office in Monrovia"	Women and Children

Organisation	Category and objectives of last financed project	Activities and Target Groups
Nigeria		
Civil Liberties Organisation (CLO)	<i>Legal Aid.</i> "Legal assistance for Ongoni 19."	Establishment of Fund for the Defence of Imprisoned Ongoni Activists
Communicating for Change (CFC)	<i>Awareness raising.</i> "To promote awareness on human rights abuses of widows in Eastern Nigeria by organising the launch of their latest film."	Awareness-raising through media campaign targeting experts, NGOs and the public at large.
Huri-Laws the Human Rights Law Service (Huri-Laws)	<i>Networking.</i> "Liase with ECOWAS to work modalities for relationship with NGOs and HR Groups."	Follow-up to first and second West African Human Rights Forum. Publication targeting networking West African NGOs
Constitutional Rights Project (CRP)	<i>Press freedom campaign.</i> "Strengthen awareness on the international obligations of press freedom and support for victims of freedom of speech violations."	Public awareness of press freedom Documentation publication, and legal aid, and distribution of T-shirts for students and university teachers.
Inst. of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (IHRHL)	<i>Community centre support and core funding.</i> "Institution-building and paralegal Community Centres."	Rural community empowerment through paralegal training and community infrastructure.
Niger Delta Human Environmental Rescue Organisation (ND-Hero)	<i>Litigation and legal aid.</i>	Legal support for victims of environmental and human rights abuses.
Shelter Rights Initiative (SRI)	<i>Training and elaboration of training material.</i> "To provide training for lower court judges on the prevalent local and international jurisprudence of housing rights."	Capacity-building of National Judicial Institute for training. Elaboration of training manual Consolidation of gains of earlier funding concerning evictions, thus targeting lower court judges.

Annex 8 India/Liberia/Nigeria: Organisation Assessment

India (Tamil Nadu and Karnataka)

Organisation	Organisational focus	Target group focus	Capacity	Documentation	Monitoring effect
People education and economic development society (PEEDS)	rights training and awareness raising and legal litigation and advocacy	Dalit groups	1 lawyer and 14 staff. Mainly legal and social action capacity. Staff capacity in Dalit mobilisation	yes	no
Promotion of Grassroot Enlightenment and Social Security (working in 18 districts of TN) (PROGRESS)	human rights education with focus on economic, social and cultural r.	college and university teachers and students and economically disadvantaged groups	1 lawyer, 2 staff. Mainly legal capacity	yes	no
Rural Environmental and Development Centre (Dharmapuri district) (REDC)	women self-help groups, human rights training and awareness raising	rural uneducated women	1 engineer and 1 social worker. 14 staff. Mainly capacity in rural development	no	no
Village Reconstruction and Development Project (three districts around Salem) (VRDP)	rural empowerment through self-help, awareness raising, and legal advocacy	tribal women	1 MA history and sociology, 1 MA social work. 30 staff. – Capacity of staff in tribal mobilisation	yes	no
Voice Trust (Andanallur Taluk, Trichy district) (VT)	rural empowerment through self-help, awareness raising, rights training and agricultural extension	landless and small-scale peasants, disabled persons	2 agriculture science, 2 community development, 22 staff. Mainly, capacity in rural development	yes	no
Young Men's Christian Association. (YMCA)	Legal training and advocacy, litigation, income generation and awareness raising	landless labourers, women's groups, school dropouts	1 zoologist, 3 with postgraduate degree. 9 staff	no	no

Liberia

Organisation	Organisational focus	Target group focus	Capacity	Documentation	Monitoring effect
Catholic Justice and Peace Commission (CJPC)	Civic education, civil society capacity-building human rights advocacy, legal aid	general, both urban and rural	Monitors trained especially for rural areas.	yes	yes
Human Rights Watch, Women and Children (HRW)	Documentation and awareness raising on women's and children's rights and grassroots HR education	illiterate people in urban areas	staff of six and voluntary members	yes	no
Liberian Human Rights Observer (LHRO)	Awareness-raising generalisation and advocacy on social and economic rights				
Liberia Human Rights Observer (LHRO)	Campaigns and training on economic, social rights and good governance,	Urban and Rural	Big staff, but restrained economy 5 branches	yes (Training and awareness raising).	yes
Liberia Prison Watch (LIPWA)	Documentation, reporting and education on prison conditions.	Countrywide	Specialised and focussed staff and Board	yes	yes
National Human Rights Centre of Liberia (NHRL)	Resource centre, documentation, fund-raising	Monrovia	Human rights consultant assistance, individual member organisation capacity	yes	no

