

FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

BASIC INFORMATION

1.1 PROJECT TITLE: Strengthening the capacity of African minorities and indigenous peoples to advocate for the implementation of African regional and international standards.

AGENCY NAME: Minority Rights Group International (MRG)

CSCF NUMBER: CSCF 343

COUNTRY: United Kingdom

1.2 NAME OF PARTNERS:

Center for Minority Rights Development (CEMIRIDE),
African Center for Democracy and Human Rights Studies (ACDHRS)

1.3 NAME OF PERSON CARRYING OUT EVALUATION

This report was compiled by **Dr. Christopher Mbazira** (bazzira@yahoo.co.uk), a lecturer in the Department of Public & Comparative Law, Faculty of Law, Makerere University, Kampala. While Dr. Mbazira takes ultimate responsibility for the report, he acknowledges the contribution made by various persons in the process of compiling the report. In this regard, the information provided and views of members of staff at MRG (in particular Paile Chabane, Claire Thomas and Paul Mulindwa), staff of partner organisations, direct and indirect, including CEMIRIDE, ACHDRS, African International Christian Ministry (AICM), Movement for the Survival of Ogoni People (MOSOP), Civil Liberties Organisation and Endorois Welfare Council, and individuals including Ag Aly from Mali, Honourable Member from Parliament Jalia Bintu from Uganda and members of minority communities interviewed including the Batwa in Uganda and Endorois in Kenya are all acknowledged.

PERIOD DURING WHICH EVALUATION WAS UNDERTAKEN:

October 2005 – Sept 2008

Table of contents

List of acronyms	iii
Executive Summary	iv
Achievement rating scale	1
Introduction to project	8
Evaluation methodology	10
Relevance	10
Equity	12
Efficiency	13
Effectiveness	18
Impact	23
Sustainability	26
Replicability	28
Lessons learned	28
Information dissemination	30
Recommendations	30

List of acronyms

ACDHRS –	African Center for Democracy and Human Rights Studies
ACHPR –	African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights
AICM -	African International Christian Ministry
AU –	African Union
CEMIRIDE –	Center for Minority Rights Development
CSCF –	Civil Society Challenge Fund
DFID -	Department for International Development
DRC –	Democratic Republic of Congo
EOW -	Equal Opportunities Watch
HRC –	Human Rights Council
MGLSD -	Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development
MOSOP –	Movement for the Survival of Ogoni People
MRG –	Minority Rights Group International
NEPAD –	New Partnership for Africa’s Development

Executive Summary

The project, *Strengthening the Capacity of African Minorities and indigenous peoples to advocate for the implementation of African regional and international standards*, was executed as a joint project between Minority Rights Group International, African Center for Democracy and Human Rights Studies and the Center for Minority Rights Development. The project goal was to enable minorities in Africa challenge their inequality and discrimination and to improve realisation of their civil and political rights and economic, social and cultural rights.

Various activities were executed, including training 24 minority representatives in regional and international standards for the protection of minorities; facilitating representatives to attend regional and international events; supported 6 national advocacy projects; held two seminars; and produced an advocacy training manual, two advocacy briefs and one thematic report.

The evaluation finds that the implementation of the project was not without problems. The management of the partnership was affected by power imbalances between the partners. This was created mainly by communication problems and the failure of one partner to meet its funding undertakings. The project was also not able to hold joint seminars with the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights as had been planned.

In spite of the above, the project was largely successful; the project's most successful activity was the training which brought together representatives from several minority rights NGOs and built their capacity on the workings and opportunities of the regional and international human rights systems. The project also facilitated the attendance of minority representatives at various international and regional fora and engaged in international advocacy campaigns leading for instance to the establishment of the UN Permanent Forum on Minority Issues.

The lessons learned from the project include the following:

- The best way of taking advocacy and human rights education to minority communities is through indirect partners, these are close to the communities but these have to be supervised and monitored closely;
- Human rights training intended to build the capacity of advocates of human rights is very effective.
- Three years can be a short time for a project tackling instances of entrenched inequality and discrimination;
- Projects executed jointly through a partnership need very careful management of the partnership in order to create a sense of joint ownership;
- On-going evaluation of a project can be as important as the activities of the project.
- Where project funds are to be obtained from two different donor sources, it is important that evidence of commitment to the project of each donor is obtained at the project planning stage before the project commences.

Some of the project activities need funding for sustainability; this includes advocacy within the African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights. This is in addition to some national advocacy projects identified in the report.

ACHIEVEMENT RATING SCALE

	Achievement for whole project	Log-frame indicators	Baseline for indicators	Progress against indicators	Comments
<p>Purpose:</p> <p>To enable minorities in 20 African States to be aware of and demand their rights and challenge inequality through increasing and improving use of African and international legal standards and mechanisms.</p>	2	<p>At least 960 minority representatives across 20 Africa countries are more aware of their rights under regional mechanisms, feel free in demanding these rights and put them in practice</p> <p>Regional dialogues in Africa change to pay increased attention to the rights and needs of minority communities.</p> <p>At least 20 laws, policies and state practices damaging to minorities are exposed.</p>	Minority represented are exposed to the regional and international standards which define their rights	<p>Over 20 minority representatives were trained and 10 advocacy projects executed.</p> <p>The project also published and disseminated advocacy briefs and thematic reports.</p> <p>While all the above helped to create awareness, the impact is still limited.</p>	<p>Advocates working with these communities reached by the project had their capacity built. They were empowered with knowledge and skills to serve the communities better.</p> <p>The advocates also mastered the confidence to demand for the rights and to appeal to regional and international structures</p>
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>Minority communities become more aware of relevant African and international standards and are more confident and able to put them into practice.</p>	2 – 3	<p>80% of the training participants report increased knowledge, skills and confidence to articulate their rights</p> <p>Advocacy projects are organized that pass on knowledge, skills and/or confidence to trainees</p>	Trainees acquire skills and become more confident to advocate for minority rights.	<p>Minority representatives received high-level training on rights and standards.</p> <p>Some minority communities received human rights</p>	Trainees become more aware of rights

<p>African decision makers are more aware of and have a clearer understanding of relevant African and international standards as they relate to minorities (thus creating an environment where minority advocacy is listened to and not automatically discounted).</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Attendees at ACHPR Joint seminars and receipts of advocacy briefs informally report increased awareness and improved understanding</p>	<p>Decision makers are unaware and not committed to the rights of minorities as protected by international and regional standards.</p>	<p>training and even formed advocacy committees.</p> <p>Joint seminars with ACHPR targeting Commission er never materialised as originally envisaged and so a different approach was adopted.</p> <p>Pretoria seminar attended by Commission er of ACHPR and member of Parliament from Uganda.</p> <p>The Kampala seminar was attended by a key Ugandan government official from the Ministry of Social Development</p>	<p>The level of awareness before the ACHPR is still very low; they are still affixed on understanding the concept and rights of indigenous and tribal peoples.</p> <p>At the country level, awareness has been created among some government officials as a result of these projects. However, a very small proportion of decision makers reached.</p>
--	----------	---	--	---	--

