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Annex 1: Mine action

Sector introduction

Every year anti-personnel mines (APM)/landmines (APL) and explosive remnants of war (ERW) kill or injure up to 10,000 people, many of whom are civilians, including children. Landmines were originally developed for military use, but they have had a profound and long-lasting impact on ordinary people and their communities. Long after conflicts end, mines and explosive remnants of war (ERW) continue to kill and maim, often making it impossible for refugees and internally displaced people to return to their homes and prolonging suffering for everyone in the affected area.

During several recent conflicts, landmines have been deliberately used to target civilian populations. As a result, mines may be found in places of little or no military value, such as schools or agricultural fields. For individuals and communities alike, many of whom are already living in poverty and insecurity, the impact of landmines is not simply physical, it is also psychological, social, and economic. Long after conflicts have ended, the legacy of landmines remains, but the problem is being addressed and the threat is lessening. Globally coordinated programmes designed to tackle the threat of landmine and UXO contamination, and the impact of these explosive weapons, is continuing to grow and develop.

An international endeavour

In 1992, six humanitarian organisations joined together to create the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL). From their work in mine affected countries they had seen first-hand the horrendous toll landmines take on innocent people in countries where conflict has already caused so much pain. The work of ICBL, which grew to a membership of more than 1400 non-governmental organisations, in partnership with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the United Nations and governments worldwide, aims to bring the history of landmines to a close. In 1992, six humanitarian organisations joined together to create the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL). From their work in mine affected countries they had seen first-hand the horrendous toll landmines take on innocent people in countries where conflict has already caused so much pain.

As a result of the ICBL campaign, in October 1996, at the closing session of an international strategy Conference of pro-ban States “Towards a Global Ban on Anti-Personnel Mines”, Canada’s Foreign Minister called upon States to return to Ottawa in December 1997 to sign a treaty totally prohibiting anti-personnel mines. The Antipersonnel Mine Ban Convention entered into force in 1998. In July 2002, more than two-thirds of the world’s countries were party to the Antipersonnel Mine Ban Convention, which bans the use, development, production, stockpiling and transfer of antipersonnel landmines. Today, the vast majority of world’s countries are now parties to the Ottawa Convention, although landmines still affect over 60 of the world’s countries. Millions of landmines are still lying in the ground, and claim thousands of innocent victims every year. In several countries, landmines continue to be used as indiscriminate weapons of war.

The fight against anti-personnel landmines has also been at the top of the European Commission’s human security agenda. Fighting landmines does not only mean providing assistance to dig out mines from fields so that economic activities can resume there. The European Community’s mine action efforts are also driven by the responsibility to protect civilians and support economic reintegration in affected areas. Since 1992, the EU has been actively involved in supporting demining programmes, research and development of technology and assistance to mine victims. To date, the EU is the largest donor in this field. Throughout the years, most technical and financial assistance programmes have been financed by EU
geographical instruments. The thematic instruments, such as the Humanitarian Aid instrument and the Instrument for Stability have also been used.

For 2014-2019, the major objective of the EU will be to continue assistance to third countries to comply with the goals of the Mine Ban Treaty to eliminate mines and resolve related economic and social problems caused by these weapons.

**Four key rules that govern the 1997 Convention**

The Mine Ban Treaty (MBT) (Ottawa Convention) provides for a complete ban for each State Party to "never undertake under any circumstances":

- The use of anti-personnel mines;
- To develop, produce, otherwise acquire, stockpile, retain or transfer to anyone, directly or indirectly, anti-personnel mines;
- To assist, encourage or induce, in any way, anyone to engage in any activity prohibited to a State Party under this Convention;
- To undertake to destroy or ensure the destruction of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines it owns or possesses (no later than four years after the entry into force of the Convention for the State Party).

**Mine action**

Mine action refers to all those activities geared towards addressing the problems faced by populations as a result of landmine contamination. Activities which aim to reduce the social, economic and environmental impact of mines and UXO. Mine action is not just about demining; it is also about people and societies, and how they are affected by landmine contamination. The objective of mine action is to reduce the risk from landmines to a level where people can live safely; in which economic, social and health development can occur free from the constraints imposed by landmine contamination, and in which the victims' needs can be addressed. UN Mine action comprises five complementary groups of activities: (1) mine risk education; mine awareness education; (2) humanitarian demining, i.e. mine and UXO survey, mapping, marking and (if necessary) clearance; (3) victim assistance, including rehabilitation and reintegration; (4) stockpile destruction; and (5) advocacy against the use of anti-personnel mines; advocacy to stigmatise the use of landmines and support a total ban on antipersonnel landmines and stockpile destruction.

**Definitions**

The two first definitions originate from the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel mines and on their destruction (18th Sept. 1997)

**Anti-personnel mine (AP Mine or APM):** "Anti-personnel mine" means a mine designed to be exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a person and that will incapacitate, injure or kill one or more persons. Mines designed to be detonated by the presence, proximity or contact of a vehicle as opposed to a person, that are equipped with anti-handling devices, are not considered anti-personnel mines as a result of being so equipped.

**Mine.** "Mine" means a munition designed to be placed under, on or near the ground or other surface area and to be exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a person or a vehicle

**Anti-tank Mine (AT Mine):** A landmine designed to disable or destroy vehicles, including tanks. Like anti-personnel mines, anti-tank mines can be detonated by pressure (though normally much greater weight is needed) or remote control, as well as by magnetic influence or through the disturbance of a tilt rod (a sort of vertical tripwire).

**Bounding AP Mine:** A fragmentation AP mine designed, once triggered by a tripwire or pressure, to be lifted to waist height by an initial charge before the main charge detonates scattering fragments in all directions.
**Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD):** The detection, identification, evaluation, render safe, recovery and disposal of UXO. EOD may be undertaken (1) as a routine part of mine clearance operations, upon discovery of the UXO; (2) to dispose of UXO discovered outside mined areas, (this may be a single UXO, or a larger number inside a specific area); (3) to dispose of explosive ordnance which has become hazardous by damage or attempted destruction.

**Demining (humanitarian demining):** Activities which lead to the removal of mine and UXO hazards, including technical survey, mapping, clearance, marking, post-clearance documentation, community mine action liaison and the handover of cleared land. Demining may be carried out by different types of organizations, such as NGOs, commercial companies, national mine action teams or military units. Demining may be emergency-based or developmental. In IMAS standards and guides, mine and UXO clearance is considered to be just one part of the demining process. In IMAS standards and guides, demining is considered to be one component of mine action. In IMAS standards and guides, the terms demining and humanitarian demining are interchangeable.

**Indicators and Methodology**

**International Mine Action Standards (IMAS)**

The revised international standards are being developed to improve safety and efficiency in mine action by establishing principles, providing guidance and, in some cases, by defining international requirements and specifications. They provide a frame of reference which encourages, and in some cases requires, the sponsors and managers of mine action programmes and projects to achieve and demonstrate agreed levels of effectiveness and safety. They provide a common language, and recommend the formats and rules for handling data which enable the free exchange of important information; this information exchange benefits other programmes and projects, and assists the mobilisation, prioritisation and management of resources. Standards should be definable, achievable, measurable and verifiable; above all they must be safe and legally defensible.

The most current standards, prepared for the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) by the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), are organized into a framework with nine subheadings as follows:

1. General mine action standards and guidelines (Series 1-5);
2. Training needs of mine action managers and staff (Series 6);
3. Management, accreditation and monitoring (Series 7);
4. Risk assessment and survey (Series 8);
5. Mine and UXO clearance (Series 9);
6. Mine action safety and occupational health (Series 10);
7. Anti-personnel mine stockpile destruction (Series 11);
8. Mine Risk Reduction Education (MRRE) (Series 12);
9. Evaluation of mine action programmes (Series 14, see below).

The latest version of each standard, together with information on the work of the technical committees can be found on the Internet at [http://www.mineactionstandards.org](http://www.mineactionstandards.org).

**National Mine Action Standards (NMAS)** are standards issued by a National Mine Action Authority (NMAA) to guide the management and implementation of mine action projects, in that country, in a safe, coordinated and efficient manner. NMAS are not International Mine Action Standards with the acronyms changed from International to National. Effective NMAS will reflect the situation of the national landmine and ERW threat, the national response to that threat, the situation of survivors and victims and the long term legislation enacted or planned to support a strategic response to the threat.

Effective NMAS whilst reflecting the local requirements within the mine action programme should also ensure that they adhere to the main guiding principles of IMAS and other national or international norms and standards. The NMAS of one mine-affected country may be different.
from another country as they reflect local realities. Like IMAS, the NMAS should be developed in consultation with a broad cross section of mine action stakeholders including the government (NMAA and MAC), UN, donors, implementing partners (operators) and representatives from the legal authority. The development of NMAS is one of the key elements of national ownership and demonstrates a national capacity in an individual country. NMAS can be found at http://www.mineactionstandards.org/standards/national-mine-action-standards-nmas/about-nmas/

**Evaluation criteria for mine action evaluation (IMAS 14.10)**

The International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) will provide technical standards on each and any sector intervention of mine action. For each series of standard, the IMAS (http://www.mineactionstandards.org/standards/international-mine-action-standards-imas/imas-in-english/) will provide a “Guide”, guidelines on “Principles and procedures”, “Operational guidelines/testing/reporting”, etc. The evaluator will have to refer to each of the technical guidelines to determine which are the most convenient for evaluation purposes. The IMAS will also provide methodological indications supporting the preparation, the implementation, the reporting and the dissemination of evaluation reports on Mine action: “The evaluation report should provide an explanation of the evaluation criteria that were used by the evaluators. It also is important to make the basis of value judgments transparent. The rationale for not using a particular criterion should be explained in the report, as should any limitations in applying the criteria. Performance standards or benchmarks used should also be described.”

IMAS does not provide specific and standard indicators. It focuses on the process of preparing and implementing an evaluation, recognizing that indicators will vary from one particular context to the other. Further process, progress or technical references will be identified through IMAS Standards. As an illustration, evaluation of **Land Release (IMAS 07.11)** as the result of a demining operation will detail technical evidence in:

- Chapter 3 (IMAS-07.11) – Ex: Cancelled land (m2), Reduced Land (m2), Cleared Land (m2);
- Chapter 5 (IMAS-07.11) – The Land Release Process – Principles, Indirect and Direct Evidence and subsequent criteria determining “SHA/Suspected Hazardous Area” and “CHA/Confirmed Hazardous Area”.

**EU Reporting on Mine Action**

Focal points within each DG should ensure that accurate information on EC assistance to mine action is provided and remains available. Also programmes should always pay more attention to integrating mine action into development programmes when such action is essential for the successful implementation of such a broader programme. To do so, accurate information on EC support for mine action is therefore indispensable. There is a clear need to "consolidate institutional memory through the use of harmonized methodologies and dedicated information systems that monitor, report on, evaluate, archive and make available information on mines-related projects and programmes". The challenge remains to coordinate all the reporting and gathering of relevant information and data received from various EU entities.

In this regard, the EU is proposing a specific template for reporting EC Mine Action Projects/Programmes that be found at http://eeas.europa.eu/non-proliferation-and-disarmament/anti-landmines/docs/guidelines_08_13_en.pdf, Annex III (p.26)
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Annex 2: Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW)

Sector introduction

The UN and the EU agree that “the number of light weapons in circulation throughout the world is estimated by the UN at 600 million. SALW are responsible for almost 500,000 deaths a year, 300,000 of which occur in armed conflicts. Of the 49 major conflicts in the 1990, 47 were conducted with SALW as the major weapons” (Council of the European Union, 13th Jan. 2006). Most present-day conflicts are fought mainly with small arms, which are broadly used in inter-State conflict. They are the weapons of choice in civil wars and for terrorism, organized crime and gang warfare.

SALW control initiatives are often very complex long-term interventions that require a holistic approach dealing with both the supply of and demand for weapons by governments, groups and individuals, as well as the relationships among armed conflict, armed violence, SALW availability and development. Insurgents, armed gang members, pirates, terrorists can all multiply their force through the use of unlawfully acquired firepower. Small arms are cheap, light, and easy to handle, transport and conceal. A build-up of small arms alone may not create the conflicts in which they are used, but their excessive accumulation and wide availability aggravates the tension. The violence becomes more lethal and lasts longer, and a sense of insecurity grows, which in turn lead to a greater demand for weapons.

Also, the illicit circulation of small arms, light weapons and their ammunition destabilizes communities, and impacts security and development in all regions of the world. To address the issue of illicit small arms, the United Nations adopted in 2001 the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (PoA). The PoA contains concrete suggestions for improved national legislation and controls, regional cooperation, and international assistance and cooperation. It covers a wide range of topics including: small arms manufacturing; marking, record-keeping, and tracing; stockpile management and security; surplus identification and disposal; brokering; public awareness; and DDR programmes. More recently, the landmark Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), regulating the international trade in conventional arms – from small arms and light weapons to battle tanks, combat aircraft and warships, entered into force on 24 December 2014.

SALW control has important links with both security and development. SALW control requires action at global, regional, national and local levels, and involves international and regional organizations, national governments, commercial companies and military stakeholders, non-governmental organizations and non-state actors operating under a variety of conditions. SALW control aims to help prevent armed conflict and violence, and to support countries to reduce the social, economic and environmental impacts of uncontrolled SALW spread and possession by reducing the number of SALW in circulation and by strengthening SALW control mechanisms. The objectives of SALW control interventions include:

- Reducing the availability and use of illicit SALW in societies;
- Reducing the number of SALW- and ammunition-related accidents;
- Increasing public awareness of the connection between the availability of weapons and the level of violence in any given society;
- Reducing and disrupting the illicit transfers of SALW at the national and regional levels;
- Regulating the possession and use of SALW through national legislation and registration;
- Recovering illicit SALW from the community;
- Reducing the visibility of weapons in the community, and counteracting the culture of weapons, especially among the youth; and
- Reducing gender-based violence related to holding and carrying of weapons legally or illegally.

Although the immediate post-conflict environment opens a window of opportunity to control the supply of and demand for SALW, efforts towards SALW control are related to development, and should therefore be reflected in national development planning frameworks and mechanisms.

**Definitions**

**UN definition – accepted by a broad range of programmes and organizations**

There is no universally accepted definition of a “small arm” or a “light weapon”. Nevertheless, a broad range of programmes and organizations adopt the proposal put forward by the 1997 UN Panel of Governmental Expert which considers portability a defining characteristic. The Panel’s list includes civilian, private and military weapons that fire a projectile with the condition that the unit or system may be carried by an individual, a small number of people, or transported by a pack animal or a light vehicle. Another distinction is made between weapons designed for personal use (small arms) and those designed for use by several persons serving as a crew, i.e. the weapons that most used in armed conflict and violence.

**Small arms**: Revolvers and self-loading pistols, rifles and carabines, sub-machine-guns, assault rifles, light machine-guns

**Light weapons**: heavy machine-guns, hand-held under-barrel and mounted grenade launchers, portable anti-tank guns and missiles, recoilless rifles, portable anti-aircraft missile systems, mortars of a caliber of less than 100 mm.

**Ammunition and explosives**: Cartridges (rounds) for small arms, shells and missiles for light weapons, anti-personnel and anti-tank hand grenades, landmines, explosives, munitions for single-action anti-aircraft and anti-tank systems.

**Source**: UN Report of the Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms, 27 August 1997, A/42/299, para.25

**EU Definition (European Union’s contribution to combating the destabilizing accumulation and spread of small arms and light weapons and repealing joint action 1999/34/CFsP)**

The Joint Action of the EU to combating the destabilizing accumulation and spread of small arms and light weapons, “while no prejudging any future internationally agreed definition of small arms and light weapons” states that:

- Small arms and accessories specially designed for military use:
  - Machine-guns (including heavy machine-guns);
  - Sub-machine guns, including machine pistols;
  - Fully automatic rifles;
  - Semi-automatic rifles, if developed and/or introduced as a model for an armed force;
  - Moderators (silencers).
- Man or crew-portable light weapons
- Cannon (including automatic cannon), howitzers and mortars of less than 100 mm calibre;
- Grenade launchers;
- Anti-tank weapons, recoilless guns (shoulder-fired rockets)
- Anti-tank missiles and launchers;
- Anti-aircraft missiles/man-portable air defence systems (MANPADS).

**UNDP (2001)**

“All lethal conventional munitions that can be carried by an individual combatant of a vehicle, that also do not require a substantial logistic and maintenance capability”.
Indicators and Methodology

Research in the early 2000 (UNDP, 2002) has attempted to assess the impacts of small arms on development. The framework proposed by Muggah and Batchelor distinguishes between direct and indirect effects, and identifies a selection of indicators for the different categories of effects. The direct effects of armed conflict and social violence relate to deaths and injuries, and the associated costs of treatment and care for firearm casualties, measured by disability-adjusted life years (DALYs). The indirect effects relate to the impact of small arms use on criminality, forced displacement patterns, health and education services, economic activity and social capital. The indirect effects also extend to development intervention and the impacts of armed violence on field staff, as well as the opportunity costs associated with the declining access of development agencies to beneficiary populations.

Example: Effects and Indicators of Small Arms Availability and Use (Two illustrations, UNDP, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts on Development</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Firearm related Death and Injury</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of firearms deaths (e.g. homicide, suicide, accidental rates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of non-fatal injuries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monetary value of non-fatal firearm injuries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Costs associated with treating firearm deaths and injuries at municipal, district and national levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Insurance costs associated with firearm deaths and disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incidence of psychosocial trauma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demographic sectors (age, gender) affected by death and injury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Armed Criminality</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rates (numbers, frequency) of different types of firearm related crimes – homicide, aggravated assault, robbery, car-hijacking (urban versus rural)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Insurance premiums (e.g. household insurance, car insurance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private security services (e.g. value of industry, non-productive labour)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demographic sectors (age, gender) that are most vulnerable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emigration (by profession)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional and complementary information in this regard can be obtained at:


Another interesting presentation of Performance Indicators is presented in "Performance Indicators for the Monitoring and Evaluation of SALW Control Programmes" (UNDP/SEESAC, 2004):

They highlight some key factors that should be taken into account while collecting data and preparing performance indicators:

- Initial data must be collected during SALW Survey, or soon after, so that progress can be as accurately identified as possible.
- The assessments, often referred to as small arms surveys or small arms baseline assessments, should ideally contain the following components (http://www.unddr.org/uploads/documents/Operational%20Guide.pdf, 138):
A small arms distribution assessment (SADA): this collects data on the type, quantity, ownership, distribution and movement of SALW within the country and region, together with an analysis of local resources available to respond to the problem;
A small arms impact survey (SAIS): this collects data on the impact of SALW on the community (types of violence), and social and economic development;
A small arms perception survey (SAPS): this collects qualitative information on the attitudes of the local community to SALW ownership and possible interventions;
A small arms capacity survey (SACS): this collects information on the national and local capacity to carry out an appropriate, safe, efficient and effective SALW intervention.
Operational objectives for SALW control interventions must be SMART: 1) Specific; 2) Measurable; 3) Achievable; 4) Realistic; and 5) Time constrained;
The widest range of PI should be agreed and adopted;
Monitoring and Evaluation techniques, and the financial resources to support them, must be included as a component of the project document;
Part of the project may be to enhance the capacity of national data collection and analysis systems in order that information is available to feed into the various PI mathematical models;
All stakeholders should agree on the appropriate PI before the commencement of a programme. This means that they have all then agreed on their objectives for the programme, increases their motivation for participation and strengthens stakeholder ownership of the process. Different stakeholder aspirations may well mean using different PI for what appear to be very similar programmes.

A Matrix of Performance Indicators versus Programme Operational Objectives can be visualized at: http://www.isn.ethz.ch/Digital-Library/Publications/Detail/?lang=en&id=13714

Example: Performance vs Programme Operational Objectives (Two illustrations, UNDP 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Objective</th>
<th>SALW Control Programme Component</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in the number of weapons available to criminals</td>
<td>SALW Collection&lt;br&gt;SALW Destruction</td>
<td>• Statistics on the “Street Price” of SALW&lt;br&gt;• SALW Recovery Statistics&lt;br&gt;• SALW Destruction Statistics&lt;br&gt;• SALW Disposal Statistics&lt;br&gt;• Security survey of SALW storage locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in armed violence (criminal and domestic)</td>
<td>SALW Collection&lt;br&gt;SALW Stockpile Management</td>
<td>• Statistics on civilian victims of armed violence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most SALW programming deals with the control of the proliferation of SALW. They usually fall under three main headings: 1) Reduction measures; 2) Preventive measures and 3) Coordination measures. Micro disarmament falls under the first range of measures. Performance indicators (PI) of all kinds provide a useful management tool, not only in judging the technical success of a micro-disarmament programme, but they also provide information that assists in the making of management decisions during a particular programme. UNDP states that “deciding on which PI to use will depend largely on the political situation within the target community”.

Some Performance Indicators on SALW measures (UNDP, 2001):

**Recovery Statistics:** the number of weapons recovered (by type) is compared against the estimated number of weapons present in the local community

\[
\text{Weapons recovered (\%) = } \frac{\text{Quantity of Weapons Recovered}}{\text{Estimated Weapons in Community}} \times 100
\]
The performance indicator considers the least number of variables, but is only as accurate as the estimate of the physical number of weapons present in the target community.

**Crime Statistics:** One indication of the impact of a micro-disarmament programme on a target community is a comparison of the crime statistics in the area prior to, during and after completion of the weapons collection phase. Statistics should be kept for: 1) murders using weapons; 2) wounding as a result of weapons; 3) armed robbery; 4) illegal weapon found and; 5) illegal weapon sales. These can be reported in percentage terms:

\[
\text{Percentage change (\%) = } \left\{ \frac{1 - \text{Current Crime Figures}}{\text{Previous Crime Figures}} \right\} \times 100
\]

This PI considers the least number of variables, but is only as accurate as the estimate of the physical number of weapons present in the target community

**Economy statistics:** Simple supply and demand rules would suggest that the success of a micro-disarmament programme could be measured by an analysis of the street price of weapons in the target community and the adjoining regions.

\[
\text{Percentage Change (\%)10 = } \left\{ \frac{1 - \text{Current Street Price}}{\text{Previous Street Price}} \right\} \times 100
\]

An increase in the street price would indicate an increasing scarcity of available weapons. This increasing scarcity is either being caused by the impact of the collection phase or by an outflow of weapons from the community into adjoining regions, (where a better price can be obtained for the dealer).

**Financial Comparison** - A more complicated approach is to compare the "cost" of recovering a weapon to the programme against the street price. The total costs of the programme, (operating costs and infrastructure development), divided by the number of weapons recovered gives an initial crude indicator of what it has cost to recover each individual weapon. If this is less than the street price, then perhaps this indicates a degree of success.

\[
\text{Cost per Recovered Weapon ($)} = \frac{\text{Total Cost of Programme ($)}}{\text{Total Weapons Recovered}}
\]

**Risk Rating** - This PI allocates a risk rating to each individual weapon type based on previous and current weapon usage in the area:

\[
\text{Risk Rating (Fatality/Injury)} = \frac{\text{Total Number of Fatalities/Injury}}{\text{Total Weapons used in Attacks}}
\]

These risk ratings can be established for both the target community and the country as a whole. If the risk rating for each weapon recovered is multiplied by the number of weapons recovered, then:

\[
\text{Potential Lives Saved} = \text{Weapon Risk Rating} \times \text{Total Weapons Recovered}
\]

It is then possible to make an estimate of the total potential number of lives saved by the addition of the results for each weapon type. Again, this methodology takes no account of the intent of the individuals to use the weapons in their possession, but is another crude indicator.

This methodology could then be further developed to establish the financial cost per life saved:

\[
\text{Cost per Life Saved} = \frac{\text{Total Cost of Programme}}{\text{Total Potential Lives Saved}}
\]

Additional and complementary information in this regard can be obtained at
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Annex 3: Disarmament

Sector introduction

Generally understood as the ‘act of reducing or depriving of arms’, disarmament is usually regarded as the first step of a disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) process. DDR is a politically-driven process. A DDR process is usually agreed to and defined within a ceasefire, cessation of hostilities or comprehensive peace accord, providing the political operational framework for the process. Yet, in some post-conflict contexts, the parties to a ceasefire or peace agreement may not trust each other and/or may lack the capacity to design, plan and implement DDR programmes. Many DDR programmes stall or are only partly implemented because the political environment is not conducive. The success of the DDR process depends on the political will of the parties to enter into the process in a genuine manner and in many instances for Government partners to enable and support the implementation of a DDR process after official agreement for a DDR process has been reached.