Nigeria

Organisation	Organisational focus	Target group focus	Capacity	Documentation	Monitoring effect
Civil Liberties Organisation (CLO)	Legal advocacy, civil and political rights, litigation, training of NGOs, documentation lobbying, democracy dialogue	general, both urban and rural,	Staff: Legal, gender, documentation. Membership: About 25.000 all over Nigeria	yes	yes
Communicating for Change (CFC)	Communication of environmental and human rights issues	population in general, youth	All of Nigeria via radio, TV and film	no	no
Huri-Laws the Human Rights Law Service, Lagos (Huri-Laws)	Strategic litigation, legal aid in prisons, lobbying for justice reforms.	Prison populations	Lagos, Enugu, primarily	yes	no
Constitutional Rights Project (CRP)	Incorporation of human rights standards, legal advocacy and lobbying, research with a focus on press freedom	general and urban	Legal, with offices in Lagos, Abuja and Owerri	yes	no
Inst. of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law, Port Harcourt (IHRHL)	Counselling and access to justice, documentation, and lobbying	Rural more than urban. Rural poor.	Legal, Delta Region, primarily	yes	no
Niger Delta Human and Environmental Rescue Organisation (ND-Hero)	Legal advocacy for community groups victims of environmental degradation and of human rights abuses of oil companies	Rural, South-eastern region	Legal and environmental	yes	no
Shelter Rights Initiative, Lagos, (SRI)	Legal advocacy, economic and social rights, litigation, training of magistrates.	urban slums	Legal, with a membership of 1000 people.	yes	no

Annex 9 Summary of Target Effects

Organisation	Target Group	Activities/effects
India		
People Education and Economic Development Society (PEEDS)	Dalit groups	Retrieved 14 acres of land for Dalit landless people, while having high court cases for others. Got compensation for two families.
Promotion of Grassroot Enlightenment and Social Security (PROGRESS)	Rural marginalized groups and university teachers and students	Education seminars for 60 college teachers and students. Education workshops in 18 districts.
Rural Environmental and Development Centre (REDC)	Rural uneducated women	Training 60 trainers and 55 paralegals. Training in rights for women self-help groups and for the animators of the organisation.
Village Reconstruction and Development Project (VRDP)	Tribal communities and authorities dealing with them	Conducting field interviews in 100 villages in tribal areas on human rights violations. Preparation of book manuscript.
Voice Trust (VT)	Landless labourers	Conducted cultural training and leadership training in three villages. Sangham saving groups.
Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA)	Dalit bonded labourers	Alternative income generation for 1400 women. Training of Dalit and tribal communities. Legal action on behalf of 40 families. In addition, recovery of land for 30 families
Liberia		
Catholic Justice and Peace Commission (CJPC)	General monitoring of government and prison monitoring	Report on captivity and forced child labour in Liberia. Government filed damages for Liberian dollars 10 mill. Funding of defence meant that government damage case was given up.
Human Rights Watch, Women and Children (HRW)	Women and children	Awareness raising campaign, mainly in one county through cultural groups, radio programs, and billboards. Difficult to assess effect, but one district commissioner acted on a case of wife beating
Liberia Human Rights Observer (LHRO)	The public in general	Workshops in six counties on civic education
Liberia Prison Watch (LIPWA)	Prison populations	A complete assessment of prisons were made, also assistance to indigent prisoners
National Human Rights Centre of Liberia (NHRL)	Human rights organisations	NGO capacity-building through training, office support (computers), and workshops

