



LE GOUVERNEMENT  
DU GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG  
Ministère des Affaires étrangères  
et européennes



# Evaluation of the activities of 5 Luxembourg NGOs in the field of human rights

Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs  
Development Cooperation Directorate

Synthesis of the final report

December 2016

## **Disclaimer**

*The findings and recommendations presented in this document were elaborated on the basis of the evaluator's methods, processes, techniques and know-how. They do not necessarily reflect the Ministry's point of view.*

# 1 Introduction

The Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs (MFEA) has requested the consulting firm EY (formerly Ernst & Young) to conduct an evaluation of the activities of **five Luxembourg Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO) operating in the field of human rights in Latin America**. The negotiations on the “future package” between the MFEA and NGO representatives have led to the identification of human rights as a priority sector. This sector will thus benefit from a preferential co-funding rate of 80% (instead of 60%).

The scope of this evaluation differs from those of previous geographical evaluations of NGO projects implemented in a specific country and of evaluations of framework-agreements (with specific NGOs), because it targets a specific number of projects (nine) implemented in a specific sector (human rights) in various countries (four). The purpose of this evaluation was twofold: accountability and mutual learning. It aimed to formulate recommendations and exchange good practices useful to local NGOs.

The evaluation assessed (i) the relevance and coherence of the projects with the human rights code [15160] of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)<sup>1</sup>, as well as with human rights issues and local needs, (ii) the effectiveness of the projects, and (iii) their impacts. The quality of project management by the Luxembourg NGOs was not evaluated.

**Nine projects** located in **four countries** have been evaluated:

Luxembourg NGO	Local partner	Name of the project	Year	Country
Action Solidarité Tiers Monde	Centro de Documentación e Información de Bolivia (CEDIB)	Provide specialized information on the exploitation of natural resources in Bolivia to strengthen public opinion and build sustainable alternatives	2015-2017	Bolivia
Action Solidarité Tiers Monde	Federación Ecuánica para el Desarrollo y la Paz (FEDEPAZ)	Improvement of the capacities of public bodies and community organisations in the Piura, Cajamarca and Amazonas regions	2015-2016	Peru
Action Solidarité Tiers Monde	Asociación de Defensa y de Desarrollo de las Comunidades Andinas de Perú (ADECAP)	Full intervention in order to contribute to the reduction of child malnutrition and the improvement of mother / child health in 15 Quechua communities in the district of Tayacaja, region of Huancavelica	2016-2017	Peru
Bridderlech Deelen	Conselho Indigenista Missionário (CIMI GO/TO)	Training program of the Conselho Indigenista Missionário for the indigenous people of the Goiás and Tocantins States	2012-2016	Brazil
Bridderlech Deelen/Caritas	Secretariado Nacional y Regional de Pastoral Social (SNPS/ SRPS)	Investigation, Training and Political participation	2015-2016	Columbia
Bridderlech Deelen/Caritas	Corporación Vínculos	“Peace culture” network: Strengthening of a network of youth organisations in the disadvantaged neighborhood Rafael Uribe	2015-2018	Columbia
Bridderlech Deelen/Caritas	Conselho Indigenista Missionário (CIMI Porantim)	Support to the publishing of the Porantim journal to guarantee the constitutional rights of indigenous people	2015 – 2016	Brazil
Solidaresch Hëllef Réiserbann	National Association of Popular Communities (ANACOP)	Support to the building of the Popular Communities' Movement	2014-2017	Brazil
Enfants de l'espoir	Fundacion Proyecto de Vida	Training of “peace officers” in the disadvantaged neighborhoods of Soacha and Usaquén	2015-2017	Columbia

The evaluation took place in 2016, between June and December. It followed three main phases: (i) an inception phase to agree on the methodological framework, (ii) nine field visits conducted between July and September 2016 to meet with the main counterparts and beneficiaries of each project (three phone interviews have also been organized with representatives of the OECD/DAC), and (iii) an analysis phase that led to the design of recommendations. These recommendations were presented and discussed with the steering committee during a participatory workshop in November 2016.