The removal of weapons, ammunition and explosives is a highly symbolic act in the ending of an individual’s active role as a combatant. Disarmament primarily aims at reducing or controlling the number of weapons held by combatants before their discharge from armed forces or groups. The surrendered weapons should be collected, registered, stored and then either destroyed or, by previous arrangements with key stakeholders, redistributed to the new government for use by the national security forces, but only as part of a broader security sector reform review and reform process. Also, the disarmament carried out within a DDR programme is only one aspect of a new national arms control management system, and should support future internal arms control and reduction measures (including SALW control).

Disarmament also contributes to establishing a secure environment and paves the way for demobilization and reintegration to take place. The disarmament component of a DDR programme needs to be comprehensive, effective, efficient and safe. It should be designed to reinforce countrywide security and be planned in coordination with wider peace-building and recovery efforts. The disarmament carried out within a DDR programme is only one aspect of a new national arms control management system, and should support future internal arms control and reduction measures (small arms and light weapons [SALW] control). Disarmament also signals that armed conflict is over and that the parties do not want to return to war; places the weapons beyond use and reduces the capacity of the parties to wage armed conflict; and builds individual and community confidence in the peace process.

The disarmament component of a DDR programme should be shaped by four guiding principles:

- National sovereignty – national governments have the right and responsibility to apply their own national standards to all disarmament operations on their territory, but should act in compliance with international arms control conventions and agreements;
- Armed violence reduction – the disarmament component of DDR is primarily aimed at reducing the capacity of individuals and groups to engage in armed violence;
- Safety – the protection of people most at risk is a basic objective of disarmament programmes. A concept of "balanced disarmament" (phased sequencing of arms collection operations) should be applied at every opportunity;
- Capacity development – building the capacity of state and non-state national bodies is essential to their empowerment and the effective, successful continuation of future disarmament programmes once DDR has come to an end.

The disarmament component of a DDR programme should usually consist of four main phases with particular components for each phase:
1) Information collection and operational planning: team selection and structure; eligibility criteria (lessons learnt from previous programmes suggest that entry into a DDR programme should not depend on participants actually possessing weapons, and include individuals in support and non-combat roles), weapons survey (number and type of weapons, ammunition and explosives that can be expected to be recovered), risk assessment, DDR awareness (sensitization of armed forces and groups to the planned collection process);

2) Weapons collection or retrieval operations; pick-up points (PUPs); weapons collection points; disarmament sites (facilities, personnel); weapons registration and accounting; explosive ordnance disposal support;

3) Stockpile management (procedures and activities regarding weapons, ammunition and explosive safety and security in accounting, storage, transportation and handling); and

4) Destruction; the physical destruction of weapons must be approached as a separate issue from the destruction of ammunition and explosives. Destruction will be dependent on the types of weapons, the quantity of weapons, the available local resources and technology, the availability of funds, the infrastructure available for moving weapons, any security problems, SALW awareness needs.

Definitions

The Integrated DDR Standards (IDDRS) state that “Disarmament is generally understood to be the ‘act of reducing or depriving of arms’, and as such is applicable to all weapons systems, ammunition and explosives, including nuclear, chemical, biological, radiological and conventional systems.” IDDRS, Chapter 4.10, para 3.

However, contemporary DDR deals with conventional weapon systems and ammunition, as it applies during DDR operations, programmes or activities. Therefore, the UN Secretary General definition of Disarmament in the context of DDR programmes: “Disarmament is the collection, documentation, control and disposal of small arms, ammunition, explosives and light and heavy weapons of combatants and often also of the civilian population. Disarmament also includes the development of responsible arms management programmes” (A/C.5/59/31, 24 May 2005).

Indicators and Methodology

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) has been one of the weakest areas of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) programme management in the past, partly due to a lack of proper planning, a standardized M&E framework, and human and financial resources specifically dedicated to M&E. Traditionally, M&E in DDR programmes has focused on assessing inputs and implementation processes. Nowadays, DDR planners and implementing partners are trying to ensure that baseline data and relevant performance indicators are built into the programme development process itself.

Baseline data are best collected within the framework of the comprehensive assessments that are carried out before the programme is developed, while performance indicators are defined in relation to both baseline data and the outputs, activities and outcomes that are expected. Monitoring and data collection should be an integral component of the information management system for the DDR process, and as such should be made widely available to key DDR staff and stakeholders for consultation. In the context of DDR, M&E is particularly important, because it helps keep track of a complex range of outcomes and outputs in different components of the DDR mission, and assesses how each contributes towards achieving the goal of improved stability and security.

In order to support M&E efforts in DDR, the Integrated Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Standards (IDDRS) have been drafted on the basis of lessons and best practices drawn from the experience of all the departments, agencies, funds and programmes involved to provide the UN system with a set of policies, guidelines and procedures for the planning, implementation and monitoring of DDR programmes in a peacekeeping context. The three main aims of the IDDRS are: a) to give DDR practitioners the opportunity to make informed decisions
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Based on a clear, flexible and in-depth body of guidance across the range of DDR activities; b) To serve as a common foundation for the commencement of integrated operational planning in Headquarters and at the country level; c) To function as a resource for the training of DDR specialists. The IDDRS are decomposed into thirty modules. Module 3.50 shows how M&E can be planned and implemented effectively through a creation of a DDR specific M&E work plan, which consists of a plan for data collection, data analysis and report. It also provides some generic M&E indicators (See below) within a results-management framework, which can be modified and adapted to each programme and project.


At the same time, more practical and more user friendly, The Operational Guide to the IDDRS contains condensed versions of the Integrated DDR Standards (IDDRS), highlighting practical steps for the planning monitoring and evaluating of DDR programmes. The Operational Guide to the IDDRS is intended to help users find their way through the IDDRS document by briefly explaining the key guidance contained in each IDDRS document module. The Operational Guide was produced by the Inter-Agency Working Group on DDR (IAWG – DDR).


Specific IDDRS on Disarmament references at: [http://unddr.org/uploads/documents/IDDRS%204.10%20Disarmament.pdf](http://unddr.org/uploads/documents/IDDRS%204.10%20Disarmament.pdf)

For the purposes of integrated DDR, M&E can be divided into two levels related to the results-based framework:

- Measurement of the performance of DDR programmes in achieving outcomes and outputs throughout its various components generated by a set of activities: for ex. for disarmament (e.g., number of weapons collected and destroyed);
- Measurement of the outcomes of DDR programmes in contributing towards an overall goal (it can take various forms: reductions in levels of violence in society, increased stability and security, and consolidation of peace process, etc.). The IDDRS state that “it is difficult however, to determine the impact of DDR on broader society without isolating it from other processes and initiatives (e.g. peacebuilding, security sector reform (SSR) that also have an impact”.

Although the definition of monitoring indicators will differ a great deal according to both the context in which DDR is implemented and the DDR strategy and components, certain generic (general or typical) indicators should be identified that can guide DDR managers to establish monitoring mechanisms and systems. These indicators should aim to measure performance in terms of outcomes and outputs, effectiveness in achieving programme objectives, and the efficiency of the performance by which outcomes and outputs are achieved (i.e., in relation to inputs).

**Baseline for Disarmament:** baseline should include estimated total weapons available in relation to total ex-combatant pool

**Generic monitoring indicators for Disarmament (IDDRS):**

- % of weapons collected from ex-combatants;
- Quality and condition of weapons;
- % of weapons disabled under collection;
- % of weapons destroyed;
- % ratio of weapons surrendered to ex-combatants registered;
- % of weapons surrendered by armed groups versus civilians;
- % of weapons remaining outside possession of ex-combatants;
Market prices and values for weapons;
Number of disarmament sites and facilities for storage and destruction.

DDR Monitoring or evaluation outputs and outcomes for specific components or activities can provide important information about whether programme implementation is proceeding in accordance with the programme plan and budget. DDR Monitoring results can also provide information on the relevance or effectiveness of an existing strategy or course of action to produce specific outcomes or achieve key objectives.

Monitoring results can provide important indications about the efficiency with which resources are used to implement activities and achieve outcomes. Given the large scale and number of activities and sub-projects involved in DDR, overall cost-effectiveness is an essential element in ensuring that DDR programmes achieve their overall objectives.

References:
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Annex 4: Demobilisation

Annex 1: Sector introduction

Demobilization is an integral part of DDR. Whether at the political/institutional level or at the individual or group level, it is voluntary. Demobilization normally follows individual disarmament, and must in turn be followed by a long-term reintegration programme.

Demobilization is a multifaceted process that officially certifies an individual’s change of status from being a member of a military grouping of some kind to being a civilian. It involves the physical separation of a combatant from the command and control of his/her armed force or group, as well as his/her psychological transformation from a military to a civilian mindset.

Combatants formally acquire civilian status when they receive documentation that confirms their final discharge from their armed force or group. However, the process of cutting formal ties with military command structures is a long and difficult one. As such, it requires important preparatory work that will assist the socioeconomic reintegration of a former combatant into civilian life. Demobilization contributes either to downsizing armed forces or groups or disbanding them completely. It is part of the wider demilitarization efforts of a society emerging from conflict. It is therefore a symbolically important phase in the consolidation of peace.

Whereas disarmament is primarily the responsibility of the military, supported by civilian staff, demobilization is primarily the responsibility of the civilian component of the peacekeeping mission, with military support.

There are two distinct approaches to demobilization: using semi-permanent demobilization sites, i.e. cantonment (called the static method) or the mobile method, where demobilization occurs at the places where groups of ex-combatants are gathered. Although cantonment was long considered standard practice, increasingly DDR programmes are using mobile demobilization, as it is cheaper, more expedient and more flexible than cantonment.

The demobilization component of a DDR programme should be shaped by four guiding principles:

- Respect for engagements and commitments – promises about post-demobilization packages must be honoured;
- Unity of effort – the physical phase of demobilization involves civil-military cooperation: UN/NGO collaboration; and collaboration among DDR participants, communities, the government and the UN;
- Non-discrimination, and fair and equal treatment - Appropriate attention should be given to the needs of women, youth and children so that (1) they are not excluded; and (2) their security is assured throughout the demobilization process;
- Human and community security: demobilization is the phase where reintegration needs are identified. It is important that between the demobilization and reintegration phases, links be developed with national authorities, communities and other stakeholders, to ensure a smooth transition between the two phases.

The demobilization component of a DDR programme should usually consist of ten phases with particular components for each phase:

- Reception – combatants enter the demobilization site. Individuals should be checked against the list and searched again for concealed weapons or munitions;
- Screening and registration – the single most important activity at the demobilization stage to establish the eligibility of the DDR candidate to enter the process, and to register those who meet the criteria;
• Registration and documentation – combatants who have been screened and found to be eligible are registered and issued with identity documents;
• Introduction and briefing – to provide the ex-combatants and associated persons with clear and simple guidance when arrive at the demobilization site;
• Counselling and referral – counselling involves identifying specific needs, providing psychosocial assistance and supporting voluntary testing for HIV/AIDS;
• Health screening – general and specific health needs are assessed;
• Pre-discharge awareness-raising/sensitization – former combatants should be given advice on the challenges of transition from military to civilian life;
• Discharge – a discharge document is given to ex-combatants upon completion of the demobilization process;
• Reinsertion – reinsertion is the final step of demobilization and aims to help provide the combatant with support until they are able to enter a formal reintegration programme. Reinsertion assistance takes the form of what is known as a transitional assistance package, which may be financial (“Transitional Safety Allowance”), food and non-food items or, as is most often the case, a mixture of both, for the ex-combatant to cater for their immediate needs and those of their dependants;
• Transport – DDR planners may wish to provide transport to the DDR participants to assist them to return to their communities.

Definitions

The Integrated DDR Standards (IDDRS) state that “Demobilization is both a physical and a mental process. The physical aspect involves the separation of an armed element (i.e., a soldier/combatant) from the systematic command and control structure of an armed force or group, thereby either reducing the number of combatants in an armed force or group, or disbanding it in its entirety. This physical aspect (...) can be used to remove from service either military or police forces members who are considered to be surplus, thus contributing to the downsizing of the armed forces. The mental aspect of the demobilization process involves preparing the disarmed individual to find his/her place in civil society without the camaraderie and support systems of the structured armed force or group. This is a longer-term objective, and can be regarded as a by-product of successful reinsertion” IDDRS, Chapter 4.20, Summary.

The UN Secretary General definition of Demobilization in the context of DDR programmes: “Demobilization is the formal and controlled discharge of active combatants from armed forces or other armed groups. The first stage of demobilization may extend from the processing of individual combatants in temporary centres to the massing of troops in camps designated for this purpose (cantonment sites, encampments, assembly areas or barracks). The second stage of demobilization encompasses the support package provided to the demobilized, which is called reinsertion.” (A/C.5/59/31, 24 May 2005).

Reinsertion, which is part of the demobilization process, is defined as: “Reinsertion is the assistance offered to ex-combatants during demobilization but prior to the longer term process of reintegration. Reinsertion is a form of transitional assistance to help cover the basic needs of ex-combatants and their families and can include transitional safety allowances, food, clothes, shelter, medical services, short-term education, training, employment and tools. While reintegration is a long-term, continuous social and economic process of development, reinsertion is a short-term material and/or financial assistance to meet immediate needs, and can last up to one year.” (A/C.5/59/31, 24 May 2005).

Indicators and Methodology

The key sources of indicators for demobilisation are the same as for disarmament, and may be referenced in Annex 1.3.

Specific IDDRS on Demobilization references at, http://unddr.org/uploads/documents/IDDRS%204.20%20Demobilization.pdf
**Baseline for Demobilization:** baseline should include total number of eligible combatants and existence of formal military structures.

**Generic monitoring indicators for Demobilization** (IDDRS) are:

- Number of demobilization facilities established;
- Number of ex-combatants demobilized per demobilization facility;
- % of ex-combatants successfully demobilized over time;
- % of ex-combatants demobilized in different geographic locations over time;
- Inclusivity and reach of the process, categorized by sex and age of ex-combatants;
- Level and type of security incidents in demobilization camps;
- Average length of stay versus total processing time for demobilization;
- Cost of demobilization facilities versus processes caseload;
- % of ex-combatants fully registered, profiled and provided with necessary documentation;
- % of ex-combatants meeting formal eligibility and screening criteria;
- % of ex-combatants receiving transitional assistance in demobilization facilities (health food, living allowance, etc.).
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Annex 5: Reintegration

**Sector introduction**

Sustainable reintegration of former combatants and associated groups in their communities of origin or choice is the ultimate objective of DDR. A reintegration programme is designed to address the many destabilizing factors that threaten ex-combatants' successful transition to peace, including: economic hardship, social exclusion, psychological and physical trauma, and political disenfranchisement. Failure to successfully reintegrate ex-combatants will undermine the achievements of disarmament and demobilization, furthering the risk of renewal of armed conflict. A key challenge that faces former combatants and associated groups is that it may be impossible for them to reintegrate in the area of origin. Their limited skills may have more relevance and market-value in urban settings. In the worst cases, places from which ex-combatants came may no longer exist after a war, or ex-combatants may have been with armed forces and groups that committed atrocities in or near their own communities and may not be able to return home.

Ex-combatants and associated groups will usually need specifically designed, sustainable support to help them with their transition from military to civilian life. But the reintegration of ex-combatants and associated groups must therefore be part of wider recovery strategies for all war-affected populations. Reintegration programmes should aim to build local and national capacities to manage the process in the long-term, as reintegration increasingly turns into reconstruction and development.

The reintegration component of a DDR programme should be shaped by **seven guiding principles:**

- **People-centered** - A ‘people-centred’ approach recognizes that differences exist among reintegration participants and beneficiaries – differences which include, but are not limited to sex, age, class, religion, and physical, intellectual or psycho-social capacities – all of which require targeted responses;

- **Flexibility** - To respond to contextual changes and remain relevant, reintegration programmes should be designed in such a way that allows for maximum adaptability. While the reintegration programme design will be based on initial assessments, it is important to remember that many contextual factors will change significantly during the course of the programme, such as the wishes and ambitions of ex-combatants, the labour market, the capacity of service providers, the capacity of the different government bodies, in addition to the agendas of political parties and leaders in power;

- **Accountable and transparent** - Public information, awareness-raising and community consultation and sensitization ensure that affected participant and beneficiary groups have a chance to influence and to receive accurate information on DDR programme procedures and reintegration assistance;

- **Nationally and locally owned** – the success of reintegration programmes depends on the combined efforts of individuals, families and communities, and therefore reintegration programmes should be designed through an inclusive, participatory process that involves ex-combatants and communities;

- **Integrated** - DDR processes both influence and are affected by wider recovery, peacebuilding and state transformational processes. It is therefore essential that reintegration programmes work collaboratively with other programmes and stakeholders to achieve policy coherence, sector programme integration, inter-agency cooperation and coordination from the start;
**Well-planned** – A well planned reintegration programme shall assess and respond to the specific needs of its male and female participants (i.e. gender sensitive planning) who might be children, youth, adults, elders and/or persons with disabilities;

**Gender sensitive** – gender sensitive reintegration includes planning based upon sex-disaggregated data so that programmes can identify the specific needs and potentials of women, men, boys and girls. Women's and young girls' needs may include availability of child care facilities, access to land, property and livelihoods resources and rehabilitation from sexual violence, whereas men and young boys may need more support to overcome socialization to violence and substance abuse, for example. Gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation requires that the DDR M&E framework includes gender-related indicators and specific assessments on gender.

The reintegration component of a DDR programme should usually consist of **two approaches** with particular components for each approach:

**Individual reintegration** - individual reintegration has aimed to provide long-term assistance to each ex-combatant depending upon his/her specific needs, the nature of the environment of return (urban or rural), and the services available in these locations. Individual reintegration has typically included targeted activities geared towards increasing ex-combatants individual employability and enabling their access to productive assets and opportunities. In addition, activities and means that have aimed to facilitate social reintegration – such as access to land and water, livelihoods assets, life skills training, psychosocial assistance, and activities that stimulate community acceptance.

The individual reintegration approach also includes ongoing technical advice, training and mentoring, and other support services for the individual ex-combatant;

**Community-based reintegration (CBR)** - be able to provide information and contribute to strategies for connecting DDR programmes to locally based justice processes. Finally, outreach to recipient communities may include discussions about locally based justice processes and their applicability. Where DDR programmes have delivered individual reintegration to ex-combatants alone, the result has often been hostility or resentment on the part of community members who feel excluded from reintegration benefits. The problems arising from such dynamics have created barriers to the goals of social reintegration and the strengthening of community cohesion, ultimately threatening the sustainability of reintegration programmes. While it is not the whole community that will receive reintegration assistance, in community-based reintegration approaches ex-combatants are assisted together with other members of the community.

**Definitions**

The UN Secretary General definition of Reintegration (2005) in the context of DDR programmes, is: "Reintegration is the process by which ex-combatants acquire civilian status and gain sustainable employment and income. Reintegration is essentially a social and economic process with an open timeframe, primarily taking place in communities at the local level. It is part of the general development of a country and a national responsibility, and often necessitates long-term external assistance." (A/C.5/59/31, 24 May 2005).

**Indicators and Methodology**

The key sources of indicators for reintegration are the same as for disarmament and demobilisation, and may be referenced in Annex 1.3.

**Baseline for Reintegration**: baseline should include total number of eligible combatants and existence of formal military structures.

**Generic monitoring indicators for Reintegration (IDDRS)**:

- % of ex-combatants receiving skills and vocational training;
- % of ex-combatants receiving no further support beyond training;
- Average length of time spent in training courses;
- Patterns of resettlement of ex-combatants in areas of return;
- Perceptions of host communities of ex-combatants and reintegration;
- % of ex-combatants receiving employment creation assistance (into new of existing jobs);
- % of ex-combatants integrated into local or community-based development projects;
- Incidence of violence in areas of return;
- Existence and degree of community mobilization to manage and facilitate reintegration of ex-combatants in areas of return;
- % of ex-combatants achieving results in their reintegration activity over time;
- % of special needs groups provided with reintegration assistance;
- % of special needs reintegration projects succeeding relative to other reintegration projects over time.
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Annex 6: Counter-terrorism

Sector introduction
Counter terrorism (CT) as a concept is broad or vague and used differently in security, political, diplomatic or public information spheres, similarly to the definitions of terrorism that can be applied in a selective, indiscriminate or discriminatory way. The objective of CT activities is to make citizens safer from terrorist threats and neutralize terrorists through military, police and/or judicial action, as well as support prevention through ‘softer’ economic, information and/or psychosocial measures. But CT activities may result in a disproportionate reactions/measures and lead to serious violations of fundamental rights and freedoms (e.g. inhumane treatment; violations of the rights to association, assembly, cult, expression, etc) and result in severe restrictions of political and civil society space. It is therefore especially important to safeguard a human rights based approach, and integrate gender sensitive and non-discriminatory approaches to counter-terrorism activities. The EU strategy to combat CT globally focuses on four main objectives, while recognising the importance of cooperation with third countries and international institutions:

- **Prevent**, to identify and tackle the factors that contribute to radicalisation and the processes by which individuals are recruited to commit acts of terror. The EU strategy for combating radicalisation and recruitment to terrorism and its Guidelines set out a series of implementation measures and identify priority actions.
- **Protect** citizens and infrastructure and the reduction of vulnerability to attack. This includes the protection of external borders, the improvement of transport security, the protection of strategic targets and the reduction of the vulnerability of critical infrastructure
- **Pursue**, in order to hinder terrorists’ capacity to plan and organise, and bring them to justice by strengthening national capabilities, improving practical cooperation and information exchange between police and judicial authorities, tackling terrorist financing and depriving terrorists of attack and communication means.
- **Respond** in solidarity to terrorist threats, preparing, managing and minimizing the consequences of a terrorist attack, improving capabilities to deal with the aftermath, the coordination of the response, and the needs of victims.

CT activities, in relations between the EU and strategic countries, often include specific assistance and capacity building projects (e.g. on strategic communication; to identify recruitment networks and foreign fighters; strengthening border security and capacity response to terrorist attacks; supporting implementation of UN Security Council resolutions by all countries).

Measurement of progress, or lack thereof, of CT activities may be framed in terms of incidents, attitudes and trends, but should in any case not rely only or mainly on quantitative indicators or on an emphasis on ‘action’. Institutional, social, cultural, economic or psychological/mindset factors and effects can be equally important, although not always tangible or easy to measure. Data collection efforts should not lead to violations of human rights and need to take into account also the fluid operating environment of such activities, as terrorist groups goals, strategies and tactics can evolve, which may require adaptation of how and what is measured. Overreliance on metrics to measure counter terrorism can be misleading in such fluid environments and given the non-linear nature of terrorist activities.

The most distinctive feature of counterterrorism indicators might be the fact that they are not likely to stem from clear sources, since they will be the aggregate of cross-referenced qualitative
assessments. On the quantitative aspect, the overall data emerge from public safety sources and law enforcement entities. They merely indicate a trend that can be connected with CT issues, but it would remain unclear whether a cause-effect relationship can be extrapolated from these numbers.

There are then two major tendencies in determining what counter terrorism is and what it does. Some seek to measure its effects on descriptive and measurable data (albeit with a very loosely defined baseline), while others seek to encompass intangible effects such as fear, economic impact, etc. Beatrice de Graaf talks about the “performative and communicative” power of terrorism and the equally important potential of counter terrorism and how this important feature is often missed in the analysis. For her, “…governments appear not to recognize the importance of their actions in setting the agenda (especially defining the threat), mobilizing popular support in support of counterterrorism, and framing the issue in the public mind.” It is then important to adopt a flexible framework that can equally handle qualitative and quantitative changes in a context where results cannot be linked to specific results, as in the case of the cost of preventive measures.

Most of the recent literature on counter terrorism has focused on measurable metrics on how military and security measures have made a difference. Hard and soft measures are clearly differentiated and measured. Yet, the emphasis on action can lead to the wrong result. The literature warns of the tendencies a) to believe the worst case scenario, b) to be over optimistic about one’s preventive abilities, c) bad statistical measurements that overlook past failures, and d) overreaction, since the pressure to do something might overtake the need to do what’s appropriate.

Finally, one can talk about the measurement of counter terrorism before and after the “War on Terror” as the latter have been framed mostly by US political leaders, mainly after the 9/11 events. The political weight thrown under the concept makes it an accessible and high yield political buzzword. Yet, a substantial amount of analytical work precedes this period providing a body knowledge that must be taken into account today.

Based on these observations, it is important to agree on what is expected of counter terrorism in order to seek the best possible set of measurements. If the idea is to use metrics to monitor actions, then numbers might fit the purpose, even if the quantitative factor might respond to more than one reason. However, if the objective is to capture the sense of an efficient state being resilient and increasing its immunity to the terrorist action, then the measurement and the timeline will be completely different.