Organisation	Target Group	Activities/effects
Nigeria		
Civil Liberties Organisation (CLO)	Ongoni 19	11 prisoners granted amnesty
Communicating for Change (CFC)	Grassroot networking among widowhood NGOs	Film guide for distributed to 300 people. Film shown to buspassengers and leaflet reaching 45,000 people.
Huri-Laws the Human Rights Law Service (Huri-Laws)	Cross-border strategic alliance	Protecting Human Rights and Peace through ECOWAS. 1999.
Constitutional Rights Project (CRP)	Public awareness of press freedom	Report on the state of press freedom in Nigeria 1997. 1800 T-shirts distributed. A conference organised for domestic journalists
Inst. of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (IHRHL)	Rural community empowerment	Establishment and reinforcement of 25 para-legal community centres. One centre visited deals on average with three cases per week, mostly arbitrary arrests and detention.
Niger Delta Human Environmental Rescue Organisation (ND-Hero)	Victims of environmental and Human rights abuses	Four litigation cases against oil companies or Nigerian State. In one case won Naira 30 mill in settlement for community youth and victims of oil spillage
Shelter Rights Initiative (SRI)	Defence and empowerment of evicted groups	Manual on Housing Rights Protection Strategies for lower Court Judges. Litigation for housing rights, sometimes very large groups involved (3 Mill one case)
National Human Rights Monitor (NHRM)	Women and children	Opening of new office space

Annex 10 Organisation Strategies

Organisation	Organisation Strategy
India	
People Education and Economic Development Society (PEEDS)	Legal advocacy and aid, and awareness raising
Promotion of Grassroot Enlightenment and Social Security (PROGRESS)	Training and education
Rural Environmental and Development Centre (REDC)	Women's empowerment through rights training and formation of rural self-help groups
Village Reconstruction and Development Project (VRDP)	Empowerment through social amenities, saving schemes, documentation and advocacy
Voice Trust (VT)	Rural development through savings, rights training, awareness raising, and improved agricultural practices
Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA)	Empowerment of people through legal advocacy and aid, litigation, mobilisation campaigns, and income generation
Liberia	
Catholic Justice and Peace Commission (CJPC)	Monitoring and advocacy, awareness raising and education
Human Rights Watch, Women and Children (HRW)	Awareness raising and education at grassroots level
Liberia Human Rights Observer (LHRO)	Awareness raising on HR and democracy. Monitoring disappearances
Liberia Prison Watch (LIPWA)	Monitoring prisons, training of prisoners, legal assistance and humanitarian aid
National Human Rights Centre of Liberia (NHRL)	Human Rights networking and capacity-building
Nigeria	
Civil Liberties Organisation (CLO)	Advocacy, legal aid and litigation, education
Communicating for Change (CFC)	Women's rights advocacy, education
Huri-Laws the Human Rights Law Service (Huri-Laws)	Strategic impact litigation, monitoring of prisoners rights, documentation
Constitutional Rights Project (CRP)	Legislative change, legal aid and litigation
Inst. of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (IHRHL)	Legal aid and litigation, HR education, documentation
Nigerian Delta Human Environmental Rescue Org. (ND-Hero)	Legal advocacy, legal aid and litigation
Shelter Rights Initiative (SRI)	Legal aid, legal advocacy, documentation and education
National Human Rights Monitor (NHRM)	Education and awareness raising targeting women and children, paralegal training

Annex 11 Bibliography

General literature

Ford Foundation Annual Report 1999. New York: The Ford Foundation. 2000.

Ford Foundation Report. Vol. 31, No. 3. 2000. New York: Ford Foundation.

Indian literature

Annual Report of Voice Trust 2000. Tamil Nadu: Voice Trust.

Black Paper – Broken promises & Dalits betrayed. Folder. India: National Campaign on Dalit human rights.

Human rights forum for Dalit Liberation (HRFDL). *Campaign seeking the inclusion of caste discrimination in the CERD convention against the background of WCAR in South Africa*. Tamil Nadu: HRFDL

People's Watch. *Human rights in Tamil Nadu – A status report – 1996*. Tamil Nadu: People's Watch.

People's Watch. *Human rights in Tamil Nadu*. Mimeo. Tamil Nadu: People's Watch.

National Campaign on Dalit human rights 10. Dec. 1998 – 14. Apr. 1999. Folder. India: National Campaign Committee.

People's Watch-News Vol. No. 4. Nov. 1999 – Apr. 2000. Tamil Nadu: People's Watch. PEEDS. (Re)Claiming Dalit land: Roots in the air. India: PEEDS.

