

ANNEX I

EIDHR FINANCIAL ALLOCATIONS 2007 – 2010

Objective	Indicative financial allocation (in €million)				Total in € million (rounded % of grand total)	Regions	Indicative regional share (in%)	
	2007	2008	2009	2010				
Objective 1 Enhancing respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in countries and regions where they are most at risk	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	56.0 (10.1)	ENPI and Middle East	35	
						Central and Latin America	15	
						ACP	25	
						Asia/Central Asia	25	
Objective 2 Strengthening the role of civil society in promoting human rights and democratic reform, in facilitating the peaceful conciliation of group interests and consolidating political participation and representation	30.0*	37.0*	44.6*	49.8*	161.4* (29.1)	Country-based support schemes	Western Balkans/ Candidate countries	25
						ENPI and Middle East countries	30	
						Central and Latin American countries	15	
						ACP countries	15	
						Asian and Central Asian countries	15	
	Transnational and regional activities	15.5	12.5	10.5	8.5	47.0 (8.5)	Western Balkans and Candidate countries	10
							ENPI and Middle East	20
							Central and Latin America	20
							ACP	25
							Asia and Central Asia	25
Subtotal (Objectives 1 and 2)	59.5	63.5	69.1	72.3	264.4 (47.7)	Global	-	
Objective 3 Support to EU Guidelines <i>Human Rights Dialogues</i> <i>Human Rights Defenders</i> <i>Death Penalty</i> <i>Torture</i> <i>Children and Armed Conflict</i>	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	2.0 (0.4)	Global	-	
	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	16.0 (3.0)	Global	-	
	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	8.0 (1.5)	Global	-	
	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	44.0 (8.0)	Global (including EU)	-	
	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	6.8 (1.2)	Global	-	
	Subtotal (Objective 3)	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	76.8 (14.1)	Global	-
Objective 4 Supporting the international framework	16.2	15.3	13.3	13.3	58.1 (10.5)	Global	-	
Objective 5 EU Election Observation Missions	35.1	31.0	32.0	33.0	131.1 (23.7)	Global	-	
Contingency	-	8.0	8.0	8.0	24.0 (4.3)	Covering Objectives 1 - 5	-	
Grand Total	130.0	137.0	141.6	145.8	554.4 (100)	Global	-	

* These amounts include up to 3% of the allocation for support measures accompanying implementation of country-based support schemes

ANNEX II

Country-based support scheme Qualifying countries in 2007 and 2008

Identification Criteria

- Certain context within civil society allowing for the development and activities of civil society organizations (including human rights and democracy advocacy bodies), but where the latter may be without much organisational capacity, influence and cohesion

and

- Well-founded need for more effective action by civil society organisations in the field of human rights and democratisation for civil society becoming a sustainable force for positive change and reform
- Specific priority established on the basis of EU policy considerations

		MICRO PROJECTS	LAUNCH CBSS
Western Balkans and Candidate countries			
1	Albania.....	2005-2006	2007
2	Bosnia and Herzegovina.....	2002-2006	2007
3	Montenegro.....	2002-2006	2007
4	Serbia including Kosovo.....	2002-2006	2007
5	Croatia.....	-	2007
6	Turkey.....	2002-2006	2007
7	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia..	2006	2007
European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument and Middle East countries			
8	Belarus.....	2005-2006	2008
9	Ukraine.....	2002-2006	2007
10	Moldova.....	-	2007
11	Armenia.....	2005-2006	2007
12	Azerbaijan.....	-	2007
13	Georgia.....	2002-2006	2007
14	Russia.....	2002-2006	2007
15	Lebanon.....	2004-2006	2007
16	Israel.....	2005-2006	2007
17	West Bank and Gaza.....	2002-2006	2007
		MICRO PROJECTS	LAUNCH CBSS

European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument and Middle East countries ctd.