Definitions

A military and narrow operational definition of counterterrorism (CT) refers to “… actions and activities to neutralize terrorists, their organizations, and networks.” However, talking about counter terrorism requires to cover, in addition to its root causes, the intangible effects of terrorism such as fear, and the impact on social cohesion, since the effectiveness of any counter measure is to be determined by how preventive or mending it has been. Terrorism is a way of conveying a message that is expected to generate certain effects (panic, fear, economic upheaval, overreaction, etc). Counter terrorism is then the set of measures and policies that can thwart that message and its intended effect.

Indicators and Methodology

The most distinctive feature of counterterrorism indicators might be the fact that they are not likely to stem from clear sources, since they will be the aggregate of cross-referenced qualitative assessments. This is a common theme that emerges repeatedly during the literature review. On

...
the quantitative aspect, the overall data emerge from public safety sources and law enforcement entities. As indicated previously, they merely indicate a trend that can be connected with counterterrorism issues, but it would remain unclear whether a cause-effect relationship can be extrapolated from these numbers.

**Metrical and Direct measures, based on \( \Delta \) (changes) since \( T_0 \)**
- Number of attacks and a possible reduction
- Number of victims per period in comparison to previous periods.
- Material Damage, quantifiable in terms of economic
- Number of arrests linked to the terrorist group.
- An overall reduction in the level of fear
- Counter terrorism done at an acceptable cost.\(^3\)

**Indirect Non metrical sources, based on causal chain.\(^4\)**
- Restraint in the use of force, not antagonizing the population, avoiding escalation
- International cooperation, since collaboration among states is essential to undermine the transnational nature of terrorist actions
- Coordination and strategy, avoiding inter-agency feuds and guaranteeing the maximum information dissemination.
- Offering non-violent options and making them viable and attractive
- Gathering intelligence that goes beyond the statistical aggregation
- Perform basic state tasks, ensuring that the sought undermining of the state authority does not happen. As well, an efficient law enforcement mechanism is key
- Address root causes, eliminating the grievances that might tilt popular support. This includes social discrimination, economic inequality, and political demands.
- Long-term commitment, since support for violent action is not sustainable in the long haul, and the state must offer a viable alternative.
- Counter narrative. It is key to undermine the ideological support. Targeting not only the supporting constituencies but also the terrorist themselves, the narrative is the centre of the effort on the messaging, central for any counter terrorism strategy.

As stated previously, the abstract and compounded nature of counter terrorism renders any measurement effort challenging. Focusing only on the metrical and quantitative data provides only a partial picture of the ongoing effort, without providing a clear indication of progress or lack thereof. In a way, public safety data can be linked somehow to counter terrorism, but it would require a major conceptual leap to frame it as a counter terrorism performance indicator, quantitatively and in terms of attribution. To complement this, one can use the concept of causal chains. Van Dogen argues that “...counterterrorism should be broken down into separate components that should all be evaluated separately. For all components, a causal chain from cause (measure) to effect (shift in indicator) should be formulated to solve the meaning and attribution problems.”\(^5\) Using the conceptual framework of causal chains yields then a set of qualitative factors that can indicate the overall direction of a counter terrorism effort.
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Annex 7: Countering Violent Extremism

Sector introduction

Stopping radicalisation and recruitment to terrorism has been a priority for the EU for over a decade, following the 9/11 attacks in the US and in particular after the terrorist attacks in Madrid (2004) and London (2005), and has grown since as an increasingly significant threat within the EU. Terrorist activities are not only the work of organised groups but increasingly by smaller groups or individuals, with the use of online recruitment and propaganda, making violent actions more difficult to predict and detect. Many Europeans have travelled to conflict zones, have been trained by radical groups, drawn into fighting and becoming more radicalised in the process. There is increasing concern for the security threat these individuals could pose upon their return (e.g. conducting lone terrorist acts, fomenting terrorist cells), while acknowledging the need for providing ‘exit strategies’ to radicalised individuals that renounce violence and the extremist ideology.

Since 2005, EU efforts against radicalisation or countering violent extremism have been guided by the EU Strategy for Combating Radicalisation and Recruitment, last revised in 2014, which focuses on three main streams of action:

- Disrupt the activities of individuals and networks that draw people into terrorism;
- Ensure that voices of mainstream opinion prevail over those of extremism;
- Promote security, justice, democracy and opportunities for all.

It is widely recognized that violent extremism is a multi-faceted problem that requires comprehensive/multidisciplinary and a mix of state and societal (including private sector) responses, at multiple levels (at local, national, regional and international). It is not merely a security issue, nor can responses be undertaken at the expense of fundamental human rights and individual freedoms (e.g. freedom of expression and information, freedom of assembly and association, respect for linguistic cultural and religious diversity). Respecting human rights, including fighting discrimination, and promoting the rule of law, alongside integration and cultural dialogue, are part of violent extremism prevention and response. Communities, civil society, NGOs and the private sector have an important role to play, alongside government, in countering radicalisation and violent extremism.

A wide variety of inter-related fields like psychology, sociology, history and political science, social policies of education and access to basic health services, public administration policies, etc may be required to understand the conditions conducive to violent extremism and why they appeal to others. Common conditions include real or perceived grievances, collective or personal humiliation, inequalities, injustice, unemployment, exclusion from economic, social and political participation, but how these factors interplay to create the breeding ground for violent extremism can be a highly contextual phenomena. CVE approaches need therefore to be tailored to each context and each community, to avoid miscalculations or misinterpretations, and take a conflict-sensitive, as well as a gender sensitive approach.

As summarised in a OSCE report on Women and Terrorist Radicalization (OSCE 2013): “Radicalization processes follow different and non-linear paths and the conditions conducive to it vary from one individual to another. Understanding a given instance of radicalization requires taking into account the specific contextual and personal factors at play, including historical, political, socio-economic and psychological considerations. Governments, civil society and international organizations should re-assert and be guided by the principle that terrorism should not be associated with any particular religion, culture, race or ethnicity. Governments should also respond in a balanced and proportionate manner to terrorist threats inspired by various ideologies to avoid focusing disproportionately on certain groups.” The potential for women radicalization and involvement in violent extremist groups also needs to be taken into account, as well as their role.
as policy shapers, educators, community members and activists in the prevention of radicalisation for terrorism.

**Definitions**

There is no consensus on a definition of violent extremism or radicalisation and its drives, but the terms are generally used to describe the attitudes and/or behaviours of predominantly young individuals who subscribe to extreme violent beliefs that could lead them to support and undertake violent actions. But what constitutes radicalization in one setting can be 'mainstream' in another, according to the political and cultural environment (Newmann 2013).

The EU defines radicalisation or violent extremism as “a complex phenomenon of people embracing radical ideology that could lead to commitment of terrorist acts”. The British government defines it as “the process by which people come to support terrorism and violent extremism and, in some cases, then to participate in terrorist groups”. The US, in its strategy to Prevent Violent Extremism in the United States, defines violent extremists as “individuals who support or commit ideologically-motivated violence to further political goals.”

Some actors distinguish between ‘cognitive radicalisation’ (with the focus on a person's beliefs) and ‘behavioral radicalisation’ (focus on a person’s actions) as the measurable criteria (e.g. Canada). Radicalization is then defined as the precursor to violent extremism, becoming a threat to national security when individuals and groups espouse or engage in violence as a means of promoting political, ideological or religious objectives (Laura Dawson et al. 2014)

**Indicators and Methodology**

Most approaches to CVE focus on three main dimensions: (i) understanding violent extremism; (ii) supporting local responses and local actors resilience and capacity for customised approaches and strategies; and (iii) supporting institutional responses and capacities to disrupt the activities of individuals and networks that draw people into terrorism, through national and international collaboration and in the respect for fundamental rights and freedoms, avoiding stigmatising any particular group of people. CVE actions need to be consistent with international human rights law, take into account the histories, cultures, and legal systems of each context, and be conducted in openness and transparency.

The EU identified several areas of action/activity, including:

- **Promote security, justice, and equal opportunities for all**: Inequality, marginalisation, social exclusion, and difficult access to quality education can be breeding grounds for radicalisation. Positive actions can include promoting inter-cultural dialogue, strengthening education to enable opportunities and critical thinking, and promoting tolerance and mutual respect, exchanging viewpoints and communicating to civil society the success in these areas.

- **Ensure that voices of mainstream opinion prevail over those of extremism**: Raise awareness, strengthen moderate civil society voices, mass and social media messaging; promote dialogue between public authorities and the various social, cultural and religious groups concerned or their leaders.

- **Support messages countering terrorism and counter online radicalisation and recruitment to terrorism**. Public-private partnership can play an important role in strategies to tackle the challenge of radicalisation online.

- **Train, build capacity and engage first line practitioners across relevant sectors**: Training of teachers, social and health care workers, religious leaders, community police officers, and prison and probation staff to be able to identify signs of radicalisation at an early stage, be aware of and understand signs of radicalisation to terrorism.
• Support individuals and communities/civil society to build resilience: empower the civil society in building and promoting resilience to resist and withstand the appeal of terrorism. Building resilience can be done by equipping individuals and civil society with the skills and resources to understand and address radicalisation to terrorism. In practice, it can entail e.g. support to and education of young people to help them build a positive sense of identity and recognise the dangers of terrorist narratives.

• Support disengagement initiatives: designing and developing disengagement and exit strategies adapted to the culture and the specific context for radicalised individuals that renounce violence and the extremist ideology.

• Support further research into the trends and challenges of radicalisation and recruitment to terrorism.

Outcome indicators on CVE actions will therefore often be expressed in terms of increase/positive change in understanding, and in behaviors or attitudes of participants, which poses the challenge of the length of time for outcomes to emerge, and the need to build trust with individuals and communities for partnering on CVE interventions. Quantitative indicators alone, such as a decrease in terrorist incidents in the country or a reduction in the number of individuals leaving to join extremism groups (to the extent such figures are known) can be useful, but are not per se indicative of a reduction in the level of extremism in a country to the extent they may be the result of better intelligence, law-enforcement, border controls, etc. Ways to overcome or mitigate the challenges of the measurement of CVE activities include the use of quantitative and qualitative data and a combination of measurement tools and methods (see namely Laura Dawson et al.)
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Annex 8: Security Sector Reform

Sector introduction
Reforming a security sector can play a positive role in the stabilization of fragile or conflict prone states. It is an essential part of any strategy to overcome conflict, and features as a central component of most donors' strategies. However, countless interventions, conceived in part to conciliate national and political agendas, as well as programmatic and technical requirements, have led to an overpopulation of strategies and approaches. Coherence has been a prime commodity, which in many cases meant that otherwise complementary interventions were in reality at cross purposes.

The OECD DAC lists few factors worth mentioning as related to the capacity gap in this area. On one hand, there has been a lack of a coherent strategy for SSR, mainly stemming from seeing different sector areas as isolated pieces instead of parts of a whole-of-government approach. On the other hand, the nature of this multi-sector area of intervention requires personnel with the ability to see things in a cross disciplinary manner. The initial perception of SSR has mistakenly led to over reliance on generalist or technical experts unable to see the cross-sector linkages or that conceive progress as a matter of procurement and logistical implementation. Finally, there is as well the proverbial lack of harmonization and alignment between SSR strategies and national objectives.

To respond to this, OECD DAC suggests a set of principles that need to oversee every type of intervention. These are:

- Establishment of effective governance, oversight and accountability in the security system;
- Improved delivery of security and justice services;
- Development of local leadership and ownership of the reform process;
- Sustainability of justice and security service delivery. (OECD, 2008).

Of key relevance for monitoring and evaluation purposes, these factors mentioned above are essential to seize the real nature of what progress should be and how it must assessed. Ultimately, SSR interventions should be part of a coherent multiparty effort to develop institutions and improve the well-being of citizens.

Definitions
Security sector reform (SSR) refers to the process to reform or rebuild any state’s security sector (Wikipedia, 2015). Often it refers to situations where in a given state, its security sector is unable to provide citizenry with basic levels of safety or when the very security sector is the source of instability or injustice. Security refers to the “…personal and state safety, necessary for economic and social development and vital for the protection of human rights.” This means that it covers not only the security and justice apparatus but also the well-being of the citizens concerned (OECD, 2008). In a nutshell, SSR encompasses sector reforms such as:

- Core security actors (armed forces, police, border guards, customs/migrations, and intelligence/security services);
- Security management and oversight bodies (ministries of defence and internal affairs, financial management bodies, and public complaints commissions);
- Justice and law enforcement institutions (e.g. judiciary, prisons, prosecution services);
- Non-statutory security forces (e.g. private security companies, guerrilla, and private militia).

Indicators and Methodology
A review of the literature indicates three clusters of observation, which in turn, are linked to different type of indicators.
First, the SSR Sector Mapping is to be established to provide an accurate picture of the different types of stakeholders. A well-drafted mapping provides a sketch of linkages and interactions that are key to the analysis of any qualitative and perception aggregate data. A good example of a starting point is provided here, bearing in mind that this will be complemented by more in-depth conflict mapping, mapping of actors and issues, and multi-level analysis. (Folk Bernardotte Academy, 2010)

Second, there must be a proper baseline/benchmarking criteria. This is to be based on the needs of the citizens, the current institutional capacities, as well as the desired end state of the population concerned.

Third and final, there must be a set of analytical tools that together can provide a reliable picture of the overall situation, shedding light accurately on the precise impact of any SSR intervention, and whether it responds to the four guiding principles mentioned above. They are listed as an annex.

**Figure**: Example of SSR Sector Mapping (Folk Bernardotte Academy, 2010, p. 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLE: SSR SECTOR MAPPING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues to consider:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Police Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on use of force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Guards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Governmental Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources are plenty in this particular field, but the key element is to ensure that they are used to develop a societal picture of the baseline and that they serve to measure social outcomes. If stakeholders are to move from a military to a people-centred security, the degree of consultation changes radically. Qualitative and quantitative measurements need to complement each other, keeping in mind that the main objective is the improvement of security sector governance. Schroeder asks for well “...targeted careful causal analyses of observable changes in variable characteristics.” (Schroeder, 2010). Of course, this will complement evaluations of individual programmes and some use of indicators that point to general trends. It is however ill-advised for policy makers to use these quantitative tools to determine the type of assistance to be allocated, as well as over relying on those for early warning or and policy forecasting.

Given the multitude of indexes, and in order to exact the right information, there must be complementarity. Quantitative indicators using aggregate data have to be linked with qualitative system data that aggregate individual perceptions information. (Schroeder, 2010)
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8.1 Policing

**Sector introduction**

From the myriad of police reform efforts in places such as El Salvador, Cambodia, Haiti, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Haiti, Kosovo, Timor Leste, Rwanda, Croatia, Georgia, Burundi, Sierra Leone, Liberia, and the DRC, among many others, there is already an emerging body of research, analysis and lessons learned that focuses on the trial and error path that has slowly calibrated what works in police reform in challenging contexts.

William O’Neill lists a set of necessary elements for a successful process which in turn can enlighten the search for a proper evaluation framework. In his view, 1) Police reform takes a long time, and requires technical and social changes, 2) organizational change in post conflicts contexts is much more difficult, 3) fostering an effective policing observant of human rights frameworks is a fundamental part of the process, 4) successful police reforms require a concurrent set of broader institutional changes within the criminal justice sector, 5) managerial tools and reforms as well as sound fiscal management are key, 6) sound and effective reforming goes through ownership of the change process which is linked to real consultation among the ranks, 7) local culture must be integrated into any policing reform effort, 8) overseeing the police and the reform requires independent oversight bodies properly enabled to do their job and 9) police reform requires to be centred on an ethos of public service and rejection of corruption. (O’Neill, 2005). Madeleine Kristoff also suggests that “…especially in post conflict environments, rebuilding the police should take into account the communities’ needs in order to build legitimacy for the institutions of government.”

Measuring policing reform needs then to be evaluated to reflect the complex context where it happens. The institutional effort must be properly captured by qualitative and contextual assessments and evaluations and this picture must be complemented by accurate quantitative indicators of operational performance as well. So far, most of the attempts to measure police efforts have focused solely on the quantification of resources spent or used, leading to a very inaccurate picture, influencing policy making decisions based on this type of reporting. (United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services, 2012) This misdirected conception of what must be evaluated is prevalent, perhaps mainly because of lack of better alternatives. Some options, as indicated here, have been suggested but they are yet to be mainstreamed.

**Definitions**

Police reform is considered to be an integral part of the security sector reform (SSR) package in any fragile context. Ensuring that a police sector is operational ranks at the top of the set of initial priorities not just in the post conflict phase, but also increasingly as part of any conflict prevention strategy. Given the importance given to this benchmark explains the number of actors that have developed expertise in this area. Donors support it, and several development actors have outdone each other in trying to develop expertise in this area as illustrated by the work of the Department of Peace Keeping Operations (DPKO) and the United Nations.
Development Programme (UNDP) in this area. However, this is a sector where international organizations are not the only ones, with involvement from bilateral donors, NGO’s, and also private sector contractors.

Police reform is mostly an institutional change endeavour, more often than not, happening in the most challenging conditions. Police reform is seen by some observers as the weakest link in the SSR sphere, and perhaps this is due to the very specifics of the nature of law enforcement in fragile contexts, the difficult in coordinating different approaches, and the fragmentary understanding in terms of what works.

**Indicators and Methodology**

For the specifics needs of policing in fragile contexts, a monitoring and evaluation framework has been proposed. In a groundbreaking report by Princeton University, the PRIME (*Police Reform Indicators and Measurement Evaluation*) system has been suggested as a key tool to measure the success of post-conflict police reform:


PRIME is based on a qualitative assessment of 16 core indicators divided in four sections that seek to address the overall context of:

- **Performance effectiveness**;
- **Management and oversight**;
- **Community relations**;
- **Sustainability**.

The complete system is presented as follows:

- **Performance Effectiveness**;

Considers the extent and quality of the police service’s efforts to produce law and order and respond to all levels of crime

- **Capacity**
- **Adequate manpower, training, and equipment to currently be effective**
- **Authority and Reach**
- **Political/legal authority to enforce internal security throughout the territory**
- **Crime**
- **Collection and use of crime statistics to set and achieve crime-fighting and crime prevention goals**;
- **Coordination**;
- **External coordination with criminal justice system (e.g. prisons, courts)**;
- **Management and Oversight**.

Assesses the police service’s basic management structure for carrying out operations and being accountable to the community

- **Mission and Procedures**;
- **Clearly defined and understood mission, code of conduct, operational procedures, and chain of command**;
- **Strategic Planning and Monitoring**;
- **Existence of goals and performance measures that regulate current and future professional conduct**;
- **Oversight and Accountability**;
- **Presence and strength of external and internal oversight mechanisms that ensure accountability**;
- **Personnel**;
- **Transparent and merit-based recruitment and promotion systems and level of retention rates**;
• Community Relations.
Consider the police service’s relations with the local community in securing the public’s support and trust:
• Human Rights;
• Level of commitment to democratic policing standards, respect for all people, and readiness to protect minority rights;
• Cooperation;
• Evidence of public involvement in ensuring internal security and in solving crime investigations;
• Corruptibility;
• Degree of police corruption and public perceptions of police honesty;
• Public Acceptance;
• Acceptance of the police as the main legitimate source of internal security;
• Sustainability.

Evaluates the ability of the police service to sustain itself and its capabilities without international donor support and guidance
• Budget;
• Long-term budget planning that secures sufficient funding for the development and maintenance of the police service;
• Training and Equipment;
• Existence of local capacity to train officers and maintain necessary police equipment into the future;
• Political Independence;
• Adequate insulation from political influence to maintain neutrality and protect all citizens;
• Compensation;
• Sufficiency of salaries and other benefits to encourage high retention;
• Discourage corruption.
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8.2 Border management

**Sector introduction**

Strong border management is vital for national and regional stability - as well as for economic growth. Good management of borders helps reducing the cross-border movement of illegal trafficking, drugs, militants, weapons and radioactive materials, while at the same time facilitating trade and legal movement of people.

A variety of actors are involved in tasks related to the management of state borders in every country. While they clearly have a different focus and thus different objectives depending on their responsibilities and powers, they all work towards a common strategic goal. Traditionally, the strategic goals at the state level in relation to border management lie in the protection of the borders against threats to national security, the national economy and public health, but also in the prevention of cross-border criminal activities and unlawful entry into or exit from the state.

Border services, including border guards as well as customs, veterinary and phyto-sanitary inspection services, all play an important role in this regard. Border services are obliged to ensure the security and health of people, animals, plants and cultural heritage. As the potential threats are numerous, an expeditious and at the same time effective control system is required, of which the management is accordingly complex. On the other hand, increased international trade and tourism, as well as the increase in cultural and educational exchanges make the facilitation of licit movement of persons and goods also an important strategic goal of most countries. Border services are therefore forced to strike a delicate balance between strict controls concerning risks and fully open borders. In order to balance these twin goals of modern border management – that is, border security and facilitated movement of persons and goods – in an efficient and effective manner, appropriate equipment and well-trained and motivated staff are as important as a strong legal basis, a clear division of tasks and responsibilities, streamlined processes and an efficient exchange of information. Taking into account the complexity of the task, this cooperation and coordination should not only be limited to the units within one ministry or agency, but should also occur both between all actors involved in border...
management within a certain country and at the international level. Most importantly, the services need to realize that they have common objectives and tasks, and that their individual objectives can only be reached by frank communication and by working together (EU, 2007).

In this regard, the EU has defined extensively the three pillars of the integrated border management concept. The key aspects of the Integrated Border Management concept are cooperation and coordination. Both are taking place at different levels:

- **Intra-service cooperation**, which refers to cooperation between units within a state body: both the vertical aspect of intra-service cooperation between the different administrative levels from the state body to the units working at the borders, and the horizontal aspect of cooperation between the various Border Control Points (BCP) as well as inland control station;

- **Inter-agency cooperation**: Inter-agency cooperation takes a horizontal approach based on cooperation and coordination between officers of the different services active at a border (local level), as well as among the regional and central ministries/authorities responsible for these services;

- **International cooperation**: International cooperation involve the cooperation between agencies involved in border issues in different countries, and exists at the local, regional and multinational levels: a) Local cooperation between officials on both sides of the border; b) Bilateral cooperation between neighbouring states; c) Multinational cooperation focusing on border management issues.

Close international cooperation in the field of border management with neighbouring and other relevant countries is an effective tool to facilitate trade and address cross-border crime and irregular migration. This can be achieved – inter alia – by establishing appropriate working mechanisms and communication channels, local contact points, joint emergency plans or exercises and handling of incidents in a factual manner to avoid political disputes.

A detailed review of the implementation in practice of the principles of cooperation and coordination in practice can be reviewed in Part III of the Thematic global evaluation of the European Union’s support to Integrated Border Management and fight against Organised Crime (2013).

**Definitions**

**Integrated Border Management**: National and international coordination among all the relevant authorities and agencies involved in border security and trade facilitation to establish effective, efficient and integrated border management systems, in order to reach the objective of open, but well controlled and secure borders.

**Border control**: An activity carried out at a border in response exclusively to an intention to cross that border, regardless of any other consideration. It covers: (a) checks carried out at authorised border crossing-points to ensure that persons, their vehicles and the objects in their possession may be authorised to enter the territory of the Member States or authorised to leave it; and (b) surveillance of borders outside authorised border crossing-points and fixed hours, in accordance with this regulation, to prevent persons from by passing border crossing-points in order to avoid checks and enter or leave the territory of Member States illegally.

**Management of external borders**: the activities carried out by public authorities of the Member States in order: (a) to carry out checks and surveillance at external borders provided for by articles 5 and 6 of the Schengen Convention; (b) To gather, analyse and exchange any specific intelligence or general information enabling the border guard to analyse the risk that a person, object or asset constitutes for the internal security of the common area of freedom of movement, law and order or the national security of the Member States, and for general compliance with Community legislation; (c) To analyse the development of the threats likely to affect the security
of the external borders and to set the priorities for action by border guards accordingly; (d) To anticipate the needs as regards staff and equipment to ensure security at external borders.


**Indicators and Methodology**

**Key sources of sector indicators**

For most recent evaluations on IBM by the EU, two specific reference guides are often quoted:

- Updated EU Schengen Catalogue on External borders control, Return and Readmission, Brussels, (2009), https://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/.../4._catalogue_bor...

Evaluation criteria which have been selected in EU led Thematic Global Evaluation of the EU’s support to Integrated Border Management are seven and include five DAC criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability), coherence and the Commission’s value added (two EU criteria). Besides the evaluation criteria, evaluation questions should also address cross-cutting issues, as well as the “3Cs”, which stand for Coordination, Complementarity, and Coherence. The criterion of the Value added of the Commission is closely related to the principle of subsidiarity and relates to the fact that an activity/operation financed/implemented through the Commission should generate a particular benefit.