				<p>10 National advocacy projects were executed some targeting decision-makers.</p> <p>Advocacy briefs and thematic reports also targeted decision makers among others</p>	
<p>African decision makers are more aware of minority communities and the extent and damage of current inequalities and instances where international standards are not met (thus creating an environment where minority advocacy is listened to and not automatically discounted).</p>	2	<p>New public statements by officials, politicians or in the media in 15 African states</p>	<p>Limited attention is given by African decision makers to the rights of minority communities and extent of damage suffered by these communities is not appreciated.</p>	<p>National advocacy projects highlighted extent of damage and reached some decision makers including executive and legislative officials.</p> <p>Advocacy was also extended to international fora like the UN Human Rights Council in Geneva and to the UN Independent Expert on Minority Issues</p>	<p>Though limited in coverage, the national advocacy projects had an impact on decision makers. Some positive responses from legislators and executive officials are highlighted in the report.</p> <p>The impact before the ACHPR was very limited, there is need for effective follow-up and continuous advocacy.</p>
<p>Inputs/Activities :</p> <p>Appropriateness (quality)</p>	Training: 2	20 – 25 minority representatives to be trained in regional and international	Trainees become more aware of minority rights issues and	Training attracted 26 participants above projected	Although the training did not reach as widely across the continent

		standards	acquire skills and confidence to advocate for the rights	range of 20 – 25. Trainees are now more aware of rights and have mastered confidence and advocacy skills.	as hoped it was a successful activity.
	Participation at international and regional fora: 2	10 representatives to attend regional events/meetings including session of ACHPR. 5 representatives to attend international fora	Exposure to international and regional events would build skills and confidence of representatives. Put minority issues on regional and international agenda.	Project facilitated the participation of representatives at sessions of ACHPR, UN Council in Geneva and the World Social Forum in Nairobi. Participants engaged in advocacy and networking.	The participation of the representatives was very effective. However, due to problems of securing visas some intended participants did not attend some events.
	Advocacy projects: 2	10 national advocacy projects are funded and supported.	Create awareness of rights among communities and decision makers and build confidence to advocate for rights.	10 advocacy projects were executed in 6 countries: Uganda, Nigeria, Kenya, Malawi, Cameroon, and DRC.	The advocacy campaigns allowed practical usage of the skills from the training. However, the monitoring not effectively done.
	Fact finding process: 4	Two fact-finding mission to the AU and NEPAD	To assess opportunities for minority to access institutions and to sensitise institutions on rights.	Missions undertaken but never achieved much. AU structures obstinate.	Fact finding mission to AU was not properly planned and achieved very little.
	Joint ACHPR seminars: 3-4	Organise joint ACHPR Seminars			The two seminars organized were not joint seminars.

Sufficiency (quantity)	Produce Training Manual: 3	Research, produce and translate Training Manual	Commissioners and ACHPR secretariat staff attend seminars. Influence of seminars is to generate debate in ACHPR on minority rights issues	ACHPR did not cooperate and seminars were never held as joint seminars.	However, one was attended by Commissioner Melo who reported to the Commission on this event.
	Produce 2 thematic report & advocacy briefs: 1	Produce targeted and concise advocacy briefs and thematic reports	Training manual To be produced and used at training	The manual was produced but long after the training had taken place and up now has not been translated.	The production of the manual encountered a Number of problems arising from consultant not adhering to agreed time deadlines.
	Training: 2	Train 20 – 25 representatives of minorities	Report and briefs to be used to influence opinion	Briefs and reports produced and disseminated	Due to late production, documents may not have reached all targeted readers yet.
	Participation at international and regional fora: 2	10 representatives attend regional events and 5 attend international	Impart skills, build confidence, expose participants to standards	Exposure of representatives	Training was held as anticipated and attracted 26 participants. More than 10 representativ es attended

<p>Efficiency(timeliness)</p>	<p>Advocacy projects: 3</p> <p>Fact finding process: 4</p> <p>Joint ACHPR seminars: 3</p> <p>Produce Training Manual: 3</p> <p>Produce thematic report & advocacy briefs: 1</p> <p>Advocacy</p>	<p>events</p> <p>10 National Advocacy campaigns to indirect partners</p> <p>Undertake 2 fact-finding missions to AU & NEPAD</p> <p>Organise two joint ACHPR seminars</p> <p>Produce 1 Training Manual</p> <p>Produce and translate 2 advocacy briefs and thematic report</p>	<p>to build their skills and confidence.</p> <p>Influence decision makers identify and change bad laws and policies</p> <p>Assess opportunities and entry points in AU and NEPAD</p> <p>Seminars attended by Commissioners and secretariat staff</p> <p>Manual to be used at training and also disseminated</p> <p>Instruments for influencing opinion</p>	<p>regional events and 4 UN Human Rights Session, while 8 attended Social Forum</p> <p>10 advocacy campaigns executed in 6 countries.</p> <p>2 missions undertaken</p> <p>2 seminars organized but not joint ACHPR seminars</p> <p>Manual produced after training event</p> <p>All produced but not translated fully</p>	<p>because of visa problems.</p> <p>Only 6 countries were reached and not the projected 10.</p> <p>Missions though largely unsuccessful enabled project assess attitude of institutions</p> <p>Seminars becoming training events and attended by decision-makers including one Commissioner</p> <p>Although produced after training it has been disseminated and could be used by advocates.</p> <p>Briefs and report delayed and not produced in time per work-plan,</p>
-------------------------------	---	--	--	--	---

	grants:2				
	Fact finding process:2	Give 10 National Advocacy grants to indirect partners to carry out national campaigns	Influence decision makers, identify and change bad laws and policies.	Advocacy grants were advanced within the time planned	Some grantees not submitting narrative reports on time and due to unsatisfactory financial reports some grantees did not receive the second tranche of funding and one grantee claims never completed advocacy project
	Training: 1	Undertake two missions, one to AU and another to NEPAD	Educate communities on their rights and build confidence	Missions were undertaken within the time planned	ACDHRS was supposed to lead this process but declined when called upon arguing that the timing was inappropriate
	Participation at international and regional events:2	Train 20 – 25 representatives of minority communities	Assess opportunities and entry points within AU and NEPAD	Training was held on schedule as planned	Holding of training at beginning of project imparted skills and built a network that proved useful in implementing project, especially with regard to National Advocacy.
	Training Manual: 4	Facilitate the participation of representatives at international and regional events	Impart skills, build capacity and confidence of trainees to advocate for rights	Facilitation of participants took place in the second and third year	Some potential
			Build capacity		

		Manual to be produced as training resource	and confidence of participants and engage in international advocacy	Manual produced long after the training	participants could not attend events because of failure to secure visas arising from short-notice timing.
	Joint seminars :3		Manual to be produced in time for training in May 2006		Production of training manual severely delayed and therefore having adverse consequences on the planned objectives around it ie to have it tested at the training event and once finalised, distributed among the trainees and other interested groups as a resource material.
	Advocacy briefs and thematic report: 3	Hold two joint ACHPR	Seminars to be attended by Commissioner and Commission staff	Seminars held but not attended by Commissioners as anticipated. Only one Commissioner attending Pretoria seminar	Manual has not yet been translated
		Produce two 2 advocacy briefs and thematic report	Report and briefs to be used as tools of advocacy. Briefs to be produced	Thematic reports production was delayed and produced over a year after scheduled time.	Commissioner not attending because of lack of co-operation from Commission

Overall Assessment			in 2007 and 2008	<p>Advocacy briefs produced but delayed, one was deferred by one year.</p> <p>The problems encountered in management of the partnership frustrated the planning and implementation of some of the project activities. There was a power imbalance and acrimonious partnership relationship</p>	<p>Thematic report and briefs not yet translated. Only one brief done by CEMIRIDE translated into Swahili.</p> <p>In spite of the partnership problems, the project was largely successful, it laid the foundation for advocacy for minority rights and built the capacity and confidence of advocates of these rights</p>
--------------------	--	--	------------------	--	--

Introduction to the project

2.1 The project was conceived and designed with the goal of enabling minorities in Africa to challenge inequality and discrimination and to improve realisation of their civil and political rights and economic, social and cultural rights. The purpose was to enable minorities in 20 African states to be aware and demand their rights and challenge their inequality through increasing and improving the use of African and

Outputs/Results of project

Minority communities become more aware of relevant African and international standards and are more confident and able to advocate with reference to them and put the increased knowledge, skills and confidence into practice;

African decision makers are more aware of, and have a clear understanding of relevant African and international standards as they relate to minorities; and

African decision makers are more aware of the rights of minority communities and the extent of the damage of current inequalities and instances where international standards are not met.

international legal standards and mechanisms. The project was motivated by the situation of minorities in Africa, who, like minority communities elsewhere, are poorer, participate less in decision-making and experience disproportionate rights abuses. The violation of the rights of minorities has been sustained mainly by the minority communities' ignorance of their rights and the inability to access the domestic and international mechanisms of human rights protection. It is in this context that the intended outcomes of the project were to be achieved.