PEEDS. *Demanding the obvious – Accessing Dalits the right to be humans PEEDS at the Anvil*. Mimeo. India: PEEDS.

Sudhantra 1995 – 1997 Status report. Women's rights are human rights. Madurai: Sudhanthra.

Liberian literature

Liberian journal of democracy. Vol. 1. No. 2. 2000. Liberia: Liberian democracy watch.

Liberian journal of democracy. Vol. 1. No. 1. 1999. Liberia: Liberian democracy watch.

Voice, The. Vol. 1. No. 5. June 1999. Lagos: National human rights centre of Liberia.

Voice, The. Vol. 2. No. 6. July. 1999. Lagos: National human rights centre of Liberia.

Nigerian literature

Agbakoba, Olisa and Wilfred U. J. Mamah. Oct. 2000. *Model constitution for Nigeria – proposed for adoption*. Lagos: HURI-LAWS.

Agbakoba, Olisa, Uche Emelonye and Wilfred U. J. Mamah. Oct. 2000. *Legal and judicial sector reform in Nigeria – report back to rule of law assessment mission to Nigeria*. Lagos: HURI-LAWS.

Agbakoba, Olisa and Emeka Asuzu Esq. No year. *Model civil procedure rules – proposed for adoption by high courts in Nigeria*. Lagos: HURI-LAWS.

Akumadu, Theresa U (Ed.). Jul. 1999. *Women's reproductive health rights – A training manual for communities of Eastern Nigeria*. Lagos: Civil liberties organisation.

Akumadu, Theresa U. April 5 1998. *Beast of Burden – A Study of Women's Legal Status & Reproductive Health Rights in Nigeria*. Lagos: Civil Liberties Organisation.

Constitutional rights journal. Vol. No. 32. 1999. Nigeria: Constitutional rights project.

Democracy review. Vol. 3. No. 2. 2000. Nigeria: Civil liberties organisation.

- Communicating for change*. Vol. 11. No. 21. 2000. Lagos: Communicating for change.
- Constitutional rights journal*. Vol. No. 32. 1999. Nigeria: Constitutional rights project.
- Democracy review*. Vol. 3. No. 2. 2000. Nigeria: Civil liberties organisation.
- Embeka Ibe & Co. 1999. *West African human rights forum – audited financial statements 1. jan – dec. 31. 1999*. Lagos: Emeka Ibe & Co.
- Emelonye, Uche Jackies. May 2000. *The governance scorecard – review of democratic governance in Nigeria*. Lagos: HURI-LAWS.
- Eze, Osita. 1998. *Study on the right to education in Nigeria*. Lagos: Shelter rights initiative.
- Eze, Osita and Eze Onyekpere. July 1998. *Study on the right to health in Nigeria*. Lagos: Shelter rights initiative.
- Film guide – Till death do us part*. 2000. Lagos: Communicating for change.
- Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. 22. Jun. 2000. National programme on governance for sustainable human development. *Programme framework document*. Abuja.
- Human rights defender*. Vol. 3. No. 1. 2000. Nigeria: Institute of human rights and humanitarian law.
- Huri-Laws. Feb. 2000. *Third West African human rights forum preliminary report*. Lagos: Huri-Laws.
- Huri-Laws Newsletter, The*. Vol. 1. No. 10. 2000. Lagos: Huri-Laws.
- Huri-Laws. Apr. – Nov. 1999. *Sixth report – death penalty project*. Lagos: Huri-Laws.
- Huri-Laws. Mar. 10 – Nov. 30. 1999. *Legal aid to prisoners in Enugu prison project report on test cases*. Lagos: Huri-Laws.
- Huri-Laws. Jan. 1999. *First report on legal aid to prisoners in Enugu prison, Enugu state*. Lagos: Huri-Laws.
- Huri-Laws. Nov. 1998 – Mar. 1999. *Fifth report on the death penalty project*. Lagos: Huri-Laws.
- Huri-Laws. Sep. 1998. *Preliminary report on the Enugu prison project*. Lagos: Huri-Laws. *Huri-Laws 1997–1998 Annual Reports and Accounts*. Lagos: Huri-Laws.
- Islam and human rights – A human rights education training manual for Islamic organisations in Nigeria*. Oct. 1999. Lagos: Civil liberties organisation.
- Labour rights, A publication of human rights education project of*, Vol. 1 No. 7. 2000. Lagos: the Civil Liberties Organisation.
- Laser Contact*. Newsletter of the Lawyers for socio-economic rights network (Laser) of shelter rights initiative. Vol. 3. No. 2. 1999. Lagos: Laser.
- Maja-Pearce, Adewale. 1999. *Annual Report 1998 – A CLO report on the state of human rights in Nigeria*. Lagos: Civil Liberties Organisation (CLO).
- Maritime Newsletter*. Apr.-Jun. 2000. Lagos: Olisa Agbakoba & Associates.
- National human rights commission. May 1999. *Third West African human rights forum, Abuja, Nigeria, 30. Mar. – 1. Apr. 1999. Final communiqué and decisions*. Lagos: National human rights commission of Nigeria.
- ND-Hero human rights alert*. Imiringi shootings. No year. Nigeria: The Niger Delta Human & Environmental Rescue Organisation.