The Final Evaluation Matrix that conducted the implementation of the Thematic Global Evaluation of the EU’s support to IBM and fight against Organised Crime presents eight (8) Evaluation questions related to: a) EU Policy Framework; b) the “3Cs”; c) Aid Delivery Methods; d) Legal, regulatory and institutional framework; e) Border cooperation; f) Security and threat of organized crime; g) Flow of persons and management of migration; h) Flows of goods and revenue collection. Each evaluation question is decomposed into two or three sub-questions, all correlated to series of three to five indicators. As an illustration, the question on "Aid Delivery Methods" is composed of two sub-questions and eight indicators which support the investigation to be conducted in order to respond to the question:
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Annex 9: Confidence building, mediation and dialogue

**Sector introduction**

Initially developed between military alliances during the Cold War in order to avoid nuclear attacks by accident, confidence-building measures (CBMs) remain a key area of activity in conflict prevention and resolution (e.g. UN’s Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 2 December 2014). UN’s Office for Disarmament Affairs identifies the following main types of CBM’s:

- Reporting;
- Information exchange measures (e.g. reciprocal appointment of military points of contact, establishment of a hotline between top generals);
- Observation and verification measures (e.g. invitation of observers to monitor major military exercises and missions to evaluate on site the information provided by a Government on its military units and equipment);
- Military constraint measures (e.g. restrictions on the number and scope of major military exercises, limitations of troop movements). (See this OAS list for more examples).

Interventions in the sector of CBMs, mediation and dialogue may have either limited or unwanted outcomes such as:

- Counter-productive effects, e.g. by providing disincentives for parties to effectively address the core issues of conflict (e.g. negotiation postponing) (US AID, 2013);
- Fragmentation of non-state armed actors, e.g. by conducing inappropriate mediation processes.

Recent M&E projects regarding CBMs have highlighted the challenge of adequately assessing their political impacts. Indeed, one the main challenges of mediating CBMs is the lack of clear guidance regarding their implementation and measurement (Mason and Siegfried, 2013). There also remains a lack of agreement on the definition of a successful mediation, which makes the identification of consistent, shared indicators more complex (IfP, 2008).

Experience suggests that this lack of consistent M&E frameworks to assess the relevance and effectiveness of interventions in this sector, despite the significance of the field of peace mediation in conflict prevention, is also conducive to misleading analysis of conflicts or post-conflicts contexts and, therefore, to peacebuilding interventions. As an example, the assessment of mediation processes have so far largely failed to adequately account for meaningful, yet unforeseen, changes that are considered as important by practitioners (ECCP, 2008).

These issues reinforce the importance to perform adequate M&E of confidence-building measures as well as mediation and dialogue initiatives, even though they remain a particularly challenging sector to assess.

**Definitions**

Confidence –Building measures are defined as “arrangements designed to enhance such assurance of mind and belief in the trustworthiness of States and the facts they create” (Holst, 1983 in UNIDIR, 1987). They primarily aim to give to a party in a conflict actual reasons to trust that future actions of the other party will be consistent with intentionality and commitments. Types of confidence-building measures may be of a declaratory, informational, communicational nature, or relate to military socialization, for example (UNIDIR, 1987).

The Initiative for Peacebuilding (IfP) (2008:7) defines peace mediation as “an intervention within an international setting by an intermediary who actively supports the conflict parties in negotiating a mutually beneficial and acceptable agreement ».
No outstanding, shared definition of dialogue has been retrieved in the policy literature.

**Indicators and Methodology**

Contrarily to other key sectors of stability and peacebuilding interventions, there appears to be no dominant, consistent frameworks for the design of M&E indicators to assess confidence-building, mediation and dialogue interventions in that area.

**OECD/DAC Guidelines and References Series. Evaluating Peacebuilding Activities in Settings of Conflict and Fragility – Improving Learning for Results (2012).**


General evaluation criteria proposed in the OECD’s report on evaluating peacebuilding and conflict prevention projects (2012: pp. 65-71) are broadly discussed as reference points for guidance in the targeting of indicators in this sector. These generic criteria are:

- Relevance;
- Effectiveness and impact;
- Sustainability;
- Efficiency;
- Coherence and coordination.

Some evaluation of CBMs (see example here) were articulated around the standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria (design and relevance, efficiency, impact, effectiveness, sustainability), to which two EU-specific criteria were added (coherence; value added).

The IfP (2008) explicitly proposed the use of OECD-DAC criteria as a basis for discussion of indicator selection in the M&E of mediation, considering them “likely to become the points of reference for evaluation in the conflict prevention field”.

**Initiative for Peacebuilding (IfP). Evaluating Peace Mediation (2008)**


In a follow-up to the debate initiated on the challenges of peace mediation in a European context, the Initiative for Peacebuilding (IfP) recently proposed a systematic but flexible framework for evaluating international mediation activities based on a series of open and non-suggestive evaluation questions rather than on conventional linear, normative assessments. Based notably on a recent OECD report on evaluating peacebuilding and conflict prevention projects (2008), this framework is sensitive to the different focus (power-based; interest-based; transformative) of the mediation processes at stake.

IfP’s framework on the evaluation of peace mediation proposes (pp. 13-19) an interpretation of the OECD-DAC criteria in light of the particularities of mediation activities.

Existing literature provides many methodological insights (e.g. Social Capital Assessment Tool (SOCAT) for measuring changes in trust, confidence and collaboration among individuals in targeted communities). Yet a substantive discussion of indicators and measurement methodologies remain surprisingly parcellar.

As initiatives aiming to (re)create and sustain a climate of trust and reconciliation, confidence-building, mediation and dialogue projects constitute mainly procedural and qualitative interventions that are less directly measurable than other forms of conflict prevention and peacebuilding sectors of activities (e.g. disarmament, mine action).

There is a general consensus in the policy literature that M&E approaches to trust, confidence and security in conflict environments should be participatory and highly context-specific, and indicators shall be based on criteria of success that are meaningful to the local groups on whom these interventions center (e.g. what local people define as signifying greater confidence or increased trust) (Social Impact, n.d.). As an example, a greater sensitivity to contexts can
translate into a "further refinement of the definition of 'significant change' together with people from the local communities" affected by conflict prevention and resolution interventions (European Centre for Conflict Prevention, 2008).

Some sources thus suggest that indicators in these sectors should be used for monitoring purposes, as progress markers, while using more flexible, context-specific criteria for evaluation activities.

OECD-DAC indicators globally point to instances of changes in attitudes, beliefs, communication, and relationships as important indicators of impact. An example of observable changes in the way people behave is an increasing level of positive social contact among people from both sides of a conflict (in such settings as markets, football games, bars, buses) (Special EU Programmes Body, n.d.).

More specific indicators of progress or impact should be able to evolve over time, along with the unfolding of confidence-building, mediation and dialogue processes (OECD-DAC, 2007).

Indicators for project evaluation shall be connected with broader activities and issues at higher levels (e.g. relationships between local and national conflicts) (OECD-DAC, 2007).

Confidence-building
Measurement of the impacts of confidence-building measures is seldom feasible within short project timeframes, as these processes unfold over time and cannot be seized through technical evaluations.

Indicators may be based on indicators used in related sectors such as social empowerment, which includes levels and types of social interactions between groups as well as levels of inter-marriage (Special EU Programmes Body, n.d.).

Mediation
The subjectivity of success, the flexibility necessary to mediation, the multiplicity of styles, aims and scope, and the intangible value of mediation are intrinsic characteristics that make its evaluation especially challenging (IfP, 2008). As an example, the value of a transformational mediation process might not so much be most adequately assessed by looking for the production of a peace agreement than by observing how conflict parties have changed their interactions. Moreover, and ultimately, the complexity of mediation environments (e.g. influence of mediator, long term scale, etc.) makes clear cause-and-effect correlations and success/failure assessments practically impossible to establish (IfP, 2008).

The Initiative on Peacebuilding (IfP, 2008) notably propose to favour an approach to peacebuilding mediation M&E:

- That focus on « what each mediation process did best » rather than on a linear or normative approach;
- Whose indicators reflect the focus of the mediation process, whether it’s deal brokering, problem-solving or long-term transformation (IfP, 2008);
- That beware of narrow definition of indicators that may restrain the crucial flexibility of mediators, or jeopardize the confidentiality of the mediation process (IfP, 2008).

Dialogue
The OECD-DAC (2012) identified a set of considerations for the evaluation of dialogue based on its general evaluation criteria. The development of indicators at different levels was proposed in order to ensure better context-specificity:

- Participant level (e.g. Changed perceptions about the conflict i.e. more accurate, balanced, empathetic and inclusive);
- Project level (e.g. Public recognition of the legitimate interests of the opposing side);
Sociopolitical level (e.g. Adoption of ideas into official structures or political negotiations ie. transfer effect).

A report of the Special EU Programmes Body (s.d.: Annex D) outlines scales for analysing social dialogue approaches through numerical measures and scales. The proposed approach is focused on the symmetry-dominance patterns in the active participation of both participants and mediators to a dialogue process, as well as on inter-group participation and general atmosphere.

**Generic indicators**

Sample objectives and indicators identified by the Special EU Programmes Body (n.d.: Annex D) include the following:

- Increase trust between two communities e.g. 50% of men, women and children from each side increase their mobility within the areas controlled by the other side by at least one square kilometre per year;
- Increase inter-community collaboration on public policy issues that address common problems e.g. expand from twice/year to six times/year the number of public policy debates or forums where all communities contribute interest-based solutions on natural resource management disputes.
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Annex 10: Rule of Law /Legal and Judicial Development

Sector introduction
As a principle of governance, the rule of law (RoL) is a core aspect of peacebuilding efforts to build effective and credible political and justice institutions at all moments of a conflict cycle. Not only is RoL considered "the most significant indicator of an escalating conflict", which makes it central to conflict prevention efforts (UNDP, 2009: 5), but it contributes to early recovery in the aftermath of a conflict by contributing to create a safe and secure environment. More broadly, the RoL is considered as providing "the very foundation" (ibid.) for the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

As was highlighted in a report of the Center for Democracy and Governance (1998), the RoL prevails when:

- The terms of the social contract are observed by both citizens and the state authority;
- The terms are enforced either by voluntary cooperation or by legal processes and institutions;
- Violations of the terms of the contract are punished according to the law.

Equal treatment according to the law (e.g. no arbitrary treatment by the State) and equal access to justice institutions and processes are landmarks to a RoL that effectively protects basic human rights as encompassed in various conventions and declarations (e.g. Universal Declaration of Human Rights).

Among the major challenges faced by conflict and post-conflict societies are the (re)establishment of a functioning Government considered as legitimate by all residents and stakeholders, as well as a fair access to safety, security and justice. These challenges are typically faced while also dealing with pressing issues such as acute poverty, malnutrition and disease, dysfunctional infrastructures and endemic corruption (UN, 2011).

The necessity to base RoL assistance on adequate evaluation measurements was acknowledged by UN’s Secretary-General in a 2011 report. Yet, the multidimensionality and multi-functionality of the RoL makes it difficult to measure and assess projects, programmes or sectors with time-bound indicators (UNDP, 2014). Shortcomings thus remain in the M&E of this sector of intervention, characterized until recently by the lack of standard guidelines to indicators development and use.

Definitions
A UN definition (UN Secretary General report to the Security Council, 2004, quoted in Parsons and Thornton, n.d.): The rule of law is a principle of governance in which all persons, institutions and entities, public and private, including the State itself, are accountable to laws that are publicly promulgated, equally enforced and independently adjudicated, and which are consistent with international human rights norms and standards. It requires, as well, measures to ensure adherence to the principles of supremacy of law, equality before the law, accountability to the law, fairness in the application of the law, separation of powers, participation in decision-making, legal certainty, avoidance of arbitrariness and procedural and legal transparency.

The critical importance of the RoL for sustainable development was reaffirmed in 2012 by Member States in the General Assembly of the United Nations, and remains considered as both a major enabler and outcome of the post-2015 Development Agenda (UNDP, 2014).

Indicators and Methodology
UN Rule of Law Indicators
Building and strengthening the “rule of law” in developing nations, particularly countries in transition or emerging from a period of armed conflict, has become a central focus of the work of the United Nations and other bilateral and international stakeholders. As a result, there is grow-
ing demand throughout the United Nations system to better understand the delivery of justice in conflict and post-conflict situations and the impact of developments in this area. The United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), in cooperation with other United Nations departments, agencies, funds and programmes, have developed an instrument [the United Nations Rule of Law Indicators] to monitor changes in the performance and fundamental characteristics of criminal justice institutions in conflict and post-conflict situations. The instrument comprises guidance on the implementation and use of this set of indicators. One of the acknowledged limits of the first edition of the Guide is that its scope is narrowed to a focus on the capacity, performance, integrity, transparency and accountability of criminal justice institutions (including police, law enforcement agencies, courts, prosecution and defence, corrections).

The instrument groups 135 indicators under three institutions:

- Police (41 indicators);
- Judicial system (51 indicators);
- Prisons (43 indicators).

Rated indicators are all expressed as a numerical value ranging from 1 to 4 (see p. 6+ of the document for a thorough description of the baskets of indicators).

Other sources

A review of the policy literature suggests that the UN RoL Indicators have become the landmark reference for M&E in this area. Yet, other key sources of sectors indicators have been retrieved and provide useful grounds for indicator development and implementation.

**UNDP’s Global Program for Justice and Security**

Under the theme “Strengthening the Rule of Law in Conflict- and Post-Conflict Situations”, this document provides examples of programme-level evaluation indicators regarding RoL-focused conflict and post-conflict interventions (section 3.2.3). Examples of aimed outputs and related indicators are as follows:

- Output 1: Rapidly and effectively respond to programme countries in providing Rule of Law assistance in conflict and post-conflict situations (Indicator example: # of rule of law programmes/projects developed, approved by BPAC and directly implemented by UNDP country offices);
- Output 2: Produce high quality and relevant policy guidelines and knowledge products directly linked to in-country programming (Indicator example: Guidance Note on Monitoring and Evaluating Rule of Law Programmes produced and disseminated);
- Output 3: Actively contribute to integrated and coherent UN system-wide assistance and coordination on Rule of Law (Indicator example: Substantive contribution to the Inter-Agency Task Force on Security Sector Reform established and expanded).

Annex 3 of the document provides a sample list of indicative performance indicators for RoL programming at country office levels. In addition to more conventional criteria (e.g. # of judges and prosecutors trained), an example of indicator is the measurement of whether Rule of law institutions develop new policies, strategies, development plans, SOPs, handbooks, training curricula etc. as part of a progressive reform agenda and apply them in practice.

Annex 4 of the publication includes a list of indicative performance indicators at a program level (e.g. according to programming areas). For example, for a program area focused on the strengthening of the RoL within an early recovery framework and during transitions, targeted indicators include the number of crimes tried by national courts and the number of such crimes that have led to convictions and sentences.

**Center for Democracy and Governance’s Handbook of Democracy and Governance program indicators**
Although this *Handbook* is not recent, its Section A (pp. 17-54) provides a detailed, consistent set of indicators (and accompanying notes) for specifically monitoring and evaluating RoL in light of specific agency objectives and intermediate results. Tables of indicators include:

- Indicator;
- Definition and unit of measurement;
- Relevance of indicator;
- Data collection methods / Approx. costs;
- Target setting / Trendline interpretation issues;
- Comments.

**Vera Institute of Justice’s Measuring Progress toward Safety and Justice: A Global Guide to the Design of Performance Indicators across the Justice Sector**

This Guide provides key guidance on the design of different *types of indicators* specific to the justice sector but encompassing accountability apparatus, that may be inspirational for broader RoL M&E:

- Strategic indicators (safety and security; access to justice);
- Institutional indicators (policing, prosecution and defence, judicial performance, non-custodial sentencing, prisons, accountability mechanisms);
- Non-state institutions (importance and challenges of measuring outcomes in this part of the justice sector, potential indicators for non-state institutions).

**Special EU Programmes Body, A monitoring and Evaluation Framework for Peace-Building**

Prepared by PriceWaterhouse Coopers, this report notably proposes a conflict analysis framework integrating variables related to the RoL. Annex B (Conflict Analysis Framework Variables) includes indicators of warning as well as escalation and de-escalation of conflicts regarding governance and political institutions (pp. 60-61). Variables for which such indicators are identified are:

- Equity of governance & political institutions;
- E.g. indicator of warning: One group tending to dominate governance and military;
- E.g. indicator of escalation: Denying constitutional rights on ethnic/social groups;
- E.g. indicator of de-escalation: Establishing political institutions with increased representation and power sharing;
- Stability of political institutions;
- E.g. indicator of warning: Weakening democratic system;
- E.g. indicator of escalation: Escalating corruption;
- E.g. indicator of de-escalation: Releasing political prisoners and returning of exiles;
- Equity of law / judicial system;
- E.g. indicator of warning: Gap between laws (legal system) and their implementation;
- E.g. indicator of escalation: Rising disregard for laws on paper and oppressive practices;
- E.g. indicator of de-escalation: Concerted effort to remove and correct perception of biases prevalent among the public;
- Links between government and citizens;
- E.g. indicator of warning: Lack of accountability of political leaders and institutions;
- E.g. indicator of escalation: Increasingly disregarding certain groups in the political sphere;
- E.g. indicator of de-escalation: Serious attempt to build trust in government.

Numerous manuals and resources propose, more broadly, indicators of democratic governance that may prove of interest.

The *UNDP’s User’s Guide to Measuring Rule of Law, Justice and Security Program (2014)* provides a useful basis for the effective measurement of RoL interventions in a development context, alt-
hough little guidance is provided on indicators per se.

The UN Rule of Law Indicators instrument outlines the following general methodological principles (pp. 1-4):

- Multiplicity of data sources (administrative data, field data, survey of experts, document review);
- Flexibility (context-specificity, adaptation);
- Focus on the dimensions of performance, integrity, transparency and accountability;
- Grouping of indicators into baskets;
- Focus on performance;
- Sensitivity to vulnerable groups;
- Change tracking over time.

The UNDP’s User Guide to Measuring Rule of Law, Justice and Security Programmes (2014: 22) identify easier and harder concepts to measure regarding rule of law. Examples are respectively:

- Perceptions of corruption through public or expert surveys vs. actual corruption;
- Contact with the formal court system vs. Effectiveness of informal justice mechanisms.

Qualitative and quantitative indicators both have strengths and limitations when monitoring and evaluating RoL (see UNDP, 2014: 38 for detailed analysis):

- Qualitative methods:
  - Example of strength: Generates a contextual description (e.g. to understand access to justice issues);
  - Example of limitation: Lack of credibility with stakeholders;
- Quantitative methods:
  - Example of strength: Useful when measuring change over time with a large group of individuals or cases (e.g. all police stations of a country);
  - Example of limitation: Narrow focus on statistical information without capturing the full picture of people’s needs, experiences and perceptions.

Guidance exist regarding cross-cutting issues to M&E in the context of the present Manual:

- Human rights: In a guide regarding the monitoring of RoL in post-conflict states (2006), the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights underlines that some indicators (e.g. Membership of a vulnerable group as victim or perpetrator or party to a case; Cases that stem from the human rights history of the country) could be targeted as monitoring priorities in order to assess potential human rights violations in the specific contexts of post-conflict interventions.
- Gender equality: Annex 4 of UNDP’s Global Program for Justice and Security (2009) provide sample indicators to assess women’s security in relationship to RoL in conflict and post-conflict situations. Proposed indicators include the number of rape and SGBV cases brought to courts and the number of such crimes that have led to sentences and convictions.

Another principle evoked in the literature for RoL M&E, and whose importance is acknowledged by most organizations, is the importance of national ownership and capacity transfer. Past initiatives have aimed to empower local governments in the methodological design of indicators.

**Generic monitoring indicators for Rule of Law**

- Number of people who voice confidence in the judicial system;
- Number of professional judges or magistrates per 100,000;
- Number of complaints lodged and considered;

---

6 e.g. UNDP Oslo Governance Centre / Mongolian government
• Desegregation of justice sector staff by sex and ethnicity.

**Methodological challenges**

A general problem regarding RoL indicators design and implementation is the limited availability of reliable data regarding governance, security and justice, in conflict or post-conflict contexts characterized by meagre data collection capacity. A key strategy is to base measurement on a broad range of data sources. UN’s RoL Indicators instrument combines information from the followings: administrative data, document reviews, field observations, public knowledge and expert surveys.

According to Parsons and Thornton (n.d.), a significant methodological limitation of indicators based on RoL is that « in many countries receiving rule of law assistance from the UN, large sections of the population rely on customary justice systems to resolve disputes and access justice ». Measurement initiatives still have to account for the role of customary justice systems in empirical terms.

Finally, "in countries where there are several UN agencies, NGOs and other donors active in the development of rule of law programmes, attributing impact to a particular programme or intervention may be impossible » (e.g. multiplicity of organizations involved in police training or prison rebuilding programmes)(Parsons and Thornton, n.d.).
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Annex 11: Transitional justice

Sector introduction

There is no universally accepted formula how to address the past, which is marred by massive human rights violations. Creating trust between former enemies is an extremely difficult task. Although all transitional justice approaches are based on a fundamental respect for human rights, each society should ultimately choose its own path determining how to come to terms with its horrendous past.

Transitional justice practitioners have also engaged with "traditional" justice measures. Some communities may wish to use traditional rituals to foster reconciliation of warring parties, in addition to other methods being used. For example, World Development 2011 report on conflict, security and development brings out Rwanda's solution to adopt a traditional community conflict resolution system, Gacaca. This approach trained more than 250,000 community members to serve on panels in 12,000 community courts. Gacaca is based on an extended plea-bargaining principle and has elements of both punishment and reconciliation. It is expected to having processed more than 1.5 million cases.

This case implies that transitional justice processes are difficult to measure comparatively across different countries. It also begs the question about foreign involvement in these truth-seeking processes, which are deeply ingrained in - and heavily dependent on - local traditions and culture.

The role of foreign donors in these processes, which have to be nationally owned in order to successfully restore government’s legitimacy, authority and capacity, has to be carefully planned in cooperation with major beneficiary stakeholders.

UN has worked out a set of Guiding Principles for transitional justice:

1) Support and actively encourage compliance with international norms and standards when designing and implementing transitional justice processes and mechanisms;
2) Take account of the political context when designing and implementing transitional justice processes and mechanisms;
3) Base assistance for transitional justice on the unique country context and strengthen national capacity to carry out community-wide transitional justice processes;
4) Strive to ensure women's rights;
5) Support a child-sensitive approach;
6) Ensure the centrality of victims in the design and implementation of transitional justice processes and mechanisms;
7) Coordinate transitional justice programmes with the broader rule of law initiatives
8) Encourage a comprehensive approach integrating an appropriate combination of transitional justice processes and mechanisms;
9) Strive to ensure transitional justice processes and mechanisms take account of the root causes of conflict and repressive rule, and address violations of all rights
10) Engage in effective coordination and partnerships.

In addition to the goals of achieving accountability, justice and reconciliation, the long-term objectives of transitional justice measures are to promote peace, national cohesion and the rule of law. These are high-level goals, fulfilment of which can be detected or verified only after a long time period. Given that international attention tends to shift periodically, proper monitoring and evaluation of these long-term processes becomes extremely important.

Whether the transitional justice processes yield to results (positive or negative) can thus be verified long after the initiation. In fact, studies draw conflicting conclusions of the truth commissions’ effectiveness in achieving their proclaimed outcomes, depending on the research.
methods used. Some quantitative studies aiming to establish causal relations between truth commissions’ work and the expected outcomes (such as higher degrees of respect for human rights) have not been able to discover significant effects. In fact, some authors claim that commissions, when used alone, tend to have a negative impact on human rights instead. Truth commissions can have a positive impact, however, when used in combination with trials and amnesties (ibid.).

Because transitional justice measures address only systemic and large-scale crimes committed in the past, the outcomes of the donor-led interventions in this field also depend on society’s current human rights status. Sometimes, the former leaders who committed crimes are elected back to the offices, whereas (depending on a country) they might be protected by parliamentary immunity.

Transitional justice thus consists of complex processes, in which the donors have to participate with extreme care. Another example of complex transitional justice issues is the blurred lines between victims and perpetrators. It can be further complicated by confusion between justice processes and the battle between political parties at elections. Additional layer of complication is added when re-evaluation of history is done in the chauvinistic interests of new government.

Donors’ success hence depends on setting moderate and realistic goals for the planned interventions in transitional justice, with thorough stakeholder and conflict analysis and conflict sensitivity.

Definitions

The UN has defined transitional justice approaches as a “full range of processes and mechanisms associated with a society's attempt to come to terms with a legacy of large-scale past abuses in order to ensure accountability, service justice and achieve reconciliation”. These mechanisms can be judicial and non-judicial measures, such as criminal prosecutions, truth commissions, reparation programs, national consultations, vetting and dismissals, and various kinds of institutional reforms, or a combination thereof.