The activities of the project were numerous as indicated in box below

Activities

Train 20 – 25 minority and indigenous representatives in regional and international standards for the protection of minorities and in advocacy methods to enforce these;

Facilitate the participation of minority and indigenous representatives to the African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights (ACHPR) and other international fora;

Assess, fund and support 10 national advocacy projects;

Hold two joint thematic seminars with the ACHPR;

Research and produce 2 advocacy briefs;

Research and produce training manuals, thematic report and translations; and

Undertake fact finding processes on the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and the African Union (AU).

2.3 With regard to implementation, monitoring and evaluation, the project was to be executed by MRG in partnership with other organisations working on minority issues in Africa. The partnership was designed to operate at two levels, the first being a direct partnership and the second an indirect partnership. The direct partnership consisted of Minority Rights Group International (MRG), Centre for Minority Rights Development (CEMIRIDE) and African Centre for Democracy and Human Rights Studies (ACDHRS) who were to jointly implement and manage the project in a relationship of complete equality. The second level partners included beneficiary organisations and representatives of minority communities identified for the purposes of implementing the project activities and to build their capacity, selected mainly from the pool of participants at the training event. Examples of indirect partners the project worked with include African International Christian Ministry (AICM) (Uganda), Movement for the Survival of Ogoni People (MOSOP) (Nigeria), Civil Liberties Organisation (Nigeria), Equal Opportunity Watch (EOW) (Malawi), Endorios Welfare Council (Kenya), and Kotido NGO Forum (Uganda).

3 Evaluation methodology

3.1 The evaluation methodology consisted of a desk review of key project documents which included the project proposal, budget and log-frame submitted to the Department for International Development (DFID), annual project reports submitted to DFID by MRG, advocacy proposals and narrative reports submitted to MRG by the indirect partners, minutes of direct partners monitoring and evaluation meetings, thematic report on the African Court on Human and Peoples Rights, advocacy briefs, training manual, and seminar reports amongst others. The evaluator also had a number of interviews with the project managers and partners and with key stakeholders in the project. Persons interviewed included members of staff at MRG (London and Kampala), ACDHRS, AICM, Civil Liberties Organisation, MOSOP, CEMIRIDE, and individuals including from Endorois Welfare Council, Ag Aly from Mali and members of the Batwa community living in Kabale, Uganda. Also interviewed were political decision makers in Uganda including the Kabale District Council Vice-Chairperson, Silver Bauma and Honourable Member of Parliament Jalia Bintu (until recently the chairperson of the Equal Opportunities Committee of the Parliament of Uganda). Dr. George Mukundi who worked as a consultant on the project (author of thematic report on the African Court) was also interviewed. Some of the interviews were done through physical contact while others were telephonic.

3.2 The evaluator travelled to Bogoria in Kenya to meet members of the Endorois Welfare Council and to Kabale to meet staff members at AICM and members of the Batwa community. One limitation that should be noted is that the telephone interviews were not as effective as those done through physical contact. This, among others, was caused by the poor telephone connection prevalent between African countries. The interview with staff members at ACHDRS, for instance, had to be abandoned because of connection problems and interview questions were instead sent by email. A telephonic interview with the Executive Director of the ACDHRS was only successful because it was done at a time when she was in Geneva. Efforts to travel to Malawi and meet staff members at EOW proved fruitless because of what appeared to be a lack of cooperation on the part of EOW.

The evaluator reported to MRG staff Paile Chabane, the International Human Rights Officer – Africa, and Clare Thomas, the Deputy Director.

4 Relevance

4.1 Africa is home to a number of ethnic and religious minorities living on the margins of what may be described as mainstream society. The sometimes distinctive physical features and ways of life have been used as identifying factors and justification for the extension of inferior treatment and utter neglect of the needs of minorities. The marginalisation of minority communities has been followed by the violation of their rights including both civil and political rights and economic, social and cultural rights. The most visible indicator of marginalisation has been the appalling poverty prevalent amongst these communities perpetrated in most communities by landlessness. While every domestic jurisdiction has mechanisms for

the protection and enforcement of human rights, these have been of no avail to minority communities given their precarious position and incapacity to access the mechanisms. It is in this context that the African regional and international mechanisms become relevant.

4.2 The African human rights system is anchored on the African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights (the African Charter) and a plethora of other treaties protecting women, children, and refugees amongst others. The system has blossomed in recent years as evidenced by the increasing use of the ACHPR and the establishment of the African Court on Human and Peoples Rights. Likewise, the international system, as heralded by the United Nations, has ridden on the information flow facilitated by the forces of globalisation to assert its relevance and attract civil society participation. The limitation though is that minority communities are largely ignorant of the existence of these mechanisms. Yet, while some of the NGOs working with these communities may be aware of the mechanisms, they do not have the capacity, both expertise and resources, to engage the mechanisms. There is also a good number of NGOs that may be ignorant of the regional and international standards.

4.3 It is in the above context that the relevance of the project should be assessed. The project was a necessary intervention to popularise the African regional and international human rights mechanisms. The overall goal of the project was to enable minorities in Africa challenge inequality and discrimination and to improve realisation of civil and political rights and economic, social and cultural rights. Ideally, the project should have targeted all African countries as they are all home to minority communities. However, this could not have been possible because of a number of limitations including the language obstacle and the absence of information on potential partners in some countries. In addition, spreading the project to all African countries would have over-stretched its management and administration there by making it hard to carry out effective monitoring and evaluation.

4.4 One of the indicators against which the success of this project should be assessed is the level of rights awareness, epitomised amongst others in awareness of the African human rights system and the opportunities it offers to minority communities. The results of such assessment may vary depending on the class of target beneficiaries analyzed, *viz* minority communities themselves, on one hand, and staff of NGOs working with the communities, on the other. From the standpoint of the communities, the level of rights awareness is still very low, and understandably so. Some of the communities were being introduced to the concept of human rights for the first time. Although they understood their problems, they could not link solutions to these with human rights. Yet the workings of the African regional and international mechanisms and the opportunities they offer are too complex for them to understand.

4.5 In an interview with some members of the Batwa community in Kabale in Uganda, the evaluator noticed that the idea of human rights had not been adequately grasped. This notwithstanding, there was evidence that the trainings had been carried out and the foundation had been laid for future activities to entrench the idea

of human rights. AICM has, for instance, helped the communities set up advocacy committees charged with the responsibility of advocating for the rights of communities. Additionally, there is evidence of rights awareness among the Endorois community leaders who had participated in the trainings and attended the hearing of the Endorois case before the ACHPR.

4.6 The biggest beneficiaries in the project as far as rights awareness and the workings of the African regional and international system are concerned are the staff members of NGOs involved in the project as indirect partners. While not all staff members from particular organisations attended the training and seminars, there is evidence that those who attended passed on some of the knowledge and resources they had obtained from the trainings. At AICM, for instance, in-house seminars were arranged at which the staff member who attended the trainings lectured others on human rights and passed on documents that had been obtained at the training. Something similar was done at MOSOP.

5 Equity

5.1 While the promotion of gender equity was never set as a purpose of the project, it can be deduced from the overall goal of the project, which included enabling of minorities challenge inequality. The project proposal also provides evidence of the intention to amongst others use the project to advance gender equality. It was, for instance, the intention of the project to ensure that women constitute 50 percent of the participants at the training. It was also noted that there are cultural and societal traditions that continue to deny women their own voice, space and can sustain double discrimination, which is an issue within minority communities. Additionally, one of the criteria used to identify partners for the project was to select organisations that were committed to working on gender and double discrimination issues.

5.2 As a matter of fact, however, gender balance was never realised in the project activities. The training and seminars, for instance, were dominated by men arising, among others, from the small number of female applicants, which greatly limited the pool of women from which participants could be drawn. Yet even within the substantive topics forming part of the training and seminar discussions, the issue of gender imbalance and double discrimination of women within minority communities did not get the prominence it deserves. Indeed, even the training manual developed as a resource for the training does not highlight this issue. At the second seminar held in Kampala on the right to development, the presentation on minority and gender was not as comprehensive as one would have expected it to be.