18	Jordan.....	2002-2006	2007
19	Egypt.....	2005-2006	2008
20	Algeria.....	2002-2006	2008
21	Morocco.....	2005-2006	2007
22	Yemen.....	-	2008

Central and Latin American countries

23	Costa Rica.....	-	2008
24	El Salvador.....	-	2008
25	Guatemala.....	2002-2006	2007
26	Honduras.....	-	2008
27	Mexico.....	2002-2006	2007
28	Nicaragua.....	-	2008
29	Panama.....	-	2008
30	Bolivia.....	2005-2006	2007
31	Colombia.....	2002-2006	2007
32	Ecuador.....	2005-2006	2007
33	Peru.....	2005-2006	2007
34	Venezuela.....	2005-2006	2007
35	Argentina.....	-	2008
36	Brazil.....	2005-2006	2007
37	Chile.....	-	2008
38	Paraguay.....	-	2008
39	Uruguay.....	-	2008

African, Caribbean and Pacific countries

40	Angola.....	2003-2006	2007
41	Burundi.....	2002-2006	2007
42	DRC.....	2002-2006	2007
43	Mozambique.....	2002-2006	2007
44	Nigeria.....	2002-2006	2007
45	Rwanda.....	2002-2006	2007
46	Sierra Leon.....	2002-2004	2007
47	Uganda.....	2005-2006	2007
48	Zimbabwe.....	2002-2006	2007
49	Cuba.....	2005-2006	2008
50	Haiti.....	2002-2006	2007

Asian and Central Asian countries

51	Afghanistan.....	2005-2006	2007
52	Bangladesh.....	2005-2006	2007

MICRO PROJECTS LAUNCH CBSS

Asian and Central Asian countries ctd.

53	Cambodia.....	2002-2006	2007
54	Indonesia.....	2002-2006	2007
55	Laos.....	2005-2006	2007
56	Nepal.....	2002-2006	2007
57	Pakistan.....	2002-2006	2007
58	Philippines.....	-	2008
59	Sri Lanka.....	2005-2006	2007
60	Vietnam.....	2005-2006	2007
61	Kazakhstan.....	2005-2006	2007
62	Kyrgyzstan.....	2005-2006	2007
63	Tajikistan.....	2005-2006	2007

Total of country-based support schemes to be launched in 2007 48

Out of which

Western Balkans and Candidate countries	7
ENPI and Middle East countries	11
Central and Latin American countries	8
African, Caribbean and Pacific countries	10
Asian and Central Asian countries	12

Total of country-based support schemes to be launched in 2008 15

Out of which

Western Balkans and Candidate countries	-
ENPI and Middle East countries	4
Central and Latin American countries	9
African, Caribbean and Pacific countries	1
Asian and Central Asian countries	1

Total of country-based support schemes to be launched in 2007 and 2008 63

Out of which

Western Balkans and Candidate countries	7
ENPI and Middle East countries	15
Central and Latin American countries	17
African, Caribbean and Pacific countries	11
Asian and Central Asian countries	14

European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights A review of the results of evaluations on the Initiative

Introduction

1. Community assistance under the European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights (in the following referred to as “the Initiative”), preceding the present European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, has been subject to much scrutiny and evaluation. Several of the lessons learnt have led to specific improvements regarding programming and implementation, including simplification of administrative procedures and requirements and acceleration of implementation related to decision making. Generally speaking, the Initiative has attempted to encompass a multiplicity of themes echoing EU Guidelines on Human Rights issues, as well as other specific objectives, mandates and suggestions from Council and Parliament, primarily concerned with human rights. The emphasis has been on “single issue” projects, assessed on their individual merits. Whilst their collective impact or synergies at national level have not been so evident, most projects, taken individually, have been of high quality, achieving positive outcomes often in difficult circumstances¹.

2. Multiple mandates and high levels of expectation have tended towards an ever broader set of objectives, issues and eligible countries for the Initiative, as well as high oversubscription rates². In order to enhance impact and achieve greater strategic focus, there have been attempts to integrate themes in a limited number of “campaigns” as for 2005-2006 programming. This process needs to go further. In order to streamline and reduce fragmentation, the general balance of opinion has been to maintain a broad geographic focus, whilst tightening and integrating further the thematic approach. To strengthen complementarity with geographical programmes, which themselves have become more engaged with governance objectives, the Initiative has moved away from capacity building of public bodies, towards cutting edge issues that are clearly too sensitive for government projects.

3. The four main trends during the period from 2002 to 2006 were:

- a major increase in country specific micro-project schemes with calls for proposals managed by Commission Delegations. In 2006, these

1 The European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights has for instance given high priority and visibility over the years to the abolition of the death penalty, the fight against torture and campaigns against racism and discrimination of minorities. It has also put a focus on the rights of women, children and indigenous peoples. It has also been a prime source of support for the launching of specialised higher education in human rights

2 The ratio of project applications to successful projects was 10:1 for the calls for proposals in 2004

represented 30% of all Community assistance preceding the new EIDHR, up from 8% in 2002;

- the gradual rise in importance of EU Election Observation Missions which in 2006 also represented almost 30% of available Community assistance;
- the decrease in the use of direct grant agreements rather than calls for proposals, mainly as a result of the modified rules of the 2003 Financial Regulation. Grant allocations without call for proposals are now dominated by intergovernmental bodies, notably UNDP, OHCHR, the Council of Europe, the ICC and international criminal *ad hoc* tribunals;
- the significant increase in geographical scope from initially 29 “focus countries” in 2002 to 68 targeted countries in 2006.