Truth commissions are defined as (government run) bodies set up to investigate a past history of violations of human rights in a particular country – which can include violations by the military or other government forces or armed opposition forces.

Reparation initiatives seek to address the harms caused by the widespread and systemic human rights violations. They can take the form of compensating for the losses suffered, or they can be future oriented - providing rehabilitation and a better life to victims, including financial compensation to individuals or groups; guarantees of non-repetition; social services such as healthcare or education; and symbolic measures such as formal apologies or public commemorations.

Vetting refers to the processes of assessing the integrity of individuals – including adherence to relevant human rights standards – to determine their suitability for public employment. Countries undergoing transitions to democracy and peace frequently use such processes to exclude abusive or incompetent public employees from public service.

Indicators and Methodology

Due to uniqueness of each case, the outcomes of transitional justice interventions do not allow for successful quantitative (cross-country or time-scale) measurement. Further, it is inherently difficult to measure objectively levels of accountability, justice and reconciliation, e.g. the very goals of transitional justice measures.

"Quantitative indicators are appealing because they are relatively concrete and often more objective - that is, the value of the indicator is less sensitive to the identity of the observer doing the measurement. Quantitative measures may also make cross-country or inter-temporal comparison more feasible. However, the scarcity of good data and the inherent subjectivity of many aspects of legal system performance limit the areas where quantitative data are available.
or relevant. It may be possible to measure objectively case processing times or legal expenditures per case.” (Source: Design, Monitoring and Evaluation for Peacebuilding.)

If aimed to be included into a composite peace and stability index (through a measurement of proxy values, for example), the analysis should always include a qualitative section. A combination of two methods ensures that weaknesses of each method are complemented with their respective strengths.

Despite the measurement difficulties, legal reform lends itself to several types of assessments: one is related to the data gathered during the project management processes: assessing whether the planned outputs were achieved within the original schedule, budget and scope.

For example, donors can play a relatively well-defined role in capacity building initiatives, supporting government’s training of judges, assist with witness protection programs or provide technical assistance to police departments to conduct investigations. It is relatively easy to evaluate the outputs of capacity building projects. Assessing capacity building programs will provide a valuable set of lessons to be learnt in order to improve the internal processes.

Second type of assessment includes gathering empirical evidence about every stakeholder’s judgement (including those stakeholders who may have a stake in maintaining the existing state of affairs) about donor-provided input. For example, have all victims enjoyed equal access to justice? Are they pleased with the time it takes to serve justice? etc.) Thirdly, several countries have assisted to measure outcomes of legal reform by measuring processes.

Following public opinion about the direction the country is going can also provide ideas about the success rate of transitional justice measures. One could also use the following tools to assess the outcomes:

- Compare with the ideal situation, for example estimating how far is the current situation from the ideal outcome; and
- Establish a counter-factual (Would an alternative mechanism have served justice better?).

Some sub-indicators of the governance measures might assist to gather national level data of proxies to rule of law, regulatory quality and accountability.

**WBI Worldwide Governance Indicators:**

The World Bank Institute composes the Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) which reports aggregate and individual governance indicators for 215 economies over the period 1996–2013, for six dimensions of governance: Voice and Accountability, Political Stability and Absence of Violence, Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law, Control of Corruption.

**Social Progress Index (Opportunities)**

The Social Progress Imperative organization has started to measure comparatively countries progress in providing social wellbeing to its citizens in 2014. The organization aims to push GDP as the main basis for cross-country comparisons. The aggregate SP Index consists of three sub-components, of which the Opportunities component would be suitable for measuring governance levels: Personal rights, Personal freedom and choice, tolerance and inclusion and access to advanced education.

**Ibrahim Index on African Governance**

Initiated by the Mo Ibrahim Foundation, the IIAG is an annual statistical assessment of African governance. The index combines over 100 variables from 30 different independent sources and can be considered a most comprehensive measurement of governance in Africa. The components include: safety and rule of law, participation and human rights, sustainable economic opportunity, and human development.
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Annex 12: Electoral assistance

Sector introduction

Elections are the means through which people voice their preferences and choose their representatives. Elections are a powerful tool: They can confer legitimacy on the institutions or representatives that emerge from them, or call their legitimacy into question.

There is a clear international consensus on the importance of democracy and the electoral process. The vast majority of countries around the world are formally committed to respecting democratic principles, through international human rights instruments, membership of regional bodies and under their own constitutions. In practice, however, democracy depends on a complex web of norms and institutions that can take many years to develop. There are many ways we can support this process of democratic consolidation, including working with parliaments, judiciaries, accountability institutions and civil society. Electoral assistance is one of the options available.

There has been a shift in international practice concerning electoral support. In the past, the common practice was to mobilise short-term assistance for the conduct of particular elections, with little continuity and few sustainable results. There is a wider recognition nowadays that, if we are serious about supporting democratic development, we need a long-term engagement throughout the development of the electoral system, grounded in careful analysis of the power dynamics and political constraints.

Starting in the early 1980s in Latin America and accelerating around the developing world after the end of the Cold War, a rapid spread of elections led people in many countries to hope that a decisive shift to democracy was underway. Today, however, there is widespread disillusionment with the results in many parts of the world. Many countries have adopted periodic elections without a strong democratic culture or a supportive institutional environment. The result has been a proliferation of hybrid political systems – somewhere election results are manipulated and serve merely to legitimize the regime; others where power is shuffled back and forth among entrenched political elites while doing little to advance democracy and development.

Where political power is located in informal institutions, elections are unlikely to produce fundamental shifts in power – although they can be characterized by bitter conflict for control of state resources. In conditions of poverty and inequality, especially where rent seeking and political patronage are entrenched, the electoral stakes can be extremely high. Election to public office offers livelihoods and privileges not just for the elected leaders, but also their clan, faction or ethnic group. This leads to a "winner-takes-all" form of political competition, in which losing carries unacceptable costs for both government and opposition, and the incentives to resort to electoral fraud and violence are high.

On the other hand, regular fair elections can be part of an incremental process of democratic consolidation, even where the broader institutional context is deficient. Even imperfect elections can in some circumstances have a positive impact by obliging political leaders to account for their performance in government, creating opportunities for new parties and leaders to emerge, and providing openings for greater civic engagement in governance and public life.

Building peaceful states and societies includes supporting the emergence of inclusive political settlements. It stresses the importance of allowing different groups in society to participate in the political process on equal terms, to prevent exclusion from becoming a source of conflict and fragility. Electoral assistance can provide one means of advancing this goal.

Elections in post-conflict settings can be an important milestone, helping forge a new political settlement and bringing former warring parties within the constitutional process.

The EU is one of the leading actors in terms of electoral assistance worldwide. Between 2006 and 2011, the EU has provided support to electoral processes in over 40 countries, with a total budget of around EUR 400 million.

**Definitions**

Electoral assistance may be defined as the technical or material support given to the electoral process. It may imply legal support to establish a legal framework for the elections. It may also take the form of a general input to the national electoral body, such as providing voting material and equipment, or helping in the registration of political parties and candidates and the registration of voters. It may also imply support to NGOs and civil society in areas such as voter and civic education or training of domestic observers, as well as support to media monitoring and training of journalists.

**Indicators and Methodology**

The *Study on Performance Indicators for Electoral Assistance* projects developed within the context of the EC-UNDP Partnership on Electoral Assistance (2012) identifies indicators of results/outcomes related to electoral assistance. Focusing on democracy support areas where activities are intended to make an impact, the study assesses the extent to which individual electoral assistance projects change behaviour.

The study also provides a tool for project designers, decision makers and implementers as well as project managers to select from an array of standard quality indicators and adapt them to specific electoral assistance programs. The study complements the *Guidelines for the Use of Indicators in Country Performance Assessment*, drafted by jointly by the EC, EU Member States, the World Bank, UNDP and the OECD-DAC in 2002.

The study identifies nine focus areas in electoral assistance:

- Electoral Management Bodies (EMBs) Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Development;
- General Electoral Operations;
- Civic and Voter Education;
- Voter Registration;
- Gender Equality;
- Electoral Justice;
- Prevention of Electoral Violence;
- Support to Media and Journalists;
- Support to Domestic Observation.

The study is divided into three parts. The first part explains the methodology and definitions of key concepts used in the study (e.g. indicator, performance indicator, context indicator, chain of results). The first part also describes the standard template of Logical Framework Matrix (LFMs) and Results and Resources Frameworks (RRFs). The second part provides a brief overview of common problems with indicators found through the analysis of over twenty multi-annual electoral assistance project implemented in various countries. Finally, the third part provides an analysis of the logic of intervention in ten different areas of electoral assistance. Tables are used to suggest result/outcome indicators, measurement methodologies and context indicators.

For each area, after an analysis of the underlying programmatic logic, the study presents a series of criteria which be used to identify the most logical outcome indicators. This information is then

---

presented in tables which help project designers identify the most appropriate indicators and adapt them to their context.

Electoral assistance objectives can be long-term in nature, and therefore difficult to measure within a project’s timeframe. In addition, the causal links between a project’s activities and its overall objective are often hard to capture.

The impact a voter education campaign on voter turnout is not as easy to assess. Voter turnout can be affected by external factors which are more immediate and critical than voter education activities. For example: weather conditions, the overall sense of security, people’s trust in the political parties, or the issues at stake.

Despite these difficulties, the identification of performance indicators has become a long-established component in project management.

How can the contribution of a project towards a democratic transition or a free and fair election be captured by an indicator?

Support to electoral processes falls into the domain of democratic development, for which the standard ‘control group’ technique for measuring impact is not feasible.

Frequently, more than one development partner (DP) is providing support to the electoral process and despite the coordination efforts among various DPs, often it is not possible to differentiate between the impacts of the different support projects.

As a result of these challenges the evaluation of electoral assistance projects is largely based on measuring basic project resources/inputs and activities/outputs.

**Common problems with electoral assistance indicators**

- **Getting the chain of results right:** It is widely recognized that determining what is achieved by electoral assistance alone is a difficult task. Electoral assistance contributes to the partner country effort, but its impact cannot be separated from “other national and international elements/factors affecting a country”. In addition, electoral assistance projects often build upon previous support programmes and are carried out for several years. As a result, performance measurement of electoral assistance has been based either on a measurement of basic project inputs and outputs or on far-reaching overall objectives. Many projects appear to miss out on measuring expected results/medium-term outcomes.
- **Activity-focused indicators:** The absence of medium-term outcomes weakens the project’s results chain and negatively affects the selection of indicators.
- **Non-indicators:** Very often, indicators at the level of expected results/outcome happen to be a simple summary of the project’s activities, rather than a way of measuring the consequence of such activities. In other cases, indicators of expected results/outcome were outright statements of activity, or, Outcome indicators often were repetitions of the results themselves.
- **Broken chains of result:** The analysis has also shown that indicators different in nature, and therefore inherently different in hierarchy in the chain of results, were sometimes used for the same objective.
- **Shopping lists of indicators:** Specificity is among the quality standards of an indicator. A specific indicator can be linked to a policy easily and unambiguously. In some projects all indicators were listed together without any distinction between the programme’s results they referred to. This way, it is neither possible to establish which specific result each indicator purports to measure, nor whether the indicator is adequate and relevant.
- **Inadequate indicators:** Once the relation between an indicator and the result it purports to measure is clearly established, the next step is to ensure that the indicator captures a real
policy-monitoring need. In principle, an indicator should assist decision-making, and not offer a policy option itself.

Another category of inadequate indicators are “process-oriented indicators”. Such indicators are underpinned by the misguided notion that the implementation of the activity implies the achievement of the expected result/outcome. This notion contradicts the definition of outcomes as “short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs”.

- **Absence of targets and baseline data**: The presence of measurable targets is the most important quality of an indicator, the absence of baseline data and targets remains a recurrent problem. It is worth noting that measurability is a requirement for quantifiable indicators and qualitative indicators alike.

- **Non-economic indicators**: The lack of accessible and reliable data is an obstacle for target-setting. However, at the same time, data cannot be obtained at any cost. Obtaining necessary data should in principle be independent of the project’s implementation, or come at the least possible cost for the project itself. Inevitably, some performance measurement will need to be carried out specifically for the project, especially for qualitative indicators that require survey or focus group methods. Typically, these involve a baseline stage – part of the project’s design/inception activities – and follow-up. A single survey or set of focus groups can address performance in a number of areas.

- **Logical framework templates**: Log frame and RRF templates that are used in projects influence the quality of indicators that are selected.

- **Absence of context indicators**: The presence of contextual indicators is the most important quality of an indicator; the literacy level is helpful, for example, when deciding between different means of communication.

Where possible, the indicators to be measured are ones that should be gathered prior to the project formulation and throughout the whole electoral cycle, which includes the pre-election period and the post-election period leading to the following pre-election period. An appropriate way to gather this type of information may be through a small scale “ad hoc” project in co-operation with national universities and local NGOs prior to implementation of the main electoral support project.

Some performance measurement will need to be carried out specifically for projects, especially for qualitative indicators that require survey or focus group methods. Typically, these involve a baseline stage and follow-up. The baseline stage would also be part of project design/inception activities. A single survey or set of focus groups can address performance in a number of areas.
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Annex 13: Reconstruction and rehabilitation

**Sector introduction**

Rehabilitation and reconstruction generally refer to the complex and multi-dimensional processes, which are undertaken after a natural disaster. Both processes require multi-sector involvement, significant resources and a wide range of tools and skills. Any restoration work in post-disaster situation needs to employ a broad inclusive approach with the affected communities.

Reconstruction has four pillars in general, which should be planned, monitored and evaluated: 1) human security, 2) economic activities, 3) governance / participation, and 4) social well-being and justice.

Rehabilitation and reconstruction is geared towards limiting the need for relief and allowing development activities to proceed. It is also a time when the affected community must decide how to increase disaster resilience in the future, indicating that reconstruction processes can include a high degree of community-led innovation and forward thinking.

**When and how?**

In developing countries, the reconstruction and rehabilitation have quite often been conceived as interim processes, which take place after the completion of humanitarian relief work and before the “normal development” work could begin.10

This view often resulted in gaps in funding, work in silos, duplicated efforts, top-down management, sudden funding terminations and unsustainable outcomes. The relief work was often seen as something, which was done to the local community not alongside them. Relief workers often had – due to the very requirement of their work to respond quickly – only limited knowledge about the customs of the land or the cultural characteristics, which might determine the community’s ability to survive and recover.

Because the communities do not function according to narrowly defined humanitarian sector, there was a need to link relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD). By linking the three, previously separated sectors, local communities can play a bigger role in designing, and monitoring the rehabilitation and reconstruction processes.

This joint approach means that different aid instruments will be used simultaneously and in a complementary way. For example, instead of providing food handouts, the donors could use cash transfers instead, or use food and cash as means for paying for the work done in disaster zone. The goal of the LRRD is to encourage communities to participate in the recovery processes and kick-start the economy while building on local capacities, reinforcing coping mechanisms and institutions. It is a basic philosophy of the reconstruction that every step must be taken to prevent the beneficiaries from becoming dependent on donor assistance. Self-sufficiency should be the goal.11 These connections between the RR and D should be planned, established, monitored and evaluated.12

**Post-disaster reconstruction indicators**

Since each case is unique, the intervention should commence with the post-disaster needs assessment in cooperation with the beneficiary. Data about reconstruction’s four pillars should be gathered:

---


11 ODI, 2006 Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD-DAC criteria, An ALNAP guide for humanitarian agencies: [www.alnap.org/material/78.aspx](http://www.alnap.org/material/78.aspx)

12 Ibid.
- Human security;
- Economic activities;
- Governance / participation;
- Social well-being and justice.

Depending on the beneficiary country, it is likely that the systems supporting human security, economic participation, and institutions for governance and social well-being were functioning already before disaster. It is important to use inclusive communication techniques towards the beneficiary to decide how it is better to restore what they perceive as normalcy. There is a need for creating a strong sense of buy-in by the beneficiary, to ensure the donor-led activities are owned and will be sustainable once the intervention has ended. The sense of ownership and interest levels can be analysed through the stakeholder analysis, which includes different data gathering methods.

The baseline study should provide rough estimates on scope and the timeliness of the work. For example, the implementers should gather the absolute numbers of those in need in a comprehensive manner from geographical, administrative, community and intra-household perspectives. Assuming that number might change during the course of intervention, it should be recorded at the beginning of intervention. All data about the beneficiaries' needs, the type and degree of damage done, etc. allows to draft a baseline study, which will be later compared to the progress made (for example, proportion of those in need assisted, expressed as a percentage).

After communicating donor constraints on budget, schedule and scope of intervention to the beneficiary, the desirable and realistically achievable outcomes should be agreed upon and expressed clearly. The specific outcomes around the four core pillars should be broken down to the actionable tasks. Pertinent targets should be developed in cooperation with the beneficiary community (and in harmony with other donors active in the region) and they should be defined in a way of ‘determining the point at which beneficiary institutions can assume effective control over the processes’\(^\text{13}\).

The ultimate goal (and a measure for success) of the reconstruction interventions should therefore be the restored capacity of beneficiary institutions to manage the consequences of disaster by themselves.

Some sources discussing post-conflict reconstruction claim that the main barrier to measuring progress in reconstruction is political, not conceptual\(^\text{14}\). In case the results reporting is overly politicized and the accountability is understood primarily as a means of reporting results to taxpayers in donor countries alone, the outcomes achieved might remain unsustainable.

Since it is in the interest of EU to enhance the relationships with the beneficiary, the entire intervention management and the consequent reporting of results would yield longer-term results if conducted from the beneficiary’s perspective. The intervention should not undermine the local governance bodies in their authority and legitimacy but strengthen their capacities instead. The goal is to avoid situations, where the beneficiary community loses trust in the local authorities and trusts the donor-led interventions the most.

One way of measuring political outcomes of the EU-led recovery projects is to attempt to assess the quality of relations established, and the values transferred. The donation of goods, equipment and vehicles is not as effective (or efficient) in achieving longer-term outcomes and political goals as spending more on joint exercises, exchanges and training sessions. Relatively less money should be spent on “hardware” and more attention paid to modes of thinking, creating relationships and transferring ways of doing governance. This way EU will have a


\(^\text{14}\) Ibid.
clearest chance in transferring the values of transparency, accountability (and civilian control, in some cases).

**Definitions**

There are no universally accepted definitions for reconstruction and rehabilitation. In general, *reconstruction* refers to measures that help to restore the livelihoods, assets and production levels in the post-conflict or disaster-affected communities. *Rehabilitation* is often used in the context of critical infrastructure (production tools) but also in the framework of reintegrating people (for example, former combatants to civilian life).

Although the terms are used interchangeably for both conflict and natural disaster, the recovery needs in two situations are very different.

The most important difference is that countries coming out of armed conflict are usually ‘weak’ or ‘fragile’, requiring extensive institution building\(^\text{15}\) as well as stabilization processes\(^\text{16}\) to address the causes of violence. The need to address the causes of the conflict makes the reconstruction processes remarkably more complex (than in disaster-affected situations), as they often aim influence the very same issues, which might have led to the conflict (such as the equal access to political and economic power). The ‘stability’ in the context of post-conflict situations might mean prolonged absence of conflict, sometimes called negative peace\(^\text{17}\). To achieve positive peace requires that state institutions are capable of absorbing the conflict.

Implementing IcSP actions under the sector of rehabilitation and reconstruction means operating in parallel to humanitarian assistance and with a view to ensuring the linkages to development (linking relief, rehabilitation and development or LRRD). In this context, the crosscutting themes of gender equality, conflict sensitivity and human rights become extremely important – the goal is to ensure that reconstruction work does not lead to societ al cleavages or cause harm.

**Indicators and Methodology**

The first and perhaps the most important data source is the intervention itself. The needs assessment data needs to be gathered during the planning phase of the intervention. The planning phase also includes information about the beneficiary stakeholders, preparing respective communication strategies, and defining intervention scope (only until the local institutions are sufficiently strong to take over the activities), funds, timelines and risks. Second source of data is gathered about damage done and state of the four pillars of reconstruction interventions.

It is likely that the urgency and stress in responding to day-to-day challenges will attempt to stunt the data gathering and monitoring activities. Danger is also in gathering metrics about what are easiest to count rather than from what really matters. A non-exhaustive set of indicators to monitor the post-disaster reconstruction work can include the following:

**Scope of work:**

- Absolute numbers of people in need in a given region;
- Share of people in need of assistance (broken down to age, gender, minority status, etc.);
- Magnitude of damage.

1. **Governance and participation:**

\(^\text{15}\) Both of the terms – reconstruction and rehabilitation - are often used in the context of stabilization, reconciliation, nation building, and peace building, depending on the concrete case.


\(^\text{17}\) The Center for Strategic and International Studies’ Post-Conflict, Program on Crisis, Conflict and Cooperation, 2015, The Uncertain Transition from Stability to Peace: [http://csis.org/files/publication/150211_Lamb_UncertainTransition_Web.pdf](http://csis.org/files/publication/150211_Lamb_UncertainTransition_Web.pdf)
1. Outcome Indicators for the lCSP - Annexes

- Status of the communities (state of leadership, level of authority and legitimacy of leaders);
- State of readiness of local governance bodies.

2. Security:
- Level of function of emergency services and security forces (army, if needed).

3. Economic:
- Level of function of critical infrastructure: water treatment facilities, hospitals, schools, local government offices;
- Transportation: conditions of roads, railroads, airports;
- Communication: status of phone lines, post offices;
- Industry (energy, food, etc.).

4. Social well-being and justice:
- Level of function law enforcement forces;
- Level of crime / looting.

The indicators to be assessed and their status could be tracked in a matrix, similar to Table 1. All qualitative indicators can be assessed through a point system, either as ‘poor’ (1), ‘satisfactory’ (2) or ‘good’ (3). Assigning numerical values to qualitative assessments allows aggregating the data and monitor improvements over time.

Table 1. Matrix for tracking transitional outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Social welfare and justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision for the reconstruction</td>
<td>Local bodies manage the aftermath of disaster in a satisfactory way</td>
<td>No added grievances. Looting and crime minimized</td>
<td>Economic means restored, critical infrastructure rebuilt.</td>
<td>Vulnerable groups (women, children, etc.) are not marginalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline situation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no clear-cut formulas how to successfully manage and measure progress in complex situations, including in the reconstruction projects. Some experts have highlighted the following facts about complexity:

- Every situation is unique;
- Universal application of tools is unlikely to yield success;
- Succeeding in one project gives no guarantee of success with the next assignment;
- Expertise can help but is not sufficient;
- Relationships are key.

Some sources have attempted to provide a validated tool that communities could use to measure their resilience in preparing for an event.

---

18 Modified from The World Bank’s Operational Note on Transitional Results Matrices: [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCDRC/Resources/Fragile_States_Transition_Note.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCDRC/Resources/Fragile_States_Transition_Note.pdf)
1. **Coherence**: How connected are the members of the community?
2. **Risk levels**: What is the level of risk and vulnerability in the community?
3. **Procedures**: What procedures support community disaster planning, response and recovery?
4. **Resources**: What emergency planning, response and recovery resources are available in your community?

These four higher-level questions led to the provision of more numerous score-card questions, which can be answered through a self-assessment on a three- or five-point-scale. The implementers of EU-led reconstruction projects will likely be constrained by time limits to conduct the assessment (participatory or not) for the project planning purposes. Nevertheless, the questions will be useful for the community itself, for the raised self-awareness and then, ultimately, preparedness.

**Score-card assessment questions for future planning**

**Coherence**

1.1 What proportion of the population is engaged with organisations (e.g., clubs, service groups, sports teams, churches, libraries)?
1.2 Do members of the community have access to a range of communication systems that allow information to flow during an emergency?
1.3 What is the level of communication between local governing body and population?
1.4 What is the relationship of your community with the larger region?
1.5 What is the degree of connectedness across community groups? (e.g. ethnicities/subcultures/age groups/new residents not in your community when last disaster happened)

**Risk levels**

2.1 What are the known risks of all identified hazards in your community?
2.2 What are the trends in relative size of the permanent resident population and the daily population?
2.3 What is the rate of the resident population change in the last 5 years?
2.4 What proportion of the population has the capacity to independently move to safety? (e.g., non-institutionalised, mobile with own vehicle, adult)
2.5 What proportion of the resident population prefers communication in a language other than state language?
2.6 Has the transient population (e.g., tourists, transient workers) been included in planning for response and recovery?
2.7 What is the risk that your community could be isolated during an emergency event?

**Procedures**

3.1 To what extent and level are households within the community engaged in planning for disaster response and recovery?
3.2 Are there planned activities to reach the entire community about all-hazards resilience?
3.3 Does the community actually meet requirements for disaster readiness?
3.4 Do post-disaster event assessments change expectations or plans?