5.3 Nonetheless, the issue features in some advocacy projects, especially those carried out among the Endorois of Kenya and Akweya of Nigeria. The advocacy amongst the Endorois has drawn women into taking part in the struggle for their rights and assuming positions of responsibility. With regard to the Akweya, while the advocacy in this area was around the issue of language, the lead activist from Civil Liberties Organisation was able to identify the marginalisation of women in the community as a big problem. In this respect, he managed to advocate for the

inclusion of women in the community leadership, which resulted in the creation of a position to be filled by a woman on the Akpa Community Development Association executive committee, a community advocacy group. Among the Batwa of Kabale, women make up 50 percent of the advocacy committees elected under the direction of AICM. Additionally, one of the advocacy briefs authored by CEMIRIDE covered the issue of pastoralist women's political participation in Kenya.

5.4 The project focused on the rights and socio-economic needs of excluded groups being part of either ethnic, religious or language minorities, who were to be empowered to fight for their rights through the regional international mechanisms. To realise this goal, one of the intervention logics was the building of capacity of representatives of minority and indigenous groups to engage the mechanisms. While these representatives were drawn mainly from civil society organisations working on minority issues, a good number of them were by ethnicity or language minorities themselves and members of the target communities. Examples of these include a Touarege from Mali (Ag Aly), an Akweya from Nigeria (Ahola Ejembi), an Endorois from Kenya (Charles Kamuren), and an Ogoni from Nigeria (Young Kigbara). The fact that most of these persons were already engaged in civil society advocacy made it relatively easy to educate them on the workings of the regional and international human rights mechanisms. Some of these individuals also took on very important roles in the implementation of the national advocacy projects within their countries.

6 Efficiency

Project management and financial system

6.1 The success of the project was to an extent anchored on the successful functioning of the partnership arrangements. The positioning and experience of each of the partners provided a valuable contribution in the implementation of the project. MRG has been working on minority and indigenous peoples' issues for quite some time and has at its disposal immense expertise on the subject. On its part, CEMIRIDE has been working on minority issues in Africa for quite some time and at the inception of the project already had contact with a number of minority communities. Since the project was targeting the African human rights mechanism, the positioning of ACDHRS could not have been better. ACDHRS is located in The Gambia, the seat of the ACHPR and has worked with the ACHPR and other AU mechanisms for quite some time. It has a rich experience in human rights education and training and has over time built and consolidated an NGO Forum which meets two times every year prior to the ordinary sessions of the ACHPR. The ACDHRS has worked very closely with the ACHPR and other AU structures and is well placed to advocate for minority rights within this forum.

6.2 The various indirect partners also made a very big contribution, their positioning gives them very close proximity to the minority communities, beneficiaries of the project. Yet, as already illustrated, some staff members of the indirect partners were themselves members of the minority communities. Some of the organisations have worked long enough with the minority communities to earn their trust. The evaluator got evidence of this when he visited the Batwa in the company of staff

members of AICM. The indirect partners were able to execute advocacy projects resulting in tangible outcomes. By way of example, in addition to being beneficiaries of the project as trainees, whose capacity in terms of understanding the regional and international mechanism was built, some members themselves became tools of further advocacy and conduits of transmitting knowledge to their organisations and communities. Indeed, some of the trainees have carried on with the advocacy even after the end of the project. Ahola Ejembi, for instance, continues to participate in the activities of the Akpa Community Development Association. Charles Kamuren has also continued to advocate for the rights of the Endorois, so has Ag Aly with regard to the Touareg.

6.3 As a matter of fact, the direct partnership developed problems at the very beginning of the project and did not work as well as had been anticipated. While there was agreement that the partners were to participate in the project equitably, this did not materialise. There was a problem of power imbalances in the administration of the project arising first from the fact that MRG had secured the bigger percentage of the project funding. While the available evidence suggests that all partners participated in the conception of the project, the participation of CEMIRIDE and ACDHRS was very minimal because of disagreements within the partnership. In the end, there was a feeling on the part of the other partners that MRG over-dominating the project. On its part, MRG was struggling to save the project and see to it that the activities are implemented. . This arose from the fact that it is MRG was that was in contact with DFID, the biggest funder of the project and as already mentioned,MRG solely raised 85 percent of the funds; CEMIRIDE was to contribute only 15 percent, while ACDHRS did not make any financial contribution. In spite of the fact that the project proposal had indicated that the project was to be executed in partnership, DFID never advanced the funding to the partners but solely to MRG, the latter alone having the obligation to account to DFID. Yet the impression ACHDRS and CEMIRIDE had at the stage of conception and planning of the project was that funding would be raised as joint funding and would therefore be administered as such. The feeling after the funds had been advanced was that MRG was over-dominating the funds. MRG on its part was apprehensive of any misuse of funds and failure to account to DFID. In such a situation, power imbalances and suspicion were inevitable. This was made worse by the failure on the part of CEMERIDE to disburse its financial contribution and the absence of openness and transparency on this matter on the part of both CEMIRIDE and TROCAIRE, which was to fund CEMIRIDE.

6.4 Clause 10.1 in the partnership agreement never took effect, by this clause all partners assumed reporting obligation with respect to narrative and financial reports submitted to the funder. Each partner was to prepare a report which would be commented on by the other partners before being forwarded to the funder by the lead agency. This arrangement never materialised and any attempts to implement the clause would have been bogged down by the communication problems encountered in the project as discussed in the next paragraph.

6.5 The functioning of the direct partnership was adversely affected by the poor communication between the partners. Failure to respond or respond in a timely

manner to correspondence made it hard to reach decisions and execute activities in timely manner. The communication problem also worsened the power imbalance and tensions between the partners as MRG on some occasions had to make the decisions in situations where it was thought that the project had to be saved. This was, however, viewed as deliberate domineering on the part of MRG and an assertion that MRG actually “owned” the project.

6.6 A number of problems were also encountered in dealing with the indirect partners. MRG had to review its relationship with some of the indirect partners. This was mainly because such partners had defaulted on the financial accountability terms forming part of the funding agreement. Examples of this include the partner in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). It is for this reason that outstanding balances of the funding approved for some partners were diverted to other organisations.

6.7 The other problem encountered with regard to the indirect partners was the failure on the part of the project to build partnerships in some countries, especially for the purposes of the advocacy activities. This failure was caused by the absence of information on potential partners in some countries, especially in those countries where no responses had been received on the training or advocacy projects calls. Some countries were deliberately excluded because of language problems. North Africa, where Arabic is the main medium of communication falls in this category. The effect of not reaching some countries is that it greatly limited the impact of the project and compromised the target of reaching at least 20 African countries. Indirect partnerships were not built in some very crucial countries, especially in Southern Africa, where the problem of violation of minority rights is prevalent. Respondents to calls from that region were not working in relevant areas of work for the project’s objectives. In some countries, because of communication problems, contact with potential partners was lost and it seems that there was no effective follow-up.

6.8 The financial system was the most negatively affected aspect of the project. MRG has in place a financial system, which it applied to the project with one of the requirements being that all monies advanced to the partners have to be accounted for and as far as possible, relevant receipts provided. Financial reports were to be submitted to MRG in this regard. As a matter of fact, some partners did not follow this rule, which, as mentioned above, is the reason why MRG had to review its relationship with some of these partners. The direct partners, CEMIRIDE and ACDHRS, were themselves not perfect in this regard as both appear not to have submitted their annual audited financial accounts to MRG.

6.9 The biggest problem encountered with regard to finances, and one which almost ripped the project apart, was the failure on the part of CEMIRIDE to meet its undertaking to contribute 15 percent towards the project funds in the way that was initially agreed. The undertaking made by CEMIRIDE during the planning of the project was that it would secure the match funds from TROCAIRE. Some of these funds were to be transferred to ACDHRS to cover for some of its overheads and staffing costs, while others were to meet the costs of some of the project activities. While the partnership agreement was not very clear on the funding responsibilities of

each of the partners, in the meeting held in March 2006 in Nairobi, where all the partners were present, it was agreed that the TROCAIRE funding would be used to cover the partner overhead and staffing costs and the breakdown indicated by year. The minutes of that meeting were treated as part of the project documentation, supplementing the budget.