As regards implementation, the rate of commitments has generally been very high, though the experience of micro project contracting has been less smooth, in part on account of political obstacles.

4. The need to enhance local ownership by improving access by CSOs from the countries and regions concerned, has led to the expansion of locally managed country specific micro-project schemes which has been generally welcomed, though this has not been without problems. Delegations need to be equipped for the task, politically as well as logistically. Moreover, the administrative obligations arising from the Financial Regulation and demands for transparency and accountability continued to limit the extent to which the Commission was able to handle multiple small projects and cope with very sensitive situations. They also constituted a disincentive for many CSOs. The latest revision of the Financial Regulation introduces some simplifications and flexibility which will be of considerable importance for implementing the new EIDHR.

5. With the purpose of providing the Initiative with indicators for its main objectives, a study on Generating Impact Indicators for the Initiative was carried out in 2005. The study provided indicators for each one of the four main objectives of the 2005-2006 programming document. On that basis, project level indicators were proposed in the guidelines of the Calls for proposals in order to show what kind of results the EC was expecting from funded projects. In this way future monitoring and measuring of project and programme results would be facilitated. Future calls for proposals will build on this experience.

1. Results of evaluations

6. During the past five years the following evaluations, organised by theme, have been carried out within the Initiative:

Evaluations of specific EIDHR projects or programmes:

- i) Programa Andino de derechos humanos y democracia, January 2006
- ii) Euro-Mediterranean Human Rights Network(EMHRN), January 2004
- iii) Moscow School of Political Studies, September 2003
- iv) HR Masters' Programmes, November 2003

Thematic evaluations:

- i) Fight Against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, October 2005
- ii) Torture Rehabilitation Centres Europe (France, UK, Belgium and Greece), January 2005

- iii) Torture Rehabilitation Centres (Nepal and Peru), November 2003
- iv) The abolition of death penalty projects between 1998 and 2006 (performed during 2006 and will be finalized in 2007)

Methodological evaluations:

- i) Generating Impact Indicators, EIDHR, March 2005
- ii) Extended Impact Assessment Council Regulations, June 2003
- iii) Ex-post Assessment of EIDHR Projects Completed between January 2002 and July 2003, Dec. 2004

7. Other more general thematic and country specific evaluations also relate to the Initiative and place its activities in a broader context. Of particular note is the recent large scale evaluation on Good Governance which has produced recommendations about raising the coherence and general effectiveness of EU interventions, including the use of the Initiative, to support good governance, which encompasses human rights and democratisation. Other commentaries and analyses of interest include a study of July 2005 commissioned by the European Parliament and carried out under the auspices of the Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy.

8. Based on conclusions and recommendations of the specific EIDHR evaluations, the critical issues to be addressed can be summarized as follows:

- More strategic programming in order to allow for a critical mass of projects under each objective combined with increased efforts to explore complementarity with other EC actions;
- Increased flexibility allowing unforeseen situations and changing needs to be addressed when required;
- Increased and improved use of logical framework approach and project cycle management;
- More systematic monitoring combining project visits by EC task managers with visits of external consultants (ROM);
- Increased number of *programme* evaluations and more strategic choice of evaluations to be carried out in order to improve long term impact measuring;
- Required plan and budget for project monitoring and evaluation systems in the guidelines for Calls for proposals.
- Increased dialogue with implementing partners during the projects
- Increased sharing of lessons learned between delegations and with headquarters on the implementation of the programme

9. The principal recommendations and lessons learnt can be summarised as follows:

- The programme and project designs that have been evaluated show a sound political judgement within their own contexts, i.e. that the objectives of the projects and programmes in an appropriate way take into consideration the environment in which they operate. However, there are several recommendations related to the need to *improve the technical design of projects and programmes*. The major need would be to improve the stakeholders' analyses techniques. Needs of direct beneficiaries are well identified and addressed, but there is in general a lack of

identification of other stakeholders and their needs. If such analyses are improved it can increase the programmes' sustainability.