**Resources**

4.1 How comprehensive is the local infrastructure emergency protection plan? (e.g., water supply, sewerage, power system)

---

4.2 What proportion of population with skills useful in emergency response/recovery (e.g., first aid, safe food handling) can be mobilised if needed?
4.3 To what extent are all educational institutions (public/private schools, all levels including early child care) engaged in emergency preparedness education?
4.4 How are available medical and public health services included in emergency planning?
4.5 Are readily accessible locations available as evacuation or recovery centres (e.g., school halls, community or shopping centres, post office) and included in resilience strategy?
4.6 What is the level of food/water/fuel readily availability in the community?
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Annex 14: Economic recovery / livelihood

Sector description

Economic recovery activities differ depending on whether the goal is to assist a country after a natural disaster or an armed conflict.20

Post-conflict recovery

For example, post-conflict economic recovery should start right after the conflict, at first run in parallel with the relief activities, and last until relative recovery is achieved or until the beneficiary institutions are strong enough to coordinate the economic development activities. In this case, economic recovery interventions are conducted in parallel with peacebuilding, disarmament demobilization, reconciliation, and institution-building activities. Final outcome of economic recovery cannot realistically be returning to pre-conflict levels, and in some cases it would not even be possible or desirable.

While the economic recovery activities should be carried from the philosophy of enabling local resourcefulness, in fragile settings it has been advised: “do not expect too much, too soon.”21

Economic recovery interventions must record a baseline situation with employment (quality and quantity of jobs available), investment levels, risks and group inequalities.22

The World Bank cautions the donors to be patient, because “historically, the fastest transformations have taken a generation” (ibid.). The relative slowness of recovery work in conflict-affected situations is related to the time required to transform institutions. It is the quality of state institutions that is considered to be the main source of peace and well-being.23

Therefore, the impact indicators to gather, monitor and evaluate in the conflict-affected situations are mainly related to country’s institutions: the rule of law, corruption, human rights, democratic governance, bureaucratic quality, oversight of the security sectors, and equity for the disadvantaged. As the economic and political institutions are often jointly responsible for country’s long-term prosperity, the goal of the interventions should be to increase their inclusiveness.24

Restoring post-disaster livelihoods and assisting with economic recovery

24 Quite interestingly, however, it was discovered that infant mortality is the single most powerful indicator to estimate the overall progress of a nation because it depends on and incorporates so many aspects of society: health services, education, human rights, security and environment. Most importantly, infant mortality indicator allows to forecast levels of risk of political crisis, including civil wars and coups, for the same reasons. Source: A Global Model for Forecasting Political Instability, by Jack A. Goldstone et al.
However, there is more urgency in restoring livelihoods after conflict or a disaster. For example, in the fragile peace settings, raising employment levels as fast as possible, especially among the youth, becomes a crucial element in conflict re-escalation and prevention.

It is important to be aware that the surveys conducted among people affected by a disaster indicated that even though the relief is undeniably a requirement for meeting basic needs of affected populations, the beneficiaries overwhelmingly prefer restoring their former livelihoods over receiving temporary relief.

In disaster affected situations, economic recovery is mainly a process with the goal to build confidence, kick-start and catalyze the revitalization of local economies without the ambition of producing major changes at the macro level. The intervention types differ depending on the geographic location: the activities in rural areas focus on restoring land tenures, deal with landlessness and gender-based differences. In urban areas, interventions focus on unemployment, access to capitals and alleviating lack of infrastructure.

World Development report on jobs states that the conventional wisdom is that a lack of jobs is detrimental to social cohesion. Yet governments and donors can also ensure that employment policies and programs positively influence social cohesion, shape social identity, build networks, particularly for excluded groups, and increase fairness. Those considerations of simply having an employment can help reduce tensions and support peaceful collective decision-making.

Donors should therefore support beneficiary government in measures that support inclusion, extend access to voice and rights, and improve transparency and accountability in the labour market can increase the extent to which people perceive that they have a stake in society. This perception can be especially critical when risks of social unrest from youth unemployment and conflict are high.

Employment programs can undermine social cohesion if they have weak governance or divisive targeting, but can have positive effects when they are well-designed. Jobs policies for youth at risk can incorporate counselling and training in conflict resolution. Public works programs can facilitate community participation and engagement between citizens and local authorities. Policies can thus focus not only on the number of jobs, but on expanding job opportunities for excluded groups.

Different short-term, emergency employment schemes can be used for restoring livelihoods:

1. Public investments in construction and through labour intensive methods,
2. Cash grants or in-kind schemes
3. More accessible microfinance schemes
4. On the job training and technical assistance
5. Business development services for creating supply chains (by Western companies and organisations)
6. Emergency employment services
7. Ad hoc vocational skills training programmes in strategic professional areas
8. Training of trainers

Respective project-level data needs to be gathered. For example, the baseline study needs to include data about the total number of people affected by the disaster, share of people without the economic means, etc. Later the baselines are compared with data gathered during monitoring and evaluation phases to assess the progress.

Since the expected impact of economic recovery is the relative strength of beneficiary economic institutions, respective data should also be gathered locally, similar to governance indicators below.

---

Planning security sensitive interventions in the field of livelihoods and economic recovery should include a thorough stakeholder analysis. As the recovery will ultimately influence or change the balance of access to economic opportunities, donor-led recovery interventions can be perceived as threatening to vested interests, sometimes very powerful ones. Draw a baseline study about the local procurement opportunities and local economic profiling, attempting to assess how large are the socio-economic disparities and do they run according to minority / ethnic / gender etc. lines? How tightly is economic power connected to political powers?

Record the baseline and measure progress over time: Assess qualitatively the situation of human rights, democratic governance, bureaucratic quality, oversight of the security sectors, and equity for the disadvantaged.

**Definitions**

**Economic recovery**, one pillar of the reconstruction processes, relates to restoring livelihoods, rebuilding or creating economic assets and necessary production levels. It often means jobs. The payoffs from jobs include stabilizing post-conflict societies in addition to acquiring skills, and empowering women. In fact, The World Development Report from 2013 claims that development happens through jobs.

The International Labor Organization ILO defines *livelihood* as a ‘set of capabilities, material and social resources, and activities required for a means of living’.

In this manual, economic recovery and livelihoods are viewed under the overarching LRRD macro-sector, which links relief work to (economic) rehabilitation and development.

In the long run, economic recovery should develop into *economic development*, which is understood as the sustained, concerted actions of policy makers and communities that promote the standard of living and economic health of a specific area.

Therefore, the outcome of economic recovery and interventions can be measured through a beneficiary readiness to continue with the economic development.

**Indicators and Methodology**

**Economic activity** can be measured with the following indicators:

1. **Unemployment rate**: Unemployment data should be available at World Bank Data centre: [http://data.worldbank.org/indicator](http://data.worldbank.org/indicator) including data about long-term unemployment for both, men and women. High unemployment rates are not the main challenge, as the characteristics of jobs also matter.

2. **Income levels**: The World Bank provides data about the incomes earned by quintiles, for example an indicator for incomes earned by the lowest 20% people from entire society. ‘Urban poverty levels’ provided by World Bank can also be assessed for estimating the scope of economic recovery work needs to be done.

3. **Share of informal labour market**: Despite expectations, the informal sector remains a major if not the major source of employment in many countries. The examples include small enterprises, casual employment, unpaid work in a family enterprise, home-based work, street vending. Often it is the only available option for poor – thus important for their survival.

---

26 See the chapter of Reconstruction and Rehabilitation, for other pillars.
28 A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with, and recover from, stress and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base. Source: [http://www.unisdr.org/files/16771_16771guidancenoteonrecoveryliveliho.pdf](http://www.unisdr.org/files/16771_16771guidancenoteonrecoveryliveliho.pdf)
4. **Share of illegal market** (human smuggling, illegal drugs, etc.): Both, informal and illegal labour market can be measured through the following indicators:

   (a) The **total number of persons** in informal employment, classified by socio-demographic and other characteristics (sex, age group, level of educational attainment, etc.) and by the characteristics of their employment and working conditions (kind of economic activity, occupation, status in employment, size of the unit, type of workplace, hours of work, duration of employment, type of contract, income related to employment);

   (b) The **total number of informal sector units**, classified by various structural characteristics so as to provide information on the composition of the informal sector and to identify particular segments;

   (c) **Incomes generated through informal sector activities**, derived where possible from data on output, inputs and related transactions; and

   (d) The **total number of informal jobs** held by persons during the reference period, classified by various job characteristics (main or secondary job, kind of economic activity, occupation, status in employment, institutional sector).

The main data sources are household surveys with a labour force component, censuses, and mixed surveys. Household surveys are the only source that can produce statistics on all forms of informal employment, including domestic workers and producers of goods exclusively for own final use or volunteer workers.

The World Bank Data section (http://data.worldbank.org/indicator) also includes indicators for ‘Coverage (%) All Social Protection and Labour’ and ‘Adequacy of social protection and labour programs (% of total welfare of beneficiary households)’, and ‘Vulnerable employment, total (% of total employment), which can be used to measure informal labour market. Relevant questions to be asked include questions on official company registration, bookkeeping practices and size of the enterprise, on social security coverage of workers and on their entitlement to holidays.

5. **Quality and quantity of jobs**: Jobs are the most important determinant of living standards around the world, however there are very few solid measurements for jobs’ quality. Gather qualitative data from beneficiaries, based on their estimates and observations and note whether ‘share of jobs that are of good quality’.

6. **Share of taxpayers**: The World Bank is gathering data for Tax revenue (% of GDP), which provides similar information about the role between the citizens and the government. The win-win relationship is reciprocated: citizens who pay taxes can more realistically be interested in holding government accountable, and the government, in turn, can provide more social services and government programming if the tax base is stronger.

7. **Match between the skills and needs of the economy**: Again, another hard-to-measure indicator about economic situation is about mismatch between available skills and the demands of the economy. The skills mismatches are arguably growing rather than shrinking. The World Bank report on jobs estimates that up to one-third of the employed people in countries as diverse as Brazil, Costa Rica, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Tanzania are either under- or over-qualified for the work they do. Again, the institutions are the key: labour shortages.

---


and mismatches often result from wrong signals generated by market distortions and institutional failures elsewhere in the economy.

8. **Gather qualitative data about countries’ connection to global markets.** Jobs, especially urban jobs, connected to global markets bring home new technological and managerial knowledge. This is especially important in resource rich countries, which need to diversify their economies through global trade rather than through government subsidies.

**Level of governance as an outcome indicator:**

**Corruption Perception Index:** Corruption Perception Index is created by the Transparency International in 1995 with the goal to bring corruption issues to the international policy agenda. Each year, the countries are scored on how corrupt their public sectors are seen to be. The officers using this index should be careful as it measures perception on corruption, and not necessarily the corruption itself, which is a complex phenomenon to measure precisely. Data can be found here: [https://www.transparency.org/research/cpi/](https://www.transparency.org/research/cpi/)

**WBI Worldwide Governance Indicators:** The World Bank Institute composes the Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) which reports aggregate and individual governance indicators for 215 economies over the period 1996–2013, for six dimensions of governance: Voice and Accountability, Political Stability and Absence of Violence, Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law, Control of Corruption. The data can be found here: [http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#reports](http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#reports)

**Doing Business:** Doing Business is composed by the World Bank Group, aiming to measure and compare the degree of ease in doing business by ranking countries. Although some of their sub-indicators might seem not relevant for the measuring the IcSP interventions’ outcomes, the sub-indicators offer plenty of data about government’s ability to impose authority and legitimacy on its citizens in sub-categories. Country ranks can be found here: [http://www.doingbusiness.org/rankings](http://www.doingbusiness.org/rankings)

**International Budget Project:** International Budget Project conducts surveys on over a 100 countries with the aim to measure the openness of governments regarding the countries’ budgets. Data for the International Budget Project is available here: [http://www.obstracker.org/](http://www.obstracker.org/) and the respective index can be found here: [http://survey.internationalbudget.org/#timeline](http://survey.internationalbudget.org/#timeline)

**Freedom in the World:** Freedom in the World is Freedom House’s comparative assessment of global political rights and civil liberties. Published annually since 1972, the survey monitors trends in democracy and track improvements and setbacks in freedom worldwide. The Freedom in the World data and reports are available in their entirety on the Freedom House website: [https://freedomhouse.org/report-types/freedom-world#.VcgpKypVhHw](https://freedomhouse.org/report-types/freedom-world#.VcgpKypVhHw)

**Worldwide Press Freedoms Index:** Press Freedoms Index is composed by the Reporters Without Borders, by ranking the performance of 180 countries according to a range of criteria that include media pluralism and independence, respect for the safety and freedom of journalists, and the legislative, institutional and infrastructural environment in which the media operates. Ranks and data can be found here: [http://index.rsf.org/#](http://index.rsf.org/#)

**Social Progress Index (Opportunities):** The Social Progress Imperative organization has started to measure comparatively countries progress in providing social wellbeing to its citizens in 2014. The organization aims to push GDP as the main basic for cross country comparisons. The

---

31 Updated and modified from the World Bank Indicators of Governance and Institutional Quality: [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTLAWJUSTINST/Resources/IndicatorsGovernanceandInstitutionalQuality.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTLAWJUSTINST/Resources/IndicatorsGovernanceandInstitutionalQuality.pdf) Almost all the data sources admit that governance is a complicated phenomenon to assess and measure. The country level measurements in the form of numerical scores should be always complemented with the qualitative assessments and project specific data, depending on the outputs and expected outcomes.
aggregate SP Index consists of three sub-components, of which the Opportunities component would be suitable for measuring governance levels: Personal rights, Personal freedom and choice, tolerance and inclusion and access to advanced education. Interactive data can be found here: [http://www.socialprogressimperative.org/data/spi#data_table/countries/dim3/dim3](http://www.socialprogressimperative.org/data/spi#data_table/countries/dim3/dim3)

**Ibrahim Index on African Governance**: Initiated by the Mo Ibrahim Foundation, the IIAG is an annual statistical assessment of African governance. The index combines over 100 variables from 30 different independent sources and can be considered a most comprehensive measurement of governance in Africa. The components include: safety and rule of law, participation and human rights, sustainable economic opportunity, and human development. The data can be found here: [http://www.moibrahimfoundation.org/iiag/data-portal/](http://www.moibrahimfoundation.org/iiag/data-portal/)
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Annex 15: Natural disaster preparedness and response

Sector introduction

With increasing global population, mega-cities, pollution, climate change and poverty, more and more people have to face the impacts of disasters.

Disaster preparedness is highly beneficial for communities located in disaster-prone areas. Preparedness to hazards, such as extreme weather, volcanic activity and flooding, can help reduce the impact of such catastrophes on lives, livelihoods and communities. Better know-how, practice and response mechanisms, such as early warning systems and other disaster preparedness activities can save lives and speed up the recovery of communities.

In addition, disaster risk reduction (DRR) programmes are cost-effective and save aid money. On average, every euro spent for reduction and preparedness activities saves between four and seven euros which would be spent to respond in the aftermath of disasters32.


It is important to mention that following the Hyogo Framework for Action, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 was adopted by the Third United Nations World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, held in Sendai, Japan, from 14 to 18 March 2015. The Sendai Framework is the successor instrument to the HFA. It is built on elements which ensure continuity with the work done by States and other stakeholders under the HFA and introduces a number of innovations as called for during the consultations and negotiations.

The Sendai Framework articulates the need for improved understanding of disaster risk in all its dimensions of exposure, vulnerability and hazard characteristics; the strengthening of disaster risk governance, including national platforms; accountability for disaster risk management; preparedness to "Build Back Better"; recognition of stakeholders and their roles; mobilization of risk-sensitive investment to avoid the creation of new risk; resilience of health infrastructure, cultural heritage and work-places; strengthening of international cooperation and global partnership, and risk-informed donor policies and programs, including financial support and loans from international financial institutions. There is also clear recognition of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction and the regional platforms for disaster risk reduction as mechanisms for coherence across agendas, monitoring and periodic reviews in support of UN Governance bodies.

Grounds for EU action on DRR

Both the 2005 European Consensus on Development and the 2007 European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid commit the EU to supporting DRR policy and action. The 2008 Council conclusions on reinforcing the Union's disaster response capacity invited the Commission to present a proposal for an EU strategy for DRR in developing countries. The European Parliament has also repeatedly argued for a more robust DRR policy and increased financial means34.

33 [http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/2909](http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/2909)
Mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into EU Policy, funds and ongoing Civil Protection Legislation development

The Commission has developed a comprehensive and integrated approach on disaster risk reduction, both within the EU and in third countries. On 23 February 2009 the Commission adopted the Communication "EU Strategy for Supporting Disaster Risk Reduction in Developing Countries", in a package with the Communication on a "Community approach on the prevention of natural and man-made disasters" addressing disaster risk reduction within the EU. Subsequently, on 18 May 2009, the General Affairs and External Relations Council endorsed the EU DRR Strategy. The EU DRR Strategy is fully in line with the Hyogo Framework for Action.

Descriptions

Natural Disaster preparedness and response is a concept that has been evolving. A shift has been observed in the use of the concepts of Natural Disaster Risk Reduction and Management as opposed to Natural Disaster Preparedness and Management.

The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), through the Sendai Framework (2015-2030) identified one single outcome for Disaster Risk Reduction: The substantial reduction of disaster risk and losses in lives, livelihoods and health and in the economic, physical, social, cultural and environmental assets of persons, businesses, communities and countries. (Sendai Framework (2015-2030), page 9).

The UNISDR Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction defines Disaster Risk Reduction as follows: The concept and practice of reducing disaster risks through systematic efforts to analyze and manage the causal factors of disasters, including through reduced exposure to hazards, lessened vulnerability of people and property, wise management of land and the environment, and improved preparedness for adverse events.

A comprehensive approach to reduce disaster risks is set out in the United Nations-endorsed Hyogo Framework for Action, adopted in 2005, whose expected outcome is “The substantial reduction of disaster losses, in lives and the social, economic and environmental assets of communities and countries.” The International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR) system provides a vehicle for cooperation among Governments, organizations and civil society actors to assist in the implementation of the Framework. Note that while the term “disaster reduction” is sometimes used, the term “disaster risk reduction” provides a better recognition of the ongoing nature of disaster risks and the ongoing potential to reduce these risks.

It also defines Disaster Risk Management as follows: The systematic process of using administrative directives, organizations, and operational skills and capacities to implement strategies, policies and improved coping capacities in order to lessen the adverse impacts of hazards and the possibility of disaster. This term is an extension of the more general term “risk management” to address the specific issue of disaster risks. Disaster risk management aims to avoid, lessen or transfer the adverse effects of hazards through activities and measures for prevention, mitigation and preparedness.

Indicators and Methodology

UNISDR 22 Core Indicators. UNISDR reviewed the experience of three biennial cycles of monitoring the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) against a set of 22 core indicators (http://www.unisdr.org/files/35716_newsystemofprogressindicatorsfordrr.pdf) across its five priority areas in 2009, 2011 and 2013. Recognizing some weaknesses, it proposed a new system of indicators for disaster risk management. The proposed indicator system is therefore comprised of families of indicators to provide insight into progress in each of these domains.

36 http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/terminology
37 http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/terminology
The **system of indicators** proposed by UNISDR is comprised of:

- Disaster loss and damage Indicators;
- Risk and Resilience Indicators;
- Underlying Risk Drivers Indicators;
- Disaster risk management policy indicators.

**HFA Monitor.** The Hyogo list of indicators called **HFA Monitor** is an online tool that aims to capture the information on progress in HFA, generated through the multi stakeholder review process. The primary purpose of the tool is to assist the countries to monitor and review their progress and challenges in the implementation of disaster risk reduction and recovery actions undertaken at the national level, in accordance with the Hyogo Framework’s priorities.

Sections 3 – 7 present the HFA's five Priorities for Action and provide a set of 22 indicators that help assess the extent of progress made with regard to implementation of key activities as outlined in these Priorities for Action. The indicators take various forms, measuring, for example, outputs and processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities for Action</th>
<th>Number of indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority for Action 1 - Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority for Action 2 - Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority for Action 3 - Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority for Action 4 - Reduce the underlying risk factors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority for Action 5 - Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each section of the HFA includes a suggested outcome and a set of indicators to help measure levels of preparedness and progress.

**Open-ended intergovernmental expert working group:** As indicated in paragraph 50 of the Sendai Framework for Disaster risk reduction, the WCDRR conference recommended that the UN General Assembly establish an open-ended intergovernmental expert working group, comprised of experts nominated by States, and supported by the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), with involvement of relevant stakeholders, for the development of a set of possible indicators and terminology to measure global progress in the implementation of Sendai Framework in coherence with the work of the inter-agency and expert group on sustainable development indicators. This proposal was adopted as agenda item 19c at the Sixty-ninth session of the UN General Assembly on June, 2015 under the heading Sustainable development: International Strategy for Disaster Reduction.

**Methodology**

Disaster risk management requires risk “dimensioning”, and risk measuring signifies to take into account not only the expected physical damage, victims and economic equivalent loss, but also social, organizational and institutional factors. Four components or composite indicators\(^{38}\) have been designed to represent the main elements of vulnerability and show each country’s progress in managing risk.\(^{39}\)

---


\(^{39}\) The Cardona (2005) paper provides a full description of how these indexes are calculated.
**The Disaster Deficit Index (DDI).** The DDI Index measures country risk from a macroeconomic and financial perspective according to possible catastrophic events. It requires the estimation of critical impacts during a given period of exposure, as well as the country’s financial ability to cope with the situation. This index measures the economic loss that a particular country could suffer when a catastrophic event takes place, and the implications in terms of resources needed to address the situation. Construction of the DDI Scientific evidence, as well as measuring the value of infrastructure and other goods and services that are likely to be affected. The DDI captures the relationship between the demand for contingent resources to cover the losses, caused by the Maximum Considered Event (MCE), and the public sector’s economic resilience, (that is, the availability of internal and external funds for restoring affected inventories).

**The Local Disaster Index (LDI).** The LDI identifies the social and environmental risks resulting from more recurrent lower level events (which are often chronic at the local and sub national levels). These events have a disproportionate impact on more socially and economically vulnerable populations, and have highly damaging impacts on national development. This index represents the propensity of a country to experience small-scale disasters and their cumulative impact on local development. The index attempts to represent the spatial variability and dispersion of risk in a country resulting from small and recurrent events. This approach is concerned with the national significance of recurrent small scale events that rarely enter international, or even national, disaster databases, but which pose a serious and cumulative development problem for local areas and, more than likely, also for the country as a whole. These events may be the result of socio-natural processes associated with environmental deterioration and are persistent or chronic in nature. They include landslides, avalanches, flooding, forest fires, and droughts as well as small earthquakes, hurricanes and volcanic eruptions. The LDI is equal to the sum of three local disaster subindices that are calculated based on data from the DesInventar database (made by the Network of Social Studies in Disaster Prevention of Latin America, La RED in Spanish) for number of deaths, number of people affected, and losses in each municipality, taking into account four wide groups of events: landslides and debris flows, seism-tectonic, floods and storms, and other events.

**The Prevalent Vulnerability Index (PVI).** The PVI depicts predominant vulnerability conditions by measuring exposure in prone areas, socioeconomic fragility and lack of social resilience. These items provide a measure of direct as well as indirect and intangible impacts of hazard events. The index is a composite indicator that provides a comparative measure of a country’s pattern or situation. Inherent vulnerability conditions underscore the relationship between risk and development. Vulnerability, and therefore risk, are the result of inadequate economic growth, on the one hand, and deficiencies that may be corrected by means of adequate development processes. Although the indicators proposed are recognized as useful for measuring development their use here is intended to capture favorable conditions for direct physical impacts (exposure and susceptibility), as well as indirect and, at times, intangible impacts (socio-economic fragility, and lack of resilience) of potential physical events.

The best indicators of exposure and/or physical susceptibility (PVIES) are the susceptible population, assets, investment, production, livelihoods, historic monuments, and human activities. Other indicators include population growth and density rates, as well as agricultural and urban growth rates.