<sup>1</sup> Six of the nine projects evaluated are reported as human right [15160] projects to the OECD / DAC

## 2 Relevance and coherence

**The evaluated projects are relevant to the topic of human rights, even if NGOs were not always conscious of this**

- ▶ **All the projects were in line with the definition of the human rights code [15160] of the OECD/DAC**, which covers three types of human rights projects<sup>2</sup> (or “pillars”). The evaluated projects are related to two of these three pillars: five projects **supported human rights defenders and human rights NGOs**, by holding the State accountable for their commitments in this area (CEDIB, FEDEPAZ, CIMI GO/TO, CIMI Porantim and SRPS/SNPS), and four projects focused on allowing the **full exercise of human rights** by specific groups (Fundacion Proyecto de Vida, Corporación Vínculos, ADECAP and ANACOP).
- ▶ **All the projects were relevant to the issue of human rights** and were in line with the main international human rights instruments. Five projects contribute mainly to the implementation and enforcement of the International Labour Organization Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples (CIMI GO / TO, FEDEPAZ, CEDIB, CIMI / Porantim, ADECAP), and two projects contribute almost exclusively to the implementation of the principles of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (Fundación Proyecto de Vida and Corporación Vínculos).
- ▶ **However, NGOs do not always fully assume the fact that they implement human rights projects**. Consequently, they do not always integrate an explicit human rights approach (this is particularly true for NGOs focusing on projects aimed at supporting the full exercise of human rights by specific groups: Fundacion Proyecto de Vida, Corporación Vínculos, ADECAP and ANACOP). Therefore, the participation of the NGOs in human rights networks and their contribution to national and international human rights mechanisms – which **increases the impact of their projects** (and also allows NGOs to share good practice, to take joint actions and to inform about human rights violations) - is uneven.

**The evaluated projects are relevant to local and national issues, and to beneficiaries’ needs. However, the issue of gender equality was not adequately taken into account by the projects.**

- ▶ **The projects are relevant to local and national human rights issues** such as the right to prior consultation of indigenous people or the right of disadvantaged children to integral development.
- ▶ Project activities are relevant to the needs of beneficiaries due to the fact that their design is based on a participatory diagnostic assessment. Although some NGOs implement specific actions to fight against **gender inequality** (which is a Sustainable Development Goal), this issue was not fully taken into account in the design of the evaluated projects.

Recommendations	Operational sub-recommendations
R1 – Clarify the contribution of the projects to the human rights normative framework and the human rights national and international mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Identify the human rights treaties or laws to which the projects contribute</li> <li>▶ Design a logical framework in the light of human rights</li> <li>▶ Identify specific human rights indicators</li> </ul>
R2 – Participate in networks of human rights organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Identify the relevant networks of human rights organisations</li> <li>▶ Participate in these networks</li> </ul>
R3 – Contribute to national and international human rights mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Identify the relevant national and international human rights mechanisms (national commissions, Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, OHCHR Universal Periodic Review, etc.)</li> <li>▶ Contribute to these mechanisms</li> </ul>
R4 – Better integrate gender equality issues in the projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Analyze the gender issues</li> <li>▶ Integrate these issues in the design of the project</li> <li>▶ Implement activities to promote the participation of women</li> <li>▶ Identify specific gender equality indicators</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup>The human rights code [15160] of the OECD/DAC covers three types of projects: (i) projects aiming at supporting the institutions and mechanisms working to the implementation of human rights, (ii) projects aiming at supporting human rights defenders / NGO, and (iii) projects allowing the full exercise of these rights of specific groups (children, persons with disabilities, migrants, ethnic, religious, linguistic and sexual minorities, etc.)

### 3 Effectiveness

#### ***The design of the evaluated projects could have been improved to better take into account the reality on the ground***

- ▶ **Project planning and project monitoring documents** (project fiche, logical framework, financial framework, and annual reports) required by Luxembourg's development cooperation contribute to structure the projects. However, evaluators observed some differences between the information contained in these documents and the reality on the ground. The scope of the actions implemented on the ground was often much wider than that defined in project documents (e.g. in the logical framework and the project fiche suggest).
- ▶ While some projects were implemented independently in a specific “project approach” with dedicated management and monitoring (for example the Corporacion Vinculos project), others were implemented as part of an “integrated approach” and were part of a **global program** that was often funded by other donors (CIMI project in the States of Goiás and Tocantins in Brazil and the SNPS / SRPS project). The “integrated approach” is an efficient option (in particular because it prevents from a duplication of monitoring mechanisms) for certain types of activities carried out by the local partner. Yet it has to be clearly acknowledged (to ensure the transparency of the funds used), which has not always been the case.