- ND-Hero human rights alert*. A pen is being detained. No year. Nigeria: The Niger Delta Human & Environmental Rescue Organisation.
- Nigeria habitat* (Newsletter of the Nigeria Habitat Coalition-NHC). Vol. 1. No. 1. 1999. Lagos: Shelter Rights Initiative.
- Olugboji, Babatunde. 1997. *Suppression of press freedom in Nigeria*. Nigeria: Constitutional rights project.
- Onyekpere Esq, Eze (ed.). 2000. *Manual on housing rights protection strategies – for lower court judges*. Lagos: Shelter Rights Initiative.
- Onyekpere, Eze (Ed.). 1998. *Manual on gender specific rights litigation and protection strategies*. Lagos: Shelter Rights Initiative.
- Report of the Third West African human rights forum*. 29 Mar.–1. Apr. 1999. Abuja: Nigerian national human rights commission.
- Resolutions of the Niger Delta women of Bayelsa state*. 25.–27. Nov. 1999. 1st Niger Delta indigenous women's conference. Yenagoa.
- Shelter Watch*. Vol. 1. No. 2. 1996. Lagos: Shelter Rights Initiative.
- UN Assessment team. Post-electoral assistance to Nigeria. *Mission report 1–13 May. 2000*.
- Norwegian literature**
- Annual report 1999*. Evaluation activities of the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Norway: Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Annual report 1999*. Norway: Norwegian People's Aid. 2000.
- Aschjem, Halvor and Margot Iglund Skarpeteig. Feb. 1998. *Fighting for human rights in Liberia and Nigeria - A report from a fact finding mission*. Norway: The Norwegian Human Rights Fund.
- Appell* Vol. 2–3. 1999. Norway: Norsk Folkehjelp.
- Evaluation Report 10.99*. AWEPA - The Association of European Parliamentarians for Africa. AEI - The African European Institute. Synthesis report. Norway: Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Evaluation Report 2.99*. International Planned Parenthood Federation – Policy and effectiveness at country and regional levels. Synthesis report. Norway: Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Evaluation Report 8.98*. Evaluation of the Norwegian program for indigenous peoples. Norway: Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Det Norske Menneskerettighetsfond 10-års seminar. Avholdt 4. juni 1998*. (Rapport fra seminaret).
- Håp for verden – kirken og menneskerettighetene*. 1998. Norway: Kirkens Nødhjelp, FIAN, Frikirkenes Globale Informasjon, Mellomkirkelig Råd, Kirkens U-landsinformasjon.
- Longva, Tale. 10. Jan. 1999. *Prosjektreise til Egypt 24. Nov.–1. Dec. 1999*. Norway: Det norske menneskerettighetsfond.
- Menneskeverd i sentrum – Hovedtrekk fra St. meld. Nr. 21 (1999–2000) – Handlingsplan for menneskerettigheter*. Dec. 1999. Norway: Utenriksdepartementet.
- Møt volden – kirkelig arbeid mot maktesløshet*. 2000. Norway: Kirkens Bymisjon, Norges KFUK/KFUM, Changemaker i Kirkens Nødhjelp, Mellomkirkelig Råd for Den norske Kirke.
- NORAD annual report 1999*. www.norad.no/ind_aktuelt.html

Norwegian People's Aid. 1999. *Program and Principles 1999–2003*. Norway: Norwegian People's Aid.