6.10 Indeed, CEMIRIDE does not deny undertaking to provide the funds. As a matter of fact, however, CEMIRIDE did not provide these funds fully in accordance with what was agreed. There was some activity costs which they covered, as well as the personnel costs for Cemiride, but not for ACDHRS. In terms that lack clarity and full of contradictions, CEMIRIDE piles the blame with regard to the failure to provide the funds on MRG. CEMIRIDE has defended itself by arguing that TROCAIRE does not fund activities in West Africa, which is the reason CEMIRIDE could not transfer funds to ACDHRS. CEMIRIDE argues that MRG should have known this. What is puzzling, however, is that CEMIRIDE was opposed to MRG having any direct contact with TROCAIRE and yet there is no evidence that CEMIRIDE ever communicated TROCAIRE's mandate to MRG. What is even more puzzling is that at the same time, CEMIRIDE kept on promising to transfer funds to the ACDHRS and claimed at one stage to have transferred £2000 but which bounced back.

6.11 In the meeting of partners held in Pretoria in 2007, attended by MRG and CEMIRIDE (represented by Korir Singoei the then Executive Director of CEMIRIDE), CEMIRIDE indicated that the failure to transfer money to the ACDHRS was because of delays on the part of TROCAIRE to transfer a second tranche of funds due to CEMIRIDE. However, Korir indicated that even in the absence of the second tranche, CEMIRIDE would transfer at least £6000 to ACDHRS. But this was never done.

6.12 In the evaluator's opinion, one of two things might have happened with regard to the TROCAIRE funds. The first is that CEMIRIDE committed itself to contribute to the funds of the project without understanding TROCAIRE's funding mandate and seeking approval for its move. The second thing is that CEMIRIDE deliberately reneged on its commitment to contribute to the project. One thing that remains certain, however, is that CEMIRIDE was never transparent as regards the funds. Yet the fact that TROCAIRE does not fund projects in West Africa was not a big problem as a TROCAIRE funds could have been switched for Eastern Africa activities and funds meant for these activities allocated to the ACDHRS. This, however, could only have been done if there was clear information on the mandate of TROCAIRE at the beginning of the project.

6.13 The TROCAIRE funding fracas greatly affected the partnership relationship and created tensions that negatively impacted on the implementation of some of the project activities. As a result of not receiving funds in time to cover some overheads and staff costs, ACDHRS never fully participated in the project as had been anticipated. ACDHRS appears to have been disenchanted by the manner in which CEMIRIDE tossed it around. Yet, even when MRG provided ACDHRS with supplementary funding, partner relations did not improve and ACDHRS never fully came on board as had been anticipated when MRG executed 'the rescue plan.'

Involvement of beneficiaries

6.14 The ultimate beneficiaries of this project were African minorities and indigenous peoples. The goal was to enable these people challenge inequality and improve the realisation of their rights. However, there was also what one would describe as “secondary beneficiaries”. This comprises of organisations working with minority communities and who were targeted as indirect partners. To enable these organisations assist minorities better, their capacity to use the regional and international system had to be enhanced. It is also important to re-emphasise the fact that some of the staff members of the organisations targeted were themselves members of the minority groups, which made them ultimate beneficiaries. There is evidence of involvement of all these beneficiaries in the project. The bulk of the participants at the training session comprised of members of organisations working with minorities. Persons from these groups were facilitated to attend sessions of the ACHPR; some even participated in such international events as the World Social Forum in Nairobi and sessions of the UN Human Rights Council in Geneva and the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Peoples’ Issues in New York.

6.15 In May 2007, the project facilitated the participation of 5 representatives of minority and indigenous communities to attend the 41st session of the African Commission and in November 2007 two representatives were facilitated to attend the 42nd session of the Commission. There is also evidence of the involvement of the ultimate beneficiaries. Examples of these include the formation of advocacy committees amongst the Batwa, the participation of representatives of the Endorios Welfare Council at the ACHPR sessions, and the participation of a member of a Sukwa and Ndali minority community in Malawi in a radio talk-show advocating for the building of a road in the area.

6.16 The positive impact of the involvement of the beneficiaries above was three fold: First it created a sense of ownership of the project and self-consciousness with regard to human rights violations in some communities. Secondly, the participation worked directly towards sustainability of the project as some representatives effectively passed on to their communities/organisations the knowledge they had acquired. Evidence of this was found among the Endorios and the Batwa during the visits and was detected in interviews with Ag Aly from Mali and Young Kigbara of MOSOP from Nigeria. Lastly, the involvement of organisations, as indirect partners and facilitating their advocacy projects, built their capacity as regards the functioning and opportunities offered by the regional and international human rights systems.

Identification and management of risks

6.17 At the inception of the project, a number of risks were identified and responses to them stated. The identified risks included: participants at trainings not putting their learning to practice; division within communities because of perceptions that some organisations are being privileged; and harassment of minority representatives on return home. None of these risks proved real, on the contrary, it is unidentified risks that materialised and actually threatened the implementation of the project. The unidentified risks included partnership relations being strained and communication problems arising. The success of the project was strongly hinged on

the partnership arrangements, both direct and indirect. Yet, owing to the distance between the partners, communication was crucial. Due to some of the factors identified above, including the financial arrangements, the relationship between the direct partners was strained. However, this risk was managed; MRG had to assume some of the tasks assigned to other partners and execute them.

6.18 With regard to the indirect partners the unidentified risk which became real was the failure of many indirect partners to report promptly and in accordance particularly with MRG's financial regulations. This problem arose as a result of the fact that some indirect partners had not handled donor funds before and did not have the capacity to report as required by MRG. At the same time there could have been instances of sheer neglect of the reporting requirements. MRG's response to this problem was to withhold second tranche fund transfers and ultimately to divert this to other similar projects after numerous follow up attempts with the partners in question proved futile. What minimised this response though was the fact that the second tranche funds constituted only 20 percent of the approved funds. If the failure to properly account for the 80 percent meant that the funds had been used ineffectively, this means that a big proportion of the funds advanced to the defaulting partners went to waste.

6.19 The unidentified risk of non-communication became very real from the inception of the project as can be seen from partners not making an input into the partnership agreement when called upon to do so. This unhealthy practice continued and was raised at every partners meeting but without any positive changes being registered. All means adopted by MRG to sustain communication between the partners did not yield much. What MRG then did, in the interest of making progress with the project's implementation, was to singularly make some of the decisions that should have been made in plurality, something which strained the partner relationship further.

7 Effectiveness

7.1 The effectiveness of the project is examined by looking at each of the intended outcomes and the extent to which they were realised.

Output 1

Minorities become more aware of relevant African and international standards and are confident and able to advocate with reference to them and put the increased knowledge, skills and confidence into practice

7.2 In the log-frame, the objectively verifiable indicator for the achievement of this output is 80 percent of the training participants (at least 16, 6 being women) reporting increased knowledge, skills and/or confidence to articulate their rights at relevant fora. Another indicator identified is advocacy projects being organised that pass knowledge, skills and/or confidence from the trainees to others in their

communities (at least 16 x 60 projects, 6 being women). This is in addition to 80 percent of the trainees reporting increased advocacy 6 months after the training.

7.3 One major hitch encountered during the training was the failure to finalise the training manual in time for use and distribution at the training. The production of the manual was delayed; the consultant hired to author the manual did not respect the time deadlines agreed on. This denied the trainees and the resource persons a resource from which they could draw from.