**The Risk Management Index (RMI):** The RMI brings together a group of indicators that measure a country’s risk management performance. These indicators reflect the organizational, development, capacity and institutional actions taken to reduce vulnerability and losses, to prepare for crises and to recover efficiently from disasters. This index was designed to assess risk management performance. It provides a qualitative measure of management based on predefined targets or benchmarks that risk management efforts should aim to achieve. The design of the RMI involved establishing a scale of achievement levels or determining the “distance” between current conditions and an objective threshold or conditions in a reference country. The RMI was constructed by quantifying four public policies, each of which has six indicators. The policies
include the identification of risk, risk reduction, disaster management, and governance and financial protection. Risk identification is a measure of individual perceptions, how those perceptions are understood by society as a whole, and the objective assessment of risk. Risk reduction involves prevention and mitigation measures. Disaster management involves measures of response and recovery. And, finally, governance and financial protection measures the degree of institutionalization and risk transfer.
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Annex 16: Assistance to migrants and host populations

Sector introduction

The Geneva Convention (1951) and Protocol (1967) provide the cornerstone of the international legal regime for the protection of refugees. Protection can be provided by the State, parties or organizations, including international organizations. All refugees in the world are under UNHCR mandate except Palestinian refugees, who are assisted by the United Nations Works Agency (UNRWA). UNHCR provides protection not only to refugees, but also to other categories of displaced or needy people, including asylum seekers, refugees who have returned home, stateless people, people resettled to third countries, as well as local communities and governments affected by the movement of refugees, and finally internally displaced persons (IDPs). This last category of concern involves civilians who have been forced to flee their homes, but who have not reached a neighbouring country and not per se protected by international law. Also, “Internal Displacement” means the involuntary or forced movement, evacuation or relocation of persons or groups of persons within internationally recognized state borders. The African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa is the unique convention that addresses internal displacement caused by armed conflict or natural disasters (including "climate change"). It was adopted in 2009 and entered into force in 2012 and recognizes state responsibilities for the protection and assistance of IDPs.

Since the mid-1990s, humanitarian agencies have tried to improve outcomes of programmatic activities through monitoring and enhancing institutional accountability. Throughout the years, UNHCR has developed a range of tools to enhance its programming and accountability, particularly in mainstreaming Standards and Indicators through the adoption of Results-Based Management within the organization. Part of its efforts led the international organization producing the "Practical Guide to the Systematic use of Standards and Indicators in UNHCR Operations". Standards and Indicators for UNHCR operations are valid for refugees as well as for internally displaced persons.

Definitions

Refugee – Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, 1951, Art. 1 – "As a result of events occurring before 1 January 1951 and owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it".

Refugee – Convention Governing the Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa, OAU, 1969 – In addition to Art. 1 of the UN 1951 Convention, "The term "refugee" shall also apply to every person who, owing to external aggression, occupation, foreign domination or events seriously disturbing public order in either part or the whole of his country of origin or nationality, is compelled to leave his place of habitual residence in order to seek refuge in another place outside his country of origin or nationality".

Internally Displaced Person – African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa (Kampala Convention, 2009) – “Internally Displaced Persons” means persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border".
**Indicators and Methodology**

The “Practical Guide to the Systematic Use of Standards and Indicators” identifies 160 indicators related to refugees programming, monitoring and evaluation, divided in four thematic categories: Country Level, Urban Areas, Refugees Camps, Returnee Areas. It can be found at [http://www.unhcr.org/40eaa9804.html](http://www.unhcr.org/40eaa9804.html).

Although the set of standards and indicators will never be exhaustive, it will nevertheless provide data for an increased number of situations. The organization also recommends that quantitative indicators "will need to be complemented with additional information from qualitative indicators, project-level indicators, detailed sectoral data, and various narrative reports”.

In order to select, define and sharing 160 standards and indicators, UNHCR has engaged in a wide consultative international process which give all its legitimacy to the “Practical Guide”. Indicators have developed using different criteria according to the following definitions: Relevance, Measurability; Clarity, Practicality and Reliability. The “Practical Guide to the Systematic Use of Standards and Indicators” is structured in three components: the first part, "Conceptual Background" underlines fundamental principles at the heart of UNHCR mandate and refugees related activities. It recalls the basic principles of international refugee law, will highlight related relevant external initiatives (like the Sphere Project or the Millennium Development Goals, MDGs), explain how the indicators will contribute to move towards a Rights-Based Approach (RBA) and the importance of participatory assessment and planning in order to promote meaningful participation through structured dialogue. Participatory of beneficiary-based evaluations provide an important means of developing a better understanding of how refugees and other people of concern perceive refugees programming.

The core of the “Practical Guide” is composed of 160 standards and indicators which provide a systematic approach to the use of standards and indicators in reinforcing a Results-Based approach to the improvement of the welfare and protection of refugees and other persons of concern of UNHCR. **Standards** refer to an ultimate aim, which for UNHCR normally has direct reference to its protection mandate, international law, human rights, or technical standards related to a specific sector of intervention. The setting of standards is aimed at the creation of acceptable conditions for persons of concern and/or acceptable levels of institution performance.

**Indicators** lead to the identification of gaps between the prevailing protection and welfare situation and acceptable norms and conditions (standards). Gaps may differ in magnitude and impact for particular sub-groups in a refugee community (for ex. the elderly, women and children, persons with disabilities or single-parent households).

Two definitions summarize the vision of UNHCR to differentiate Standards and Indicators:

- **Standard**: A specific fixed point or range on the variable scale (indicator) that has to be reached or maintained to avoid occurrence of unacceptable conditions for refugees and persons of concern of unacceptable levels of performance. The standard definition process is based on data relevance, impact on the lives of persons of concern, negotiation and agreement between different stakeholders.

- **Indicator**: A variable scale on which it is possible to objectively measure different points and that corresponds to, or correlates closely with, variations in the conditions of the refugees and persons of concern. In other words, “An indicator is an instrument to tell us how a project/programme is proceeding. It is a yardstick to measure results, be they in the form of quantitative or qualitative change, success or failure. It allow managers, but also all the stakeholders involved in a programme, to monitor desired levels of performance in a stable and sustainable fashion (Green, 2001)”.

The “Standard and Indicator Guidelines” present and develop a simple and clear guide on Standard and Indicators through the development of indicator summary boxes, which support series of reporting forms that prove to be extremely useful guidelines for reporting on refugees, IDPs
and other categories of concern. The Standard and Indicator Report (SIR) allows the M&E or programme officer to concentrate its efforts at the a) Country level (Protection, registration, reduction of statelessness, durable solutions, rights of people of concern, duties of governments, etc.); b) Refugee Camp/Settlement, presenting a picture of the well-being of the asylum-seekers/refugees in camp settings for more than 6 months and 2,5000 individuals or more; c) Urban Programme, presenting a picture of the well-being of the asylum-seekers/refugees in non-camp settings; and d) Returnee Area, helping providing a review of the well-being of the populations in areas of return (national protection, sustainable livelihoods, access to basic services, etc.)

The indicators selected are presented grouped in different parts, and further broken down into themes and sub-themes. The determination of themes and sub-themes relies on the need to focus and emphasize policy issues and themes related to refugees programming activities. An illustration is provided below:

**Example: Indicators for Refugee Status Determination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliance, Assistance and Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each indicator will be disaggregated by Sex, Age and will present:

- Rationale
- Methods of Measurement
- Data sources
- Frequency of Measurement
- Notes
- References

According to UNHCR, refugee operations need to be planned on the basis of both impact and performance indicators, taking into account the local situation. The effectiveness of education, health, sanitation, and other services provided by UNHCR and its partners relates not only to performance on matters such as number of teachers trained, cases of malaria treated or number of latrines built, but the impact these issues have in bringing about positive changes in the lives of refugees and persons of concern, and of course internally displaced persons. The gap between a given situation (assessment) and accepted standards, broadly translates into the programme plan, determining the objectives and outputs. Monitoring assesses the progress towards attaining those objectives and reaching UNHCR’s strategic goals.
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Annex 17: Mainstreaming gender equality

Sector introduction

Connecting gender, conflict and peacebuilding:

Conflict can exacerbate gender inequality. Armed conflict has been recognized as one of the most significant structural barriers to development, with the UN Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda stating that, “violence and fragility have become the largest obstacle to the MDGs”. As well as causing death, injury, and displacement, armed conflict destroys infrastructure, disrupts markets, disturbs social ties, diminishes the capacity of states, and diverts vital resources away from development. While available evidence suggests that men are more likely to suffer violent deaths during armed conflict, women are subject to other adverse effects such as increasing the double burden of productive and reproductive labour, larger numbers of dependents (including the injured and orphaned), and increases in gender-based violence (GBV), disease, and malnutrition. While in some cases women make gains in advancing their strategic interests during conflict, this is often – though not– followed by a post-conflict backlash in which more unequal gender roles are restored always.

Gender inequality can fuel conflict. Considerable evidence indicates that inequalities between social groups can become drivers of conflict, and gender inequality is no exception. While women may be less likely than other marginalised groups to take up arms in response to their subordination, evidence from Nepal and Liberia suggests that gender inequality and sexual violence were key motivating factors for female combatants during civil wars in those countries. Perhaps more crucially, there is evidence that the patriarchal gender norms which lie at the heart of gender inequality can also fuel conflict and violence, particularly where militarized notions of masculinity are prevalent. This is most obvious when discriminatory attitudes fuel GBV; however, it can also be observed in armed conflict within and between communities.

Resolutions on women, peace and security:

The first UN Security Council Resolution (SCR) on women, peace and security, SCR 1325, was unanimously adopted in October 2000. Subsequent resolutions have sought to reinforce specific aspects of SCR 1325, in particular with regard to the prevention of and protection from gender-based violence (GBV), including sexual violence, in conflict and post-conflict situations.

UN Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000) SCR 1325 (2000) recognises the particular negative impacts that armed conflict has on women and the important contributions women can make to peace, security and reconciliation. SCR 1325 urges increased representation of women in conflict prevention and management. Special attention is given to the need for a gender perspective in the implementation of peace agreements, including support to local women’s peace initiatives and respect for the human rights of women and girls in policing and justice; gender-responsive DDR, and gender training for peacekeepers.

UN Security Council Resolution 1820 (SCR 1820) was adopted in June 2008. It demands that states take special measures to protect women and girls from sexual violence in armed conflict, and ensure access to justice and assistance for victims. SCR 1820 (2008) emphasises the role of peacekeepers in protecting civilians and urges greater numbers of female peacekeepers. It requests that the UN develop mechanisms in DDR and SSR processes to protect women from violence, in consultation with women and women’s organisations.

UN Security Council Resolution 1888 (SCR 1888) was adopted in September 2009 and also focuses on sexual violence in armed conflict. SCR 1888 (2009) urges inclusion of sexual violence issues in peace processes, DDR and SSR arrangements, and for justice reform to address impunity and ensure access to justice for survivors. It establishes new mechanisms within the UN to ad-
dress sexual violence in conflict, including the appointment of a Special Representative of the Secretary General. Women’s representation in mediation and decision-making processes and the inclusion of female personnel in UN missions are again emphasised as a priority.

**UN Security Council Resolution 1889 (SCR 1889)** was adopted in October 2009. SCR 1889 extends the Council’s focus on women’s participation in peacebuilding, emphasising women’s political and economic decision-making. It urges gender mainstreaming in all post-conflict recovery processes; funding and programming for women’s empowerment activities; and concrete strategies in law enforcement and justice to meet women and girls’ needs and priorities. It calls for DDR processes to address the needs of women associated with armed groups/forces.

Presently, a growing number of governments are developing National Action Plans for implementation of resolution 1325 (2000) and mainstreaming a gender perspective into training for military personnel, especially those sent to peacekeeping missions, and/or into their development aid packages to post conflict countries. Some governments are also instructing senior representatives to address gender issues, encourage women’s representation and reach out to women in conflict and post-conflict zones. However, it is important that more Member States take responsibility for the successful implementation of resolution 1325 (2000) and ensure that it is integrated into their national policies and training programmes.

**Gender Equality in the European Union:**

Equality between women and men is one of the European Union's founding values. It goes back to 1957 when the principle of equal pay for equal work became part of the Treaty of Rome.

The Strategy for equality between women and men represents the European Commission’s work program on gender equality for the period 2010-2015. It is a comprehensive framework committing the Commission to promote gender equality into all its policies for the following thematic priorities:

- Equal economic independence for women and men;
- Equal pay for work of equal value;
- Equality in decision-making;
- Dignity, integrity and ending gender-based violence;
- Promoting gender equality beyond the EU;
- Horizontal issues (gender roles, including the role of men, legislation and governance tools).

The strategy highlights the contribution of gender equality to economic growth and sustainable development, and support the implementation of the gender equality dimension in the Europe 2020 Strategy. It builds on the priorities of the Women’s Charter and on the experience of the Roadmap for equality between women and men.

Recently, the EU has developed several strategies to promote gender equality in external action. A Communication on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment in Development Cooperation was adopted in 2007 and complemented by a Plan of Action for the period 2010-2015. In 2008, the EU adopted Guidelines on violence against women and girls as well as a Comprehensive Approach to the EU implementation of the United Nations Security Council Resolutions (UNSCR) 1325 and 1820 on women, peace and security. In 2010, the Council adopted 17 indicators to follow up on the implementation of the Comprehensive Approach by the Commission and the EU Member States. In 2012, the EU Strategic Framework and Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy were adopted.

---

41 Countries with national action plans: [http://www.peacewomen.org/naps/](http://www.peacewomen.org/naps/)
The work of the Union on protecting women in conflict situations and in facilitating their pro-active role as peace-builders is also guided by the “EU Comprehensive Approach for the Implementation of UN Security Council Resolutions 1325 and 1820 on Women, Peace and Security”.

Definitions

**Gender mainstreaming.** In 1997, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) agreed conclusions defined gender mainstreaming as the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. In doing so, Member States agreed that gender mainstreaming is required to integrate women’s specific concerns and experiences into all policies and programmes in all sectors so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. In its conclusions, the Council clearly stated that the ultimate goal of gender mainstreaming is to achieve gender equality.

**Gender equality in evaluation** involves learning how change happens in gender relations, analyzing which strategies worked and which did not, and how these could be refined for greater impact, practicing accountability among the various stakeholders to empowering constituencies by involving them in analyzing change processes so that they feel strengthened to sustain, extend and expand change, and advancing advocacy for gender equality and social justice (adapted from Batliwala and Pittman, 2010).

**Indicators and Methodology**

A comprehensive set of indicators to track implementation of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) on women, peace and security can be found in the 2010 Secretary-General’s Report on Women, Peace and Security (S/2010/498). The List of Global Indicators are presented in four sections/pillars where both Impact and Outcome Indicators are presented:

- Prevention;
- Participation;
- Protection;
- Relief and Recovery.

Also, the **List of EU Indicators on SCR 1325 (2000)** provides 17 indicators for the Comprehensive approach to the EU implementation of the United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1325 and 1820 on women, peace and security.

Gender equality in evaluation is still a new developing area and, in fact, there are many challenges in practical work.

A publication of UN Women examined the latest development of the UNEG’s work on gender equality dimension in evaluations, which is influencing concepts, methods and frameworks of evaluation. The publication analyzed the difficulties and limitations of the gender sensitive approaches that are being used and elaborated suggestions to strengthen the gender mainstreaming approach:

---


**Strengthen gender sensitive indicators.** The best place to strengthen programme indicators is in its planning stage. When developing indicators, first, we review elements of good indicators with programme managers to make sure that they are SMART indicators. Following the concept of SMART, further characteristics of a good indicator are as follows:

- Includes a unit of measurement: does it specify a unit of measure? (e.g. Quantitative: #, %, rate, score, etc.; qualitative: perspectives, types etc)
- Non-directional: does it avoid direction of change ("increase")?
- Relevant: does it measure the most important results you want to achieve among intended beneficiary group (institution, police, etc)? It needs to be relevant to programme and national standards.
- Specific: are all terms are clear and can they be clearly defined?
- Measurable: do you have resources/methods to measure it?
- Valid: does it really measure what you think it does?
- Reliable: can it measure the same thing consistently over time?
- Sensible timeframes and frequency: can it be measured at time intervals that allow you to measure change (e.g. Before/after project)?
- Both qualitative and quantitative easy to interpret and enable to track of changes over time. Then, the publication recommends developing indicators in the following process:
  - Develop in participatory manner
  - Brainstorm all possible indicators and then select best ones
  - Limit the number of indicators (2 to 3 per result)
  - Examine the relevance to needs of the user
  - Measure realization and enjoyment of rights
  - Always sex-disaggregate
  - Planning evaluations in programme cycle.

**Methodological improvement.** To maximize gender sensitivity of evaluation methodology, the following measures can be taken:

- Gender sensitive evaluation team
- Gender sensitive evaluation questions and triangulation
- Evaluation capacity development
- Staff capacity development
- Partners' capacity development
- Evaluator's capacity development.
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Annex 18: Mainstreaming Human Rights

**Sector introduction**

Since the establishment of the United Nations in 1945, the international human rights normative framework has evolved since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations General Assembly on 10 December 1948. Drafted as “a common standard of achievement for all peoples and nations”, it spelled out basic civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights that all human beings should enjoy. It has been widely accepted as an instrument containing the fundamental norms of human rights that should be respected, protected and realized. The Declaration together with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights form the International Bill of Human Rights.48

The other conventions adopted by the United Nations to address the situation of specific populations or issues in the promotion and protection of human rights are:

- The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
- The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
- The Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
- The Convention on the Rights of the Child;
- The International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families;
- The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities;
- The International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

These nine conventions and their optional protocols constitute the core international human rights instruments of the United Nations. Their provisions form the essence of the normative human rights framework of the United Nations. The treaty bodies that review their implementation have developed the normative basis of the standards reflected in the treaties and the obligations of the duty bearers that follow from those standards through treaty-specific general comments and recommendations. Other human rights mechanisms, such as the special procedures of the Human Rights Council, have also contributed to the normative understanding of human rights standards.

While covenants, statutes, protocols and conventions are legally binding on those States that ratify or accede to them, there are many other universal human rights instruments with a different legal status. Declarations, principles, guidelines, standard rules and recommendations have no binding legal effect, but have an undeniable moral force and provide practical guidance to States in their conduct.49

**Peace and Security Meet Human Rights – The Road Less Travelled**

“The suffering of human beings in war-torn societies highlights the entwinement of peace and security concerns and human rights issues. From a layman’s perspective there seems to be a natural connection between the two areas, especially in cases of large-scale violence. To be able to find durable solutions to conflicts human rights must be guaranteed, and in order to safeguard human rights violent conflicts must be kept at bay.”50

---

48 [http://www.ohchr.org/EN/AboutUs/Pages/WhatWeDo.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/AboutUs/Pages/WhatWeDo.aspx)
Peace and security issues were for a long time described as high politics, while human rights were considered soft or low politics – both in domestic and international politics. Consequently, the two fields developed separately with separate theories and separate practices. Peace and security research has focused on causes of conflicts, negotiations and conflict stages, while Human rights research mainly has been focusing on the development and usage of human rights law. The practices within the two fields have basically mirrored this division – or vice versa. In order to move beyond this separation – and sometimes even opposition – between the two fields it is important to look at the reasons behind them:

- First of all the two fields have generally drawn people of different training and views on international relations to them;
- Secondly, the training and traditions of the two fields hamper the attempts to find a middle ground;
- Thirdly, they are commonly physically divided into different units and rarely meet.

The Human Rights and Conflict Management Programme (HRCMP) at the Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR) in South Africa, suggests that the relationship between human rights abuses and conflict is a good starting point for a further development of research and practice merging human rights and peace and security. According to Parlevliet, human rights violations are of two kinds – the ones that create conflict and the ones that are a result of conflict. There is a tendency within both fields to concentrate more on human rights violations of the latter kind e.g. massacres, mutilations, rapes, and ethnic cleansing, since they are more revolting.

The European Union, Human Rights and Peace and Security

EU foreign policy has increasingly acknowledged the inter-relationship between human rights, peace and security:

1) Mainstreaming human rights in the Common Foreign Security policy (CFSP) of the EU (Pillar II). The character of the political co-operation between the EU member states in the field of foreign policy was strengthened and became more binding by formulating the CFSP framework as part of the 1992 Treaty on the European Union (TEU). Explicit objectives of the CFSP include the development and consolidation of democracy and the rule of law, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

2) Mainstreaming human rights, peace and security objectives in the development cooperation policy of the European Community (Pillar I). Issues of human rights and democracy were included as essential elements in the overall development policy-making process of the European Community in the 1990s. The EC not only relied on development aid as a sanction instrument, but has also increasingly started to deploy aid in support of processes of good governance. This proactive approach includes human rights clauses in financial aid agreements with third countries. These clauses seek to make human rights part of the political dialogue and the implementation of proactive measures. And they provide a legal basis for suspension or restriction of the agreement in the eventuality of unsatisfactory response by the contracting country.

The EC increasingly regards development co-operation as the most powerful instrument for treating root causes of conflict. The 2001 European Commission Communication on conflict prevention emphasises that an integrated approach is needed to restore or consolidate structural stability considering aspects ranging from sustainable economic development to democracy and respect for human rights. A striking example was the Stabilisation and Association Process starting 1999 to maintain peace and to avoid conflict in the Western


52 Memorandum of Understanding for the implementation of a European Concerted Research Action designated as COST A28 Human Rights, Peace and Security in EU Foreign Policy. Evaluating combined instruments to promote human rights and to enhance peace and security in order to strengthen EU foreign policy in this area
Balkans. The countries were given prospects of integration in the EU structures provided that they complied with conditions regarding human rights, minority protection, good governance and democratic principles.

**Definitions**

**Human rights.** Human rights are rights inherent to all human beings, whatever our nationality, place of residence, sex, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, language, or any other status. We are all equally entitled to our human rights without discrimination. These rights are all inter-related, interdependent and indivisible. Universal human rights are often expressed and guaranteed by law, in the forms of treaties, customary international law, general principles and other sources of international law. International human rights law lays down obligations of governments to act in certain ways or to refrain from certain acts, in order to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms of individuals or groups.53

**Human rights-based approach.** A human rights-based approach is a conceptual framework for the process of human development that is normatively based on international human rights standards and operationally directed to promoting and protecting human rights. It seeks to analyse inequalities which lie at the heart of development problems and redress discriminatory practices and unjust distributions of power that impede development progress. 54

**Indicators and Methodology**

**OHCHR Indicators**

The work on indicators at the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), Human Rights Indicators: A Guide for Measurement and Implementation (http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/Human_rights_indicators_en.pdf) provides practical tools for measuring and implementing human rights as well as categories of indicators used for human rights. It provides a distinction between quantitative and qualitative indicators and between fact-based and judgement-based indicators (the former referring to objects, facts or events that can, in principle, be directly observed or verified, and the latter referring to indicators based on perceptions, opinions, assessment or judgements expressed by individuals, categorized as subjective indicators) and suggests that fact-based or objective indicators, in contrast with judgement-based or subjective indicators, are verifiable and can be easier to interpret when comparing the human rights situation in a country over time and across populations. (see figure next page)

In recent years, having accepted the objective of mainstreaming human rights in their mandated activities, including development cooperation activities, the United Nations system’s agencies and programmes have been seeking tools and monitoring methodologies that could help them in assessing their performance on the said objective. As a result, indicators have been identified and toolkits developed that use what are essentially performance indicators. The primary objective of performance indicators is to allow the verification of changes produced by development intervention relative to what was planned. They are based on programming principles and terminologies (such as input-output-outcome-impact categorization of indicators) and anchored essentially in the respective programme activities. Such indicators can be used to monitor the performance of programme activities and to assess their conformity to some of the cross-cutting human rights norms.55

However, performance indicators, though helpful in furthering an approach based on human rights in development programming, capture only some aspects of the cross-cutting human rights norms. Their coverage of the human rights standards as laid out in various instruments

remains limited and often only incidental. Therefore, the use of performance indicators, as articulated in the literature and applied in current practice, does not in itself provide an adequate way forward for developing and encouraging the use of indicators in the implementation of human rights. Unlike performance indicators, compliance indicators in the human rights context are explicitly anchored in human rights standards. Such indicators are meant to capture the extent to which the obligations flowing from those standards are being met and are yielding outcomes that can be associated with improved enjoyment of human rights.

*Figure: Categories of indicators used for human rights*[^56]

The work undertaken in the OHCHR Guide relates to the identification of indicators that can be used to promote and monitor the compliance of duty bearers with their human rights obligations. However, in specific contexts, where programmes have been tailored to furthering the realization of human rights, or are contributing to the implementation of specific human rights obligations such as extending free primary education, programme specific performance indicators will also help in assessing the programme’s compliance with human rights standards. Chapter two of the guide provides a conceptualization of indicators for human rights.

- Measuring human rights commitments-efforts-results;
- Structural indicators;
- Process indicators;
- Outcome indicators;
- Indicators for cross-cutting human rights norms or principles.

The underneath example presents illustrative indicators on the rights to liberty and security of person:

![Image of indicators table]

---

The guide also discusses methodological approaches to human rights indicators and ethical, statistical and human rights considerations in indicator selection. Annex 1 also provides a Metadata sheets on selected indicators, including the Definition, Rationale, Method of computation, Data collection and source, Periodicity, Disaggregation, Comments and limitations for each indicator.