Odegard, Jan Thomas H. 10. Aug. 1998. *Det norske menneskerettighetsfondets reise til Colombia 16.–26. Mai 1998*. Norway: Det norske menneskerettighetsfond.

Skarpeteig, Margot Igland. 17. Mar. 1999. De glemte menneskerettighetsbruddene – Brudd på grunnleggende menneskerettigheter i Bhutan, India og Nepal. *Landrapport nr. 1 1999*. Norway: Det norske menneskerettighetsfond.

Skarpeteig, Margot Igland. 17. Mar. 1999. Menneskerettighetssituasjonen i Nigeria i overgang fra diktatur til demokrati. *Landrapport nr. 2 1999*. Norway: Det norske menneskerettighetsfond.

EVALUATION REPORTS

1.87	The Water Supply Programme in Western Province, Zambia	2.97	«Kultursjokk og Korrektiv» – Evaluering av UD/NORADs Studiereiser for Lærere
2.87	Sosio-kulturelle forhold i bistanden	3.97	Evaluation of Decentralisation and Development
3.87	Summary Findings of 23 Evaluation Reports	4.97	Evaluation of Norwegian Assistance to Peace, Reconciliation and Rehabilitation in Mozambique
4.87	NORAD's Provisions for Investment Support	5.97	Aid to Basic Education in Africa – Opportunities and Constraints
5.87	Multiateral bistand gjennom FN-systemet	6.97	Norwegian Church Aid's Humanitarian and Peace-Making Work in Mali
6.87	Promoting Imports from Developing Countries	7.97	Aid as a Tool for Promotion of Human Rights and Democracy: What can Norway do?
1.88	UNIFEM - United Nations Development Fund for Women	8.97	Evaluation of the Nordic Africa Institute, Uppsala
2.88	The Norwegian Multi-Bilateral Programme under UNFPA	9.97	Evaluation of Norwegian Assistance to Worldview International Foundation
3.88	Rural Roads Maintenance, Mbeya and Tanga Regions, Tanzania	10.97	Review of Norwegian Assistance to IPS
4.88	Import Support, Tanzania	11.97	Evaluation of Norwegian Humanitarian Assistance to the Sudan
5.88	Nordic Technical Assistance Personnel to Eastern Africa	12.97	Cooperation for Health Development
6.88	Good Aid for Women?		WHO's Support to Programmes at Country Level
7.88	Soil Science Fellowship Course in Norway	1.98	“Twinning for Development”. Institutional Cooperation between Public Institutions in Norway and the South
1.89	Parallel Financing and Mixed Credits	2.98	Institutional Cooperation between Sokoine and Norwegian Agricultural Universities
2.89	The Women's Grant. Desk Study Review	3.98	Development through Institutions? Institutional Development Promoted by Norwegian Private Companies and Consulting Firms
3.89	The Norwegian Volunteer Service	4.98	Development through Institutions? Institutional Development Promoted by Norwegian Non-Governmental Organisations
4.89	Fisheries Research Vessel - “Dr. Fridtjof Nansen”	5.98	Development through Institutions? Institutional Development in Norwegian Bilateral Assistance. Synthesis Report
5.89	Institute of Development Management, Tanzania	6.98	Managing Good Fortune – Macroeconomic Management and the Role of Aid in Botswana
6.89	DUHs Forskningsprogrammer	7.98	The World Bank and Poverty in Africa
7.89	Rural Water Supply, Zimbabwe	8.98	Evaluation of the Norwegian Program for Indigenous Peoples
8.89	Commodity Import Programme, Zimbabwe	9.98	Evaluering av Informasjonsstøtten til RORGene
9.89	Dairy Sector Support, Zimbabwe	10.98	Strategy for Assistance to Children in Norwegian Development Cooperation
1.90	Mini-Hydropower Plants, Lesotho	11.98	Norwegian Assistance to Countries in Conflict
2.90	Operation and Maintenance in Development Assistance	12.98	Evaluation of the Development Cooperation between Norway and Nicaragua
3.90	Telecommunications in SADCC Countries	13.98	UNICEF-komiteen i Norge
4.90	Energy Support in SADCC Countries	14.98	Relief Work in Complex Emergencies
5.90	Intentional Research and Training Institute for Advancement of Women (INSTRAW)	1.99	WID/Gender Units and the Experience of Gender Mainstreaming in Multilateral Organisations