7.4 The extension of the training to at least 6 women was never achieved, the reasons that explain this, including the fact that the majority of the applicants for the trainings were men, are detailed above. Nonetheless, when assessed at the level of knowledge and skills being passed on by the trainees to members of their communities and organisations, the picture begins to change. The same could be said in respect of some of the national advocacy projects executed. Though male participation remains dominant, there is evidence of increased participation of women in the trainings. For instance, out of 31 participants that attended the Niger Delta Minority Representatives Training organised by MOSOP in March 2007, 10 were women. In a similar manner, out of 21 members forming the various advocacy and lobbying committees formed among the Batwa by AICM after the trainings, 11, more than 50 percent, are women.

7.5 In spite of the gender imbalance and other logistical problems that were encountered, the training was very successful and greatly contributed to the realisation of output 1. Many of the participants had never been introduced to the workings and mechanism of the African human rights system. This is in addition to the opportunities offered at the international level. As a matter of fact, even individuals that were already working on issues of minorities and working with communities were ignorant about the workings and the opportunities offered by the systems referred to above. There is also strong evidence that more than 50 percent of the participants were able to pass on the knowledge they had obtained from the trainings either directly to the communities or indirectly through persons working with organisations that advocate for the rights of minority communities. Evidence of this could be found in the internal trainings organised by organisations such as MOSOP and AICM and the advocacy project executed by the Endorios Welfare Council.

7.6 There is also evidence that the trainees are now more confident to advocate for the rights of minorities. This confidence has been bolstered by the skills the trainees obtained and their exposure to the international and regional human rights mechanisms. Some of the trainees were given the opportunity to use the skills they acquired to advocate for minority rights before the regional and international bodies such as the UN Human Rights Council and the ACHPR.

7.7 The available evidence, however, suggests a varied impact as far as becoming more aware of the relevant African and international standards are concerned. Understandably, the level of awareness among members the communities is very low. This, among others, is because of the high levels of illiteracy prevalent in these communities, yet they were being introduced to the

subject of human rights for the first-time. In spite of this, there is evidence of awareness that minorities are entitled to protection and the enjoyment of certain rights. In Kabale, an interview with a key political decision-maker, the vice chairperson of the District Council, revealed that due to the sensitisation created by AICM among the Batwa, though still in very small numbers, Batwa people are beginning to approach the district political authorities to demand for their rights. There was also evidence that the Batwa in Kabale are beginning to take interest in participating in local political decision making structures including local council meetings.

7.8 Nonetheless, the level of confidence among the communities to advocate for their rights is still very low. The reasons that explain this are various, most important is the fact that minority communities have been victims of exclusion for quite some time and are faced with a number of structural obstacles that hamper their recovery. In this context, it takes time to create a sense of confidence to enable such peoples to advocate for their rights; this is a slow process that cannot be accomplished in a three year project. What is crucial, however, is that the project has laid a foundation that could be built on to create such confidence. It has created awareness and improved the skills of members of organisations working with these communities. Yet, as already observed, some of the persons that were targeted by the training and other subsequent activities, were themselves members of the minority communities. Indeed, most of these persons and their organisations have indicated a desire to continue with advocacy work and to pass on the skills and build the confidence of the communities.

Output 2

African decision makers are more aware of, and have a clearer understanding of relevant African and international standards as they relate to minorities (thus creating an environment where minority advocacy is listened to and not automatically discounted)

7.8 The verifiable indicators for this output was attendees at the ACHPR joint seminars and recipients of advocacy briefs reporting increased awareness and understanding of the relevant standards. What can be deduced from the log-frame and proposal is that the decision makers targeted with respect to this output included members of the ACHPR and government officials from various countries.

7.9 The realisation of this output was at the very on-set compromised by the failure to organise joint seminars with the ACHPR. This resulted from unwillingness on the part of the Commission to be involved in hosting the seminars, precipitated by a prejudice against, resistance to, or a lack of awareness still on minority rights issues. Further more, as a new issue, it will find itself competing for prioritisation with others for the attention of the heavily under-resourced and still politically influenced, Commission The Commission appeared content with the fact that it was already working with a Working Group on Indigenous and Tribal peoples. From this, one would conclude that members of the ACHPR were never reached.

7.10 A closer examination, however, reveals that at least one Commissioner was reached, and through her, others were remotely reached. The impact in the latter respect though was very limited. Commissioner Angelo Melo, the Vice-Chairperson of the ACPHR, attended the Pretoria seminar in March 2008; the attendance of other Commissioners could not be secured due to their unresponsiveness. The key objective of this seminar, which attracted participants from over 15 African countries, was to bring together representatives of ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities in Africa and other key role players to explore the legal and policy dilemmas raised by the recognition of minority rights in Africa. Commissioner Melo was very co-operative and described the seminar as a “mind-opener”. She undertook to lobby her fellow Commissioners to take the issue of minority rights seriously.

7.11 Indeed, during the 43rd Ordinary Session of the ACHPR, as is evidenced in the 24th Activity Report of the Commission, Commissioner Melo reported to other Commissioners that she had attended the seminar; she conveyed the suggestion from the seminar that a minority forum be established. It should be noted, however, that without effective follow up the report by Commissioner Melo may not achieve anything substantive. As a matter of fact, Commissioner Melo’s report as recorded in the Activity Report, if not followed up on will, remain mere rhetoric and the product of a perfunctory procedure of the Commission.

7.12 Within the states, while the impact of the project as far as decision-makers’ awareness is concerned may appear minimal, there is evidence that processes that could inform decision-makers have been kick-started. Yet there is also evidence of some decision-makers who have been sensitised on the relevant standards with regard to the rights of minorities. The Pretoria Seminar was for instance attended by a Member of Parliament from Uganda, who was also at the time the chairperson of the Equal Opportunities Committee of Parliament. This Member of Parliament has expressed her appreciation to the project because of the exposure the seminar gave her. According to her, her knowledge on the African system was greatly enhanced and the literature distributed at the seminar has been a source of knowledge.

7.13 The Kampala Seminar was attended by a senior public servant in Uganda; this was the Director of Social Protection in the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development. In Nigeria, the advocacy work was extended to legislators forming the various committees on human rights in the legislatures of the states of Rivers, Bayelsa and Akwa Ibom. In Kabale the advocacy activities involved members of the local governments, right up to the smallest local government unit, the village local council. Interviews with both the staffs involved in the advocacy activities and some leaders provides evidence that to some extent, as limited as it may appear, an environment has been created where minority rights advocacy is listened to and not automatically discounted. In Kabale, for instance, a sub-county security officer was involved in the advocacy activities and has continued to advocate for the rights of the Batwa in the county.

Output 3

- 2 African decision makers are more aware of the rights of minority communities and the extent and damage of current inequalities and instances where international standards are not met (thus creating an environment where minority advocacy is

7.14 The objectively verifiable indicator for this output as identified in the log-frame is attendees at the ACPHR seminars and recipients of advocacy briefs informally reporting increased awareness and understanding. The obstacles encountered, and the limited success achieved, in reaching members of the ACHPR are enumerated above. Attempts to reach decision makers in other key AU structures such as NEPAD were also largely unsuccessful. Apart from the organisational problems encountered in executing the fact-finding mission to the AU and NEPAD, there was a lack of interest in minority rights issues at the level of these structures.

7.15 Nonetheless, some of the advocacy activities narrative reports and some of the interviews conducted for purposes of this evaluation provide evidence of increased awareness of the extent of damage of the equalities in some countries. All the advocacy activities examined for purposes of this evaluation had targeted some decision-makers in the form of legislators, government bureaucrats and political leaders. Though somewhat limited, there is also evidence that some key decision makers attended the Pretoria and Kampala seminars. In Nigeria, some legislators were reached and sensitised on the plight of minorities and the extent of violation of their rights.