In selecting human rights indicators, the RIGHTS criteria, which take into account the desired statistical and methodological properties in an indicator as well as the principles and human rights concerns, could be useful. 58.

R - Relevant and Reliable
I - Independent in its data-collection methods from the subjects monitored
G - Global and universally meaningful but also amenable to contextualization and disaggregation by prohibited grounds of discrimination
H - Human rights standards-centric; anchored in the normative framework of rights
T - Transparent in its methods, Timely and Time-bound
S - Simple and Specific

According to Saddiq Osmani (2003) there are four key traits that characterises a human rights-based policy. 59.

- First, it has the potential to empower people as they can legitimately claim that the state has an obligation to serve them and will be held accountable if it does not.
- Secondly, it is based on the principles of equality and non-discrimination, which highlights the fact that the situation of many underprivileged groups originates from discriminatory practices. This, in turn, makes it necessary for a human rights-based policy to address the institutions that sustain discriminating structures.
- Thirdly, a human rights-based policy focuses on the accountability of policy-makers and other actors whose actions have an impact on the rights of people. Rights imply duties, which demand accountability making legal/administrative arrangements for ensuring accountability a necessary part of all policies.
- Finally, a human rights-based policy attaches as much importance to the processes through which the policy goals are achieved as to the goals themselves. In particular, it emphasises the importance of ensuring people’s participation, especially the participation by marginalised groups in all aspects of the development process. A human rights-based policy sees participation as valuable, not just as a means to other ends but also as a fundamental human right that should be realised for its own sake. Consequently, human rights-based policy-making changes the role of human rights. Human rights are not only a goal – a result of a certain policy – they are also a critical part of the policy-making process. If taken seriously, it puts a range of new demands on politicians, policy planners, practitioners and evaluators;

Other references/tools: The United Nations has established a website called the 'Practitioners Portal on HRBA' – [www.hrbaportal.org](http://www.hrbaportal.org) - which brings together a number of HRBA projects from different countries and sectors with the aim of mainstreaming information and understanding about HRBA.
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Annex 19: Mainstreaming conflict-sensitivity

**Sector introduction**

Conflict sensitivity is a crosscutting theme for the initiatives under the Instrument contributing to Peace and Stability, together with gender equality and respect for human rights.

As the definitions above suggest, conflict sensitivity is an ability of donor organisation to understand the context in which it operates, understand the interaction between the planned intervention and the context and act upon the understanding of this interaction in order to avoid negative impacts and maximise positive impacts. The main goal is not to do harm.

Conflict sensitivity is based on the hypothesis that: 1. Any initiative conducted in a conflict-affected area will interact with that conflict. Such interaction will have consequences that may have positive or negative effects on that conflict.60

Peace and stability interventions tend to, by definition, be focused on countries with fragile governments who, lacking authority, legitimacy and capacity, fail to deliver state services to citizens, to control corruption, and hold law-breakers accountable. Violence and political instability occurs predominantly in the fragile countries61. Peace and security interventions are required to find a balance between enhancing government's capacity to deliver services, increasing government's legitimacy and authority on one hand, and assist the citizens demand respect for their rights on the other. The need for conflict sensitivity is not only about what the interventions aim to achieve (increased stability, preventing violence) but also "how" the activities are managed without creating additional grievances, balancing gender approach and respecting human rights.

Agencies funding peace and stability interventions wish to have guarantees that not only are their investments fruitful in meeting their objectives but also those new challenges are not being created along the way.

**Definitions**

"Conflict sensitivity is a set of processes that help us recognise the unintended ways our work can contribute to conflict. It involves understanding the conflict (through a conflict analysis), assessing how programming interacts with the conflict, and revising programming in light of this knowledge.62"

"Conflict sensitivity analysis aims to ensure that a project does not aggravate existing tensions or create new ones."63

"A conflict sensitive approach involves gaining a sound understanding of the two-way interaction between activities and context and acting to minimize negative impacts and"

---

60 Conflict Sensitivity Consortium: http://www.conflictsensitivity.org/content/introduction-0#defining
61 Authority captures the extent to which a state possesses the ability to enact binding legislation over its population, to exercise coercive force over its sovereign territory, to provide core public goods, and to provide a stable and secure environment for its citizens and communities.
Legitimacy describes the extent to which a particular government commands public loyalty and generates domestic support for legislation and policies.
Capacity refers to the potential for a state to mobilise and employ resources towards productive ends, similar to the focus on progressive service delivery. Source: David Carment, Joe Landry, Yiagadeesen Samy & Scott Shaw (2015) Towards a theory of fragile state transitions: evidence from Yemen, Bangladesh and Laos, Third World Quarterly, 36:7, 1316-1332.
maximize positive impacts of interventions on conflict, within an organization’s given priorities / objectives and mandate.64

**Indicators and Methodology**

Conflict-sensitive approach requires project implementers to engage in thorough risk, conflict and stakeholder analyses. These exercises are the main sources for indicators.

1. **Risk Analysis**

Risks are uncertain events that can impact the project outcome and the ways the project needs to be managed (i.e. valuing human rights, gender equality and sensitivity to conflict), either positively or negatively. The difficulty to analyse risks stands in the fact that risks are always in the future. They can have many causes and consequently impact the intervention outcomes (and the related project cost, schedule, and performance). The interventions under the IcPS should also be guided by a low risk tolerance towards aggravated security situation or violation of human and gender rights. It should be also decided, which of the three main constraints – project budget, schedule or scope – is more likely to tolerate risk. Which would be rather acceptable: cost increase, schedule extensions or project scope reduction?

In order to assist to eliminate the degree of uncertainty, which accompanies almost all the temporary undertakings, potential risks need to be identified, and then qualified and quantified in the planning phase of the intervention. Only then can risk management strategies be planned. Unknown risks cannot be managed; thus there is a need for a contingency plan (or model-based early warning systems).

**How to identify risks?**

Using the list of project activities (which was composed based on project requirements), stakeholder register and respective communication plan, previous lessons learnt, analysis of surrounding environment, the project team members and stakeholders can prepare a list of potential risks. Risks can be related to project management facets (such as risks to schedule, project scope, cost and quality) but for the purpose of conflict analysis, risks to peace and stability, potentially posed by the intervention activities, should be identified.

As many team members and stakeholder representatives as possible should be encouraged to participate in risk identification in order to avoid estimation biases. All in all, they should attempt to answer a very basic question: ‘how will this planned activity / stakeholder communication strategy / project scope / project hiring practice / event in certain location etc. interact with the prevailing security situation?’

Potential risks can be identified through information gathering activities such as document reviews, brainstorming activities, (anonymous) questionnaires, interviews and workshops, SWOT and root cause analysis, and expert judgement. The main goal is to avoid generalizations from one-off events or to low estimate the occurrence of potentially high-frequency events.

**Risk Categories**

As a result of risk identification processes, which can be iterative (i.e. repeated through the project cycle as conditions change), risks are divided into categories65:

- **External or contextual risks** (e.g. political risk, ethnic diversity, polarization66, natural resources, economic situation, unemployment rate among youth, reluctant bene-

---


66 Predicting Local Violence in Liberia: two of the 56 risk factor variables predicted consistently risk of violence, [http://www.poverty-action.org/project/1031](http://www.poverty-action.org/project/1031)
ficiary, fiduciary risk, fragile security situation, high interest / high reluctance stakeholders, interests of neighbouring countries, etc.);

- **Institutional or programmatic risks** (e.g. high-risk or inexperienced implementing partners, lack of local knowledge, project design issues, insufficient human resources, lack of or delayed funding, communication issues, low donor reputation, faulty project management processes: estimating, planning, monitoring);

- **Technical risks** (e.g. risks with project requirements, incl. for equipment, logistics and technology issues, complexity, performance, weather).

The main risk categories can interact and affect one another. When institutional risks coincide with external risks, the intervention might lead to doing harm. For example, lack of local knowledge and project design flaws will do harm when coinciding with a reluctant beneficiary and their fiduciary risks. High-risk implementing partner can lead to low donor reputation. Logistical problems or bad weather affecting equipment delivery may delay project progress, which may in turn jeopardize relations with beneficiary. Hiring practices favouring only one social group will cause grievances in the other, etc.

In addition to the above-mentioned risks, alleviating fragile security situations depend on international coordination, political capital of leaders and shared knowledge among the stakeholders.

**Donor influence levels**

Of the three risk categories, donor agencies seem to possess only limited influence over external or contextual risks in short term, aiming nevertheless to design smart interventions that create conditions for reduced external risk in long-term. Some of the high impact technical risks may also be out of donors’ control.

Therefore, the donors have the strongest role to play in mitigating and responding to the programmatic or institutional risks (by extensively studying local situation, managing projects impeccably, cooperating with high performing implementing partners, conducting careful and precise communication, etc.). OECD, for example, has recognised the need for well-designed risk management strategies that balance risk and opportunity and that are rooted in a solid understanding of the country context. Only this way the benefits of intervening can overweight potentially damaging risks.

**Risk registry**

Once risks are identified, the risks are then listed under each category in a following format: potential events; their likely cause; effect, and responses. Table hereunder depicts a hypothetical example of the *risk registry*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks category</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Response strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>1. Low capacity to conduct risk management processes</td>
<td>Lack of training</td>
<td>Compromises achievement of project goal</td>
<td>MITIGATE: Provide training, develop manuals and templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Weak beneficiary sense of ownership, low absorptive ca-</td>
<td>Low interest in the project goal, priorities elsewhere</td>
<td>Affects project effectiveness</td>
<td>ACCEPT: work with low levels of local ownership MITIGATE: change project scope, increase in-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Source</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Risk Response Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>3. Unanticipated partnering proposal</td>
<td>Increased global interest in the cause</td>
<td>Reduces cost and effort, increases local knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>4. Opposition to project goal among local population</td>
<td>Project goal impacts their interests</td>
<td>Increases instability, jeopardizes achievement of outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>5. Unreliable internet connection</td>
<td>Weak ICT network in the country</td>
<td>Slow communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prioritization of risks for drafting a response**

It is seldom possible to plan responses to all the identified risks (positive or negative) due to limited time and funding. Therefore, risks should be prioritized. Using the information gathering techniques, managers need to assign likelihood and impact on each risk – measure probability of occurrence (in percentages) and likely impact (as cost of loss in euros). Risks can then be prioritized accordingly. High probability and/ or high impact risks should be managed on a priority basis.

**Risk response strategies**

OECD has listed possible risk responses strategies as follows:

- **Risk avoidance** refers to the practice of refraining from activities associated with high levels of risk. In many circumstances risk avoidance is a rational risk management practice.
- **Risk mitigation** refers to the use of specific measures to reduce risk. This can be directed at addressing risk factors so as to reduce the probability and severity of risk outcomes. Alternatively, risk mitigation may include adaptations to the design and management of programmes so as to limit their vulnerability to disruption in the face of particular risk outcomes.
- **Risk sharing** refers to the agreement of several actors to expose themselves to risk and to spread the burden of potential losses. An important example is the use of pooled funds.
- **Risk transfer** refers to situations where exposure to a particular type of risk is transferred from one party to another. Insurance against natural hazards is an example of risk transfer, which involves the insurer taking on the risks of the insured in exchange for the payment of a premium.
- **Risk acceptance** refers to the decision to accept or tolerate a level of risk. Often providers of development assistance will try to reduce risk through various strategies of risk mitigation, sharing and transfer, but will be left with a level of residual risk that they will need to accept in order to operate.
- **Risk exploitation** refers to a case when an unanticipated positive risk requires changing the project design, scope or schedule / cost.

**2. Stakeholder Analysis**

General stakeholder analysis (normally conducted during the planning phase of the project in order to identify project communication needs) will provide useful information for the purposes of the conflict sensitivity, as well. Analysing if any project’s activity or management practice might negatively impact stakeholders’ interests (justified or not) assists the project team to estimate the potential risks to stability and security.

For example, groups of people, possessing authority and legitimacy in the eyes of local populations should be paid careful attention to, as they will likely feel most threatened by state-

---

68 ibid. p. 23
building activities, which aim to increase the legitimacy of government. In addition to regional governors, elders, mighty warlords, religious leaders who play a role in status quo situation, the role of foreign governments should be analysed, as well. In many cases, the parties to the civil war are / were supported from outside the country, thus requiring diplomatic solutions.

This stakeholder assessment and the corresponding communication strategy should be periodically reviewed during the project execution phase to adjust to potential changes.

**Effects Estimate**

The International Security Sector Advisory Team recommended conducting an exercise on project level to estimate intervention’s unintended consequences. Effects Estimate tool is a version of stakeholder analysis, but is more similar to a model or a simulation. It first requires listing project end goal (outcomes and outputs), tools or means (equipment and skills), methods (how?) and actors (beneficiary, partners and implementers). Next, it is recommended to list as many negatives and positives as possible to identify what currently divides or unites the community where the project takes place.

Assign negatives / positives to following factors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>因素</th>
<th>Negatives</th>
<th>Positives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems and institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences and history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbols and occasions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effects estimate then recommends to refine the original project goal statement by diminishing as many of the negatives and reinforcing positives listed above (as if in a model for desired outcome). This exercise reveals, which actors will end up losing or winning from the changed outcome. This informs what kind of risk management actions need to be undertaken to stabilize the power structures and relations.

**3. Conflict (or Context) Analysis**

The cornerstone of conflict sensitivity is a structured conflict or context analysis, which is regularly updated throughout all phases of project cycle. The goal is to inform and assess the way interventions are designed, implemented and evaluated. The systematic analysis of conflict and its participants:

- Analyzes background and history of the conflict;
- Identifies the causes of conflict using case studies;
- Identifies all the relevant groups involved and attempts to understand the perspectives of these groups and how they relate to each other.

A conflict analysis can be mapped illustratively, preferably in a participatory manner. Geneva Centre booklet *Ten programming tools for Security and Justice Sector Reform* recommends to conduct it in a visual form (for example with post-it notes) where the main stakeholders are marked for their importance, marking alliances with similar colours, their relations to each other and to the donor initiatives marked with meaningful lines.

---

69 The grid for estimating the levels of power and interests of stakeholders (described in the baseline study section) could be modified to include potential spoilers: levels of reluctance and influence.

As the key sources of indicators for estimating intervention's level of conflict sensitivity indicated above, the data are primarily gathered during the project planning, execution and monitoring phases, by including beneficiary and a large group of stakeholders. Third party data is needed to estimate the baselines for environmental situation (security, economy, unemployment levels, etc.).

Monitoring and controlling conflict sensitivity approach in donor-led interventions is more important than evaluating the program’s outcome. Summative evaluation comes too late in the process, given the acuteness of fragile security situation. In many cases, developmental evaluation, which is similar to monitoring and controlling phase in projects (as it happens in the middle of the process), is better suited in fragile contexts. It takes advantage of complexity theory and can assist to develop social change initiatives in complex or uncertain environments.

Methods for monitoring conflict sensitivity

(Indicators should include conflict indicators and interaction indicators).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Contribution to peace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considers unintended outcomes</td>
<td>To ensure intervention does no harm (and contributes to peace where possible)</td>
<td>Examines any contribution to peace, including strengthening of small scale connectors (i.e. peace writ little):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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71 Developmental Evaluation supports innovation development to guide adaptation to emergent and dynamic realities in complex environments. A complex system is characterized by a large number of interacting and interdependent elements in which there is no central control. Patterns of change emerge from rapid, real time interactions that generate learning, evolution, and development – if one is paying attention and knows how to observe and capture the important and emergent patterns. Complex environments for social interventions and innovations are those in which what to do to solve problems is uncertain and key stakeholders are in conflict about how to proceed. Source: Better Evaluation: http://betterevaluation.org/plan/approach/developmental_evaluation


Developmental evaluation can be used instead of both, monitoring and summative evaluation in conflict-affected regions: Better Evaluation:
http://betterevaluation.org/plan/approach/developmental_evaluation

Poverty Action lab: http://www.poverty-action.org/
Annex 20: Note on Aggregation of Outcome Indicators

A general note of caution about the aggregation of results regards the technical and methodological consistency issues that can affect the significance of analysis and interpretation of results or impacts. Meaningful aggregation of results in particular can be especially challenging in the absence of harmonised methods of data collection, measurement or value of indicators across projects at country/sector/instrument level. The same indicator does not, and should not necessarily be weighted in the same way in every context or situation. Actors’ capacity and – especially in peace building activities – context often condition the quality or even just the availability of data.

Another key issue that deserves special attention is the tendency to focus on capturing positive or intended outcomes and impact. In peace building activities in particular, understanding or being attentive to unintended negative results and impacts is equally – if not more – important in order to avoid doing the exact reverse of what is intended, but which risks going unreported, whether for lack of awareness or under pressure to show results. The inclusion of the ‘Do no harm’ principle in key guidance on peace building, security, development and humanitarian activities alike, has played a critical role in raising awareness to the potential – and in many instances real – negative effect of aid. A conflict-sensitive lens needs therefore to inform the definition of indicators for each project in each context, as well as the analysis of results and impacts.

In any case, it is advisable not to expect fast results or evident attribution in state- and peace-building efforts. These are long-term endeavours in contexts where short-term vulnerabilities make transition to effective democratic governance and stable societies a fragile and non-linear process.

Data aggregation is a process in which disparate data are gathered into a whole and expressed in a consolidated form. Using aggregated data in composite indexes allows to compare countries as distinct as Finland and Central African Republic on the same scale, and to measure their change in time.

The project managers should attempt to measure progress in the outcome of each core sector, or through clustering similar sets of indicators. As the different indicators are originally measured in different units (i.e. essentially as apples and oranges), the data need to be rescaled and standardised either as percentiles, z-scores or percent ranks in Excel, SPSS or another data analysis software. The standardisation provides a unified score between 1 (or 100) and 0, which allows the scores to be summed and / or averaged into a composite index. These rankings can be aggregated and assessed throughout time and converted into trend lines of progress toward core outcomes and the overall mission goal.

Perhaps the best-known aggregate score attempting to measure social progress in different countries is the Social Progress Index (SPI). The final score of the SPI is calculated as a simple average of three aggregated indexes, different but interrelated dimensions: essential needs, foundation of wellbeing, and opportunity. Each of these is measured as a composite index of four additional components. For example, the ‘essential needs’ dimension is a composite index of measures on nutrition, water, shelter and safety. Further, each of those components is measured as an aggregate

---

73 Key references, amongst others, are the OECD Principles For Good International Engagement In Fragile States and Situations of April 2007, or the publication Do No Harm: International support for statebuilding, 2010; and Mary Anderson landmark book from 1999 on “Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace – or War”.


75 A percentile is a measure indicating the value below, which a given percentage of observations in a group of observations fall. For example, the 20th percentile is the value (or score) below which 20 percent of the observations may be found.

76 A z-score is a statistical measurement of a score’s relationship to the mean in a group of scores.

77 Percent rank function in Excel returns the rank of a value in a data set as a percentage of the data set. This function can be used to evaluate the relative standing of a value within a data set.
of three to five different outcome indicators. The final index score is therefore made up of dozens outcome indicators, which makes it robust enough to allow comparisons across countries (even if some indicators were not available for certain countries) and ideally assess progress by comparing change over time, although that still is a limitation of the SPI Index.

Various similar modalities for aggregation of IcSP indicators could be considered. It would be possible to gather so called ‘apples and oranges’ data about peace and stability in each beneficiary country – aggregation at country level – and/or compare the most frequent/common used indicators in IcSP projects across all beneficiary countries – aggregation at Instrument level.

Whatever the aggregation modality, there could be opportunities to connect with the global and open-source Risk Assessment Index (INFORM) for humanitarian crises and disasters the EU has taken a lead role in developing and is an inter-agency effort. It brings together data from various organisations operating worldwide. INFORM could possibly provide relevant complementary data at country level (especially regarding vulnerability/humanitarian indicators), and offers the opportunity to link up with a widely established methodology. IcSP indicators, on the other hand, could contribute to develop further the INFORM tool to include a peace and security dimension which currently does not exist in the Index.

In both modalities, the approach would gain if complemented with qualitative case studies (using observation, survey results and interviews). This would provide a useful contextualisation narrative to the data sets.

a) Aggregation at country level
This could be done by either gathering all sector IcSP indicators used in all projects in a country and monitor their evolution from the start to the end of the projects. If similar indicators were used and measured in the same way under previous IcSP or other projects, it is then possible to also compare them over time, or even to sum some of them. Other available and relevant security and governance outcome indicators (from the state or other partners) would complement IcSP indicators. Both IcSP and non-IcSP indicators could then be aggregated in standardised data up into a composite index.

Ensuring that a consistent methodology is used to aggregate the data over time, the resulting indexes are then comparable on a yearly basis. This would allow to draw conclusions about how the security situation is changing and possibly how it interrelates with other contextual factors. This modality presents some advantages, as well as difficulties.

Main Advantage:
- Aggregation at country level would have the advantage of providing the bigger picture, i.e. it allows to put into context what is being measured, and consequently also the opportunities/limitations of the Instrument in achieving the desired outcomes and impact. It would not be possible to establish attribution – i.e. whether the change occurred because of or despite the intervention supported by the Instrument –, but depending on the type of intervention, attribution may not be possible anyway, in which case it would be more relevant to try understanding how the project contributed to change.

Difficulties:
- Need for methodological consistency, both within IcSP and with other projects/sources indicators, which would limit the possibility to aggregate indicators.
- Existence of reliable data, given the monitoring challenges in the fragile or conflict-affected contexts where IcSP intervenes (e.g. access restrictions, controlled environment) – a general contextual difficulty, but which poses greater difficulty for aggregation.
- When IcSP projects are localised interventions, aggregation at country level is likely to be unfeasible or limited pending availability of other data for the same locations.

---

78 See the methodology behind Social Progress Index:
http://www.socialprogressimperative.org/data/spi/methodology

79 The methodology used to calculate SPI was not consistent from 2014 to 2015. Annual comparisons are therefore not yet possible.
b) Aggregation at Instrument level

A much simpler method to report on results is to gather data about one indicator in each beneficiary country, essentially comparing apples with apples. Not only does the indicator data provide a much more detailed picture of progress, it is also helpful for communication purposes, especially for the general public. One benefit of using a well-defined and clear-cut indicator instead of an aggregate index is its ability to allow comparisons between specific regions and the national average. Ideally, it should also allow comparison over time, which would provide indications about longer-term change and impact of interventions. As mentioned, this could be made more difficult given the short-term nature of IcSP projects, especially in one-off type of interventions. It could nonetheless allow for measuring performance of the Instrument.

IcSP indicators could be aggregated at instrument level and measured per sector and/or macro-sector. An example of composite scoring per sector is provided in the table below, using the outcome indicators proposed in the matrix for the Confidence Building, Mediation and Dialogue sector. A similar exercise applied to each sector of the Peace building and Governance macro-sector would provide a score of IcSP performance at macro-sector level. The same logic applied to all macro-sectors would provide a score to the overall performance of the Instrument.

Alternatively FPI could select, rank and score indicators from across sectors that would be especially relevant for each of the objectives of the IcSP Thematic Strategy Paper 2014-2020 and, applying the same logic, score the Instrument performance against the overall objectives set in the IcSP Thematic Strategy Paper 2014-2020.

### Example of composite scoring for IcSP Confidence Building, Mediation and Dialogue sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>Ex. of score</th>
<th>Composite sector score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence Building, Mediation and Dialogue</td>
<td>1. Conflict analysis identifies conflict drivers and/or change factors Improved relevance</td>
<td>0=0 1=100</td>
<td>100 (conflict analysis conducted and drivers/change factor identified)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. % of project stakeholders benefitting from capacity development that have engaged in confidence-building mediation and dialogue activities in their community</td>
<td>0=0 80(%target) =100</td>
<td>75 (60% of stakeholders... engaged in confidence-building mediation...)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Involvement of women and youth in conflict management mechanisms and peacebuilding initiatives</td>
<td>0=0 50(%target) =100</td>
<td>60 (30% of women and youth involved in peace building mechanisms)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Improved public perception of the peace processes</td>
<td>0=0 5(max_score) =100</td>
<td>80 (score of 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. % of citizens satisfied with community dialogue mechanisms and/or reconciliation initiative in response to key local conflict issue</td>
<td>0=100 80(%target)=1 00</td>
<td>75 (60% of citizens satisfied)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly to the previous methodology, there are limitations and risks to the aggregation of indicators at instrument level:

- Methodological consistency across IcSP projects using similar indicators;
- Monitoring of indicators is often challenging due to insecurity, access restrictions or controlled environments;
- peace building is a long-term endeavour and outcome indicators may only capture part of the story;
- risk of measuring performance of the Instrument outside the context it intervenes on.