#### ***The evaluated projects were globally effective, but their management could still be improved***

- ▶ The activities planned under the projects have been implemented (or were in the process of being implemented at the time of the evaluation). The objectives should be achieved within the planned timeframe.
- ▶ The factors facilitating the achievement of the project objectives were mainly linked to the capacity of local NGOs to meet the needs of the beneficiaries, proposing solutions that were relevant to the socio-cultural context, associating them with the projects or programs' design, and training “facilitators”. The “facilitators” served as a link between the local NGOs and the community members (in particular the projects carried out by ADECAP, FEDEPAZ, CIMI GO / TO and Fondation Proyecto de Vida).  
The evaluation did not reveal any major organizational or management deficiencies. Yet some weaknesses have been observed : (i) the organisation of the projects was not always clear, which did not facilitate their monitoring, (ii) some organisations lacked proper management tools, which sometimes made it difficult to perform financial and operational monitoring, and (iii) **indicators** were not **collected** for internal or strategic use (but only for an accountability issue).

Recommendations	Operational sub-recommendations
R5 – Improve coherence between project documentation and the actions implemented as part of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Formulate clear objectives, in coherence with the mission of the NGO and the expected impacts of the project</li> <li>▶ Cover all activities carried out by the NGO</li> <li>▶ Define context, outcome and impact indicators</li> <li>▶ Clarify all contextual elements</li> </ul>
R6 – Clarify the approach (project approach / integrated approach)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Choose the relevant approach between project and program approach</li> <li>▶ Define consistent indicators</li> </ul>
R7 – Improve project management and monitoring capacities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Define the project organisation and management</li> <li>▶ Develop appropriate management and monitoring tools</li> <li>▶ Train local NGOs in project management</li> <li>▶ Integrate the use of management tools into the mission of local NGOs' professionals</li> </ul>
R8 – Improve data collection, consolidation and analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Structure and plan data collection</li> <li>▶ Collect data from existing beneficiaries and former beneficiaries</li> <li>▶ Consolidate the data in a database and exploit it more proactively for project management purposes</li> </ul>

## 4 Impact and sustainability

### ***The evaluated projects have demonstrated many positive impacts on beneficiaries***

The evaluation identified several transversal impacts on the beneficiaries:

- ▶ Better exercise of individual and collective rights;
- ▶ Greater and more visible mobilization of beneficiaries for the defense of their rights;
- ▶ Prevention of violence;
- ▶ Creation of national human rights processes; and
- ▶ Improvement of living conditions in terms of health, education, access to water, etc.

### ***The evaluated projects were sustainable in the short- and medium-term. However, the conditions for longer-term sustainability could be improved***

Projects have, to a certain extent, produced sustainable effects and contributed to the autonomy of communities and / or individuals. Projects appeared to be sustainable in the short- and medium-term. However, they will continue to require the support of the donors that accompany them:

- ▶ Local NGOs appeared to be relatively dependent on Luxembourg **funding**, with the exception of two projects (SRPS / SNPS and Fondation Proyecto de Vida), for which financing from Luxembourg development cooperation was rather marginal (thanks to other sustainable resources).

More broadly, the Latin American context of reducing Official Development Assistance and the absence of national funding for NGOs created two financing needs: a diversification of traditional financing sources and a need to find new resources that are not dependent on development assistance (self-financing and non-financial contributions).

- ▶ **New technologies** (Internet, social networks) contributed to optimizing NGOs' work and impact, particularly in terms of communication and project coordination. These technologies facilitate the dissemination and impact of information, enable the set-up of online donation tools and the publication of data, articles and studies.

However, some NGOs did not fully exploit the potential of these instruments (or did not seem to master them). For example, the National Association of Popular Communities did not have a website, and the Porantim newspaper published by the Conselho Indigenista Missionário was only available online in black and white PDF (Portable Document Format).

Most NGOs used "**facilitators**" coming from beneficiary communities to leverage their actions. While this was identified as a success factor of the projects, some improvements could be made in terms of recruitment (women and young people), the content of the "facilitators" trainings (pedagogy) and stronger inclusion of the "facilitators" in the design of the projects.

Recommendations	Operational sub-recommendations
R9 - Optimize and diversify the funding structure of local NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Map possible sources of funding</li> <li>▶ Identify and look for non-financial contributions</li> <li>▶ Develop self-financing</li> </ul>
R10 - Develop multi-channel communication / dissemination strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Create / improve t websites</li> <li>▶ Communicate on social networks</li> <li>▶ Maintain communication via paper</li> </ul>
R11 - Train "facilitators" to multiply actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Design a recruitment strategy for facilitators</li> <li>▶ Train Facilitators</li> <li>▶ Co-build actions with facilitators</li> </ul>