- Concerning *measuring of effectiveness and impact* through indicators and project monitoring, most of the supported programs and projects were deficient.
- There are several recommendations concerning long term impact assessment, which is better served by having *programme evaluations* rather than project and case oriented ones. It is recommended that the EIDHR makes a more strategic choice of the type of evaluations it wants to select.

Lessons learnt per theme/sector

Racism, xenophobia and discrimination

- The supported programmes and projects have managed to *reach* some of the most *vulnerable* communities in the most challenging environments in the world. The funds have given some NGOs *the strategic freedom* and *financial stability* to implement innovative projects that often reach out to change the lives of the most marginalized and excluded in society. The NGO's participative methodology and human rights principles add real value and *promote trust across ethnic divides*, in places where governments often cannot work.
- The projects that appeared to have most impact and the best prospects of sustainability were those with a *coherent design*, based on a *sound in depth analysis of the country situation* and that were *able to respond to changing circumstances*. Those that had good local partnerships, experienced management and a participatory methodology, that understood the local environment and complex inter-ethnic relations, were often better equipped to run this. Linking the local and national was also an important element in order to have impact.
- It is evident that projects that consciously *use human rights standards* and adopt a *rights based approach* are more relevant and effective in tackling the root causes of racism and discrimination against minorities, and they are likely to have a significant and sustainable impact in the long term.
- The evaluation shows that projects that focus on a *single theme are more vulnerable* and makes it even more important in those cases to build up the strength of the local NGOs and CBOs (Community Based Organisations).
- Regional and global projects should seek to have a *regional or global impact* and be more than just a series of country projects collated together.

Torture rehabilitation Centres

The two thematic evaluations on the Torture Rehabilitation Centres gave the following input:

- The evaluations conclude that activities on rehabilitation of victims of torture *can have some impact on the prevention of torture*. This prevention is in terms of protection of victims, support of asylum applications and capacity building for asylum officers.

- The strategy of *advocacy* in relation to torture prevention by the Torture Rehabilitation Centres did *not seem to be very well developed*. Not at the international level nor at the local and community level. In order for evaluations to furnish more systematic experience on strategies of prevention, a more elaborated programme evaluation would be necessary.
- The consultants propose the EU to *facilitate the coordination* between the European torture rehabilitation centres in their *implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems*. Such development would help to professionalize the management of the centres which is needed in order to improve the impact and effectiveness of the work.
- The centres have *little chance of being sustainable* without EC funding, since the countries where the centres are located do not fulfil their obligations under international law to be given means for as full rehabilitation as possible.
- In order to *enhance the effectiveness of torture* rehabilitation, the centres need to focus more on factors such as integration into a new culture, the victims lack of family and other networks, the need of meaningful working conditions, and not only the medico-psychological factors.

The Abolition of the Death Penalty

- The EC has played a vital role in supporting ADP projects. This is one area in which there has not been major overlap of donors and projects, due in part to the small number of donors and specialist NGOs working in this thematic area.
- Efforts to build coalitions advocating abolition have proved successful in some cases, for example in relation to the Catholic Church in the Philippines and in the case of groupings of NGOs supported by the EC in North Africa. However the role played by individual organisations working on their own with a narrow focus should never be underestimated.
- Projects implementers need systematically to identify all potential local allies and develop long-term relationships with them. The relatively short time-span of EC funding is not helpful in that regard.

Lessons learnt regarding the Project Cycle Management (including calls for proposals)

- Requirements for mainstreaming in EIDHR projects must be clarified.
- EIDHR Call for Proposals guidelines should incorporate a clear formulation on the requirements for monitoring and evaluation of EIDHR projects. The Initiative should consider requiring its partners to plan and budget for Monitoring & Evaluation systems and the required personnel to implement them, since only such systems are capable of tracking indicators systematically over the course of a multi-year project.
- The evaluations clearly show the well known fact that projects and programmes can not entirely fulfil its objectives if all steps in the project management cycle are not followed. This is something that needs to be clarified in the guidelines. The evaluations raise the idea of reinstatement of the *helpdesk* function for log-frame development and other project cycle management techniques.
- Even more systematic monitoring combining project visits by EC task managers with visits of external consultants (ROM).

- Increased dialogue with implementing partners during the projects. Increased sharing of lessons learned between delegations and with headquarters on the implementation of the programme.

Thematic and geographic priorities

- For several of the thematic priorities of the EIDHR it is necessary to have a long term approach in order to have impact and be sustainable. It is therefore important to avoid changing priorities and target countries from year to year unless exceptional circumstances arise.