7.16 In Malawi, EOW reports that the media coverage of the advocacy for the construction of the Chitipa-Karonga Road for the benefit of the marginalized Ndali and Sukwa communities caught the attention of government. According to the report, using the media, including live radio talk shows, EOW highlighted the negative impact that the failure of government to construct the Karonga road is having on the Ndali and Sukwa. EOW demonstrated that the failure of government constituted a violation of such human rights as the right to development, the right to equality and the right to take part in economic activity of one's choice. While EOW reports that the advocacy project had exerted pressure on government to begin serious work on the construction of the road, available evidence suggests that government had already entered into arrangements with contractors on the road before the media campaign. The delays that have been experienced in the construction of the road are attributable to a political decision by the government of Malawi to sever ties with Taiwan, which was funding the road construction, and to embrace mainland China. In my evaluation, while the advocacy project created awareness on the benefits of the road and the human rights issues involved, the decision by government to construct the road cannot be attributed to the project. The project has, however, highlighted and informed decision makers of the damage delays to complete the road would have on the Ndali and Sukwa communities.

7.17 The evaluator observed that output 3 had largely been achieved with respect to the Batwa in Kabale. This conclusion is based on the evaluator's observations when he visited the area and interviewed the AICM advocacy team, members of the Batwa communities and some local leaders. The methodology adopted by AICM to implement the advocacy campaign was very effective. AICM conducted a study and advocacy which was chronologically linked at three levels: (i) a baseline study of the status and level of enjoyment/violation of Batwa rights; (ii)

participatory rural appraisal, which brought together stakeholders to verify the findings of the baseline survey; and (iii) the participatory community action plan, which was a dissemination of the findings and means of devising responses in a participatory manner involving various stakeholders. Local leaders were tagged to all these processes, which created awareness of the extent of the damage of inequalities suffered by the Batwa. Innovatively, the project also tagged along non-Batwa communities among which the Batwa live. Resulting from the awareness, the District Council has put the Batwa on its agenda and made a number of decisions for the benefit of this group, these include considering the needs of the Batwa in the District budget, allocating the Batwa land and, through the District Land Board, allocating land and processing land titles for some Batwa communities.

8 Impact

8.1 In spite of some of the obstacles encountered in the implementation of the project, the project has made an impact in the area of minority rights in Africa. While there could be some weak links that need to be strengthened, the project has developed a network of advocates of minority people's rights in Africa. This was achieved mainly through working with the indirect partners and convening events such as seminars and training sessions where the different indirect partners met and discussed common issues in their cause of advancing minority communities. Organising the training around the NGO Forum prior to the session of the ACHPR created a wide pool from which networks could be built. The project also brought together members of minority communities from different parts of Africa, which enabled the sharing of experiences leading to the realisation that all minorities in Africa face the same problems and that the struggle for the advancement of minority rights is a global cause anchored on global standards.

8.2 Within the ACHPR, while the concept of minority rights has not attracted much attention, the project has precipitated voices advocating for these rights before the Commission. Use of the NGO Forum created an immediate impact as far as creating voices of advocacy is concerned. The NGO Forum holds a meeting, which is also sometimes a training session, on the sidelines of, and immediately before, every ordinary sessions of the ACHPR. The forum meeting usually ends a day before the ACHPR opens and members of the forum immediately apply the knowledge acquired in the Forum for advocacy at the public session of the Commission session. For the trainees under the project, this provided them with a perfect opportunity to test and apply the knowledge acquired in the training. Some of the trainees made statements before the Commission and have been inspired to apply for Observer Status to enable them engage the Commission on a continuous basis. Although unsubstantiated, the report to the Commission by Commissioner Melo of the need to establish a minority people's forum in Africa has, though seemingly remote, put the issue of minority rights on the table of the ACHPR.

8.3 The project contributed to most of the core Civil Society Challenge Fund (CSCF) areas including building capacity of Southern civil society to engage in local and national decision-making processes, global advocacy and raising awareness of entitlements and rights. As already indicated, a number of members of civil society

advocates were introduced to the regional and international human rights system and the relevant standards on minority rights in this regard. In addition to the trainings, the capacity of the indirect partners was built through the advocacy activities they executed, which also allowed them to reach out to a number of decision-makers and engage the processes. AICM, for instance, engaged (and continues to engage) the District Local Council, while MOSOP and Civil Liberties Organisation engaged some state legislatures in Nigeria. In Malawi, EOW engaged decision-makers at the national level on the issue of construction of the road. Newspaper clippings from Malawi show that the advocacy on the construction of the road induced responses from the National Road Authority.

8.4 As far as global advocacy is concerned, the project through MRG joined hands with other organisations in lobbying for the establishment of the UN Forum for Minorities. The lobbying was successful and ended on 27 September 2007 with the establishment of the Forum. MRG also joined such organisations as the International Movement Against all Forms of Discrimination and Asian Legal Resource Centre in lobbying for the renewal of the mandate of the UN Independent Expert on Minority Issues. Project partners have also agreed to lobby for the establishment of an African Forum for Minorities. MOSOP has reported that the network resulting from the advocacy project has grown to engage in other advocacy activities. The network is, for instance, sending some its members to Geneva to attend the 10th Session of the Human Rights Council (HRC) at which Nigeria will be reviewed under the HRC Universal Periodic Review.

Target group and beneficiaries

8.5 The project's ultimate target is members of minority communities. In this respect, the project reached the Batwa of Kabale in Uganda, the Endorios of Lake Bogoria in Kenya, the Ogoni of the Niger Delta in Nigeria, the Akweya of Benue state in Nigeria and the Ndali and Sukwa of Malawi. The advocacy activities executed in all these locations were intended to highlight the nature of violations the communities face and to instill the confidence requisite for the communities to advocate for their rights. The impact of the project on these communities may at the moment seem minimal. In spite of this, the project has laid a foundation which can be built on to enable minority communities in Africa advocate for their rights.

8.6 In addition to minority communities, the project also targeted members of civil societies working on minority issues and key decision-makers both at the national and regional level. The intended coverage was 20 African countries, African regional structures including the ACHPR and NEPAD. This is in addition to UN structures including the HRC. As a matter of fact, the project in some respects failed to attain its intended coverage, while in other respects it did. For purposes of advocacy, the project failed to build partnerships and have projects executed in all the intended 20 countries. The reasons which explain this have already been alluded to. Only 6 countries benefitted from the advocacy grants with a total of ten projects being executed; the countries include: Uganda (2 projects), Kenya (2 projects), Nigeria (2 projects), DRC (1 project), Cameroon (2 projects) and Malawi (1 project).

8.7 The training attracted 26 participants, above the intended range of 20 – 25 participants. However, the 26 participants came from only 12 countries which included 5 of the countries where advocacy projects were later executed. Indeed, the training constituted a pool from which beneficiaries for other subsequent activities could be drawn, to give them an opportunity to use the skills imparted to them at the training back at home. Nonetheless, the seminars brought on board additional countries; the Pretoria seminar, for instance, brought on board 8 countries not covered either in the training or advocacy activities. The new countries included Lesotho, Senegal, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Malawi, Somalia, Djibouti and Mozambique. The Pretoria seminar also extended coverage to crucial Southern African countries that had not been reached by the project such as South Africa, Botswana, Lesotho and Mozambique.

8.8 It has been indicated that the ACHPR was only remotely reached through Commissioner Melo and yet the fact-finding process on NEPAD and the AU did not yield any tangible results, key decision-makers in this process were not reached. Nonetheless, some success was scored with regard to reaching decision-makers at domestic levels. Evidence of this has already been illustrated above with regard to decision-makers being reached in Uganda, Nigeria and Malawi. The Pretoria and Kampala seminar attracted a Member of Parliament from Uganda, Hon. Julia Bintu Lukumu. The Kampala seminar was also attended by Mr. Beekunda George, the Director of Social Protection in the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD). The most successful engagement with decision-makers, as already illustrated, was in Kabale in Uganda where local government leaders were reached by the advocacy project executed by AICM.

8.9 In addition to the above, while it may be too early to assess their impact, publications of the project, including the advocacy briefs and thematic reports, have been published and distributed to a variety of persons. The distribution list includes government departments, UN agencies working on minority rights issues, donors, international institutions, journalists, NGOs and academics. While no feedback has been received on any of the publications, it is hoped that with such a wide readership the publications will have an impact. One limitation though is that the publications have not been translated in French and other the African languages as had been anticipated. The evaluator saw only one advocacy brief that has been translated into Swahili. The project managers have, however, given an assurance that the translation process is underway.