6.90	Socio-Cultural Conditions in Development Assistance	2.99	International Planned Parenthood Federation – Policy and Effectiveness at Country and Regional Levels
7.90	Non-Project Financial Assistance to Mozambique	3.99	Evaluation of Norwegian Support to Psycho-Social Projects in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Caucasus
1.91	Hjelp til Selvhjelp og Levedyktig Utvikling	4.99	Evaluation of the Tanzania-Norway Development Cooperation 1994–1997
2.91	Diploma Courses at the Norwegian Institute of Technology	5.99	Building African Consulting Capacity
3.91	The Women's Grant in Bilateral Assistance	6.99	Aid and Conditionality
4.91	Hambantota Integrated Rural Development Programme, Sri Lanka	7.99	Policies and Strategies for Poverty Reduction in Norwegian Development Aid
5.91	The Special Grant for Environment and Development	8.99	Aid Coordination and Aid Effectiveness
1.92	NGOs as Partners in Health Care, Zambia	9.99	Evaluation of the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF)
2.92	The Sahel-Sudan-Ethiopia Programme	10.99	Evaluation of AWEPA, The Association of European Parliamentarians for Africa, and AEI, The African European Institute
3.92	De Private Organisasjonene som Kanal for Norsk Bistand, Fase I	1.00	Review of Norwegian Health-related Development Cooperation 1988–1997
1.93	Internal Learning from Evaluations and Reviews	2.00	Norwegian Support to the Education Sector. Overview of Policies and Trends 1988–1998
2.93	Macroeconomic Impacts of Import Support to Tanzania	3.00	The Project “Training for Peace in Southern Africa”
3.93	Garantiordning for Investeringer i og Eksport til Utviklingsland	4.00	En kartlegging av erfaringer med norsk bistand gjennom frivillige organisasjoner 1987–1999
4.93	Capacity-Building in Development Cooperation Towards Integration and Recipient Responsibility	5.00	Evaluation of the NUFU programme
1.94	Evaluation of World Food Programme	6.00	Making Government Smaller and More Efficient. The Botswana Case
2.94	Evaluation of the Norwegian Junior Expert Programme with UN Organisations	7.00	Evaluation of the Norwegian Plan of Action for Nuclear Safety Priorities, Organisation, Implementation
1.95	Technical Cooperation in Transition	8.00	Evaluation of the Norwegian Mixed Credits Programme
2.95	Evaluering av FN-sambandet i Norge	9.00	“Norwegians? Who needs Norwegians?” Explaining the Oslo Back Channel: Norway's Political Past in the Middle East
3.95	NGOs as a Channel in Development aid	10.00	Taken for Granted? An Evaluation of Norway's Special Grant for the Environment
3A.95	Rapport fra Presentasjonsmøte av «Evalueringen av de Frivillige Organisasjoner»	1.01	Evaluation of the Norwegian Human Rights Fund
4.95	Rural Development and Local Government in Tanzania		
5.95	Integration of Environmental Concerns into Norwegian Bilateral Development Assistance: Policies and Performance		
1.96	NORAD's Support of the Remote Area Development Programme (RADP) in Botswana		
2.96	Norwegian Development Aid Experiences. A Review of Evaluation Studies 1986–92		
3.96	The Norwegian People's Aid Mine Clearance Project in Cambodia		
4.96	Democratic Global Civil Governance Report of the 1995 Benchmark Survey of NGOs		
5.96	Evaluation of the Yearbook “Human Rights in Developing Countries”		
1.97	Evaluation of Norwegian Assistance to Prevent and Control HIV/AIDS		

Published by
The Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
7. juniplassen 1/Victoria Terrasse
P.O. Box 8114 Dep., 0032 Oslo
NORWAY

Available on the Internet:
[http://odin.dep.no/ud/english/publ/
rappporter/032091-990133/](http://odin.dep.no/ud/english/publ/rappporter/032091-990133/)

Evaluation reports may be ordered from:
E-mail: eval@mfa.no
Fax: +47 22 24 35 40
Tel: +47 22 24 33 54