9 Sustainability

9.1 While some benefits of the project appear to have a prospect of being sustained after the funding stops, others need more funding to be sustained. The most visibly self-sustainable benefit of the project is the capacity that was built from the training of representatives of minority communities. The trainees acquired knowledge on the standards applicable to minorities and were exposed to the workings of the international and regional human rights systems and the opportunities they offer. From interviews with selected trainees, there is no doubt

that the knowledge acquired will be used in a sustainable manner. Indeed, there is evidence that the training has already had a multiplier effect; some trainees have passed on the knowledge they acquired to members of their organisations and members of local networks. The training has also resulted in a network of minority rights advocates on the continent. As loose as this network may appear at the moment, it has great potential if supported. The NGO Forum run by the ACDHRS provides the most appropriate forum for strengthening this network. Indeed, the ACDHRS has indicated that it has maintained contact with some of the trainees and has plans of involving them in future activities, including participation in the NGO Forum.

9.2 The publications of the project will also be a constant supply of knowledge on minority issues even when no further funding is provided. In addition, some of the benefits resulting from international advocacy have a prospect of being sustained. An example of this is the success in joining other organisations in advocating for the establishment of the UN Forum for Minorities. This Forum, under the auspices of the UN, has established itself as an important forum for putting to the fore issues around the rights of minorities. This notwithstanding, it may be necessary to ensure a continuous participation of representatives of minorities in this Forum, which may require funding. Such continued participation will ensure that the needs of minorities in Africa continue as a subject of international discussion before the Forum in the presence of representatives of African communities. This will put minority communities and their representatives forward as primary stakeholders in the issues discussed at the Forum.

9.3 The 10 IT grants have also enabled beneficiary organisations to improve their ICT infrastructure. Computers were purchased for some organisations and although all of them are not connected to the internet some are. This has improved the research and communication capacity of some organisations. CEMIRIDE, for instance, reports that the laptops purchased using the grants have made research and communication more convenient especially whenever a member of staff is travelling.

9.4 Benefits that need further advocacy and hence further funding for sustainability include putting minority rights issues on the agenda of the ACHPR and other AU structures. As already mentioned, minority issues, including the formation of an African forum for minorities, were put on the agenda of the ACHPR only remotely and without further advocacy will fall away. There is also no evidence to suggest that minority communities are sufficiently aware of their rights and the international standards in this regard. Minority communities have also not attained the confidence requisite for them to advocate for their rights. As already observed, for instance, while advocacy committees have been formed among the Batwa in Kabale, the members of the committees have not properly grasped the concept of human rights, they also exhibited a lack of confidence to advocate for the rights of their communities. In Nigeria, as significant as the advocacy activities appear to have been, they were to a certain extent only a drop in the ocean. Further advocacy is needed around the language rights of the Akweya and to disseminate the Akweya alphabet developed by the project. With regard to the MOSOP Ogoni peoples'

project, further action is needed to reach all key decision-makers. While there was advocacy in various state legislatures this only reached the legislative human rights committees and not the whole house as had been planned. There is need for follow-up advocacy that would reach the various houses beyond the human rights committees.

9.5 Among the Endorios of Kenya, human rights education and advocacy work was rallied around the case the community has instituted against the Kenya government before the ACHPR. While the communication has been declared admissible, the Commission has not yet delivered its decision on the merits. There is need to enable the community follow-up on the case. Yet the decision when made in favour of the community should be used as a tool of further advocacy to instill confidence in the community to take further action to advocate for their rights. There will also be need for further advocacy around the implementation of the decision. Should the decision not be in favour of the community, stronger advocacy would still need to be undertaken on the implications of that decision as regards indigenous peoples' rights, not least in the context of reconciling it with other precedents set by the Commission.

9.6 The direct partnership had a potential for the creation of a network that would greatly contribute to the sustainability of the project and its outcomes. However, the network created by the direct partners stands on shaky ground because of the problems encountered in the management of the partnership. The lack of proper communication and joint management of most of the activities and evaluation of the project made it impossible for the direct partners to build a sustainable bond.

9.7 There was also a potential of building networks and initiate collaboration with and among the indirect partners. Indeed, as already observed, through working with the indirect partners, the project has created a network of advocates of minority rights in Africa. It is around this network that advocacy for the establishment of an African forum for minorities, and the forum itself when established, could be built. There are, however, a few weak links that need to be strengthened to concretise this network. The network is not built around any concrete activity with a specific goal and purpose on which members can collaborate. Without effective follow-up and a clear and committed leadership, networks of this nature tend to fade away without accomplishing anything concrete. Rallying advocacy around the Forum could strengthen this link.

10 Replicability

10.1 In addition to replicating the project in other regions of the world, the project could be replicated in regions in Africa which were either not covered at all or given inadequate coverage. Northern Africa and Southern Africa immediately come to mind; while the former was not covered at all, the later was given inadequate coverage. The most innovative aspect of the project design that could be replicated is working in partnership with other organisations and in a manner that establishes the two levels of partnership: direct and indirect. However, for the direct partnership

to work well and to realise the desired outcomes, it would have to be designed in a manner that gives all partners equal rights and responsibilities and creates a sense of genuine joint-ownership. The second level partnership in the form of indirect partners is replicable as it creates allies in the national advocacy projects and brings on board organisations that are close enough to the communities to earn their trust. Indeed, some of the indirect partners on the project were organisations formed by minority communities themselves. The second level partnership in addition spreads out the surface of coverage of the project and acts as a safety-net when management problems are encountered at the first level of partnership as was the case in this project.

10.2 Another innovative aspect of the project that could be replicated is the direct involvement of representatives of minority communities who are themselves members of the minority communities. These are usually persons who have real life experiences of marginalisation and a clear understanding of the problems their communities face. Their involvement in addition to creating a sense of ownership of the project makes the transfer of knowledge much faster than when it is done through intermediary persons emotionally detached from the communities. It also contributes a great deal to sustainability as such representatives could more easily make advocacy for the rights of their communities a life-time project. Additionally, the involvement of such persons makes it easier for international and regional structures to have a direct interface with marginalised communities. This is what happened, for instance, when Ag Aly, a Touarege from Mali, attended a session of the UN Human Rights in Geneva and had opportunity to personally relate the problems of his people to the UN Independent Expert on minority issues.

11 Lessons learned

Project level lessons

11.1 Even with the thousands of minority communities living on the African continent, the AU structures, including the ACHPR, are still far from accepting the notion of minority rights. The ACHPR appears to be fixed on the recognition of the rights of indigenous and tribal peoples, a process which is still in its evolution. This notwithstanding, there is room for advocacy that would persuade the AU structures to take seriously minority rights and issues, which, however, requires continuous and consistent advocacy.

11.2 The best way of taking advocacy and human rights education to minority communities is through indirect partners as the intermediaries. The indirect partners, as was used in the project, are very close to the communities, speak the language and understand the ways of the community and have earned their trust. The transmission is even more effective if the indirect partners are individuals that are part of the communities or organisations formed from among members of the communities.

11.3 Working with indirect partners requires close supervision and monitoring to ensure that activities are executed and funds applied appropriately. A lot of time has

to be committed to monitoring and keeping the communication channels open. Monitoring and supervision based on written reports submitted by the indirect partners may not be very effective. There is need for on-sight monitoring through field visits and actual involvement, though in a peripheral manner, in the activities of the partners.

11.4 A project with a continental focus, though limited to as little as 20 countries, without a proper monitoring, evaluation and follow-up mechanism may turn out to be too ambitious. The process of monitoring and evaluation must be planned very carefully and executed in a timely manner.

11.5 Human rights training intended to build the capacity of advocates of human rights is very effective. The training usually attracts persons who do not begin from a zero level of information as they will always have some knowledge of the nature of the problem they are dealing with. However it is vital that nominating organisations select relevant staff members, in order to achieve this. Otherwise it could be a wasted and lost opportunity. This proved to be one of the challenges of the training event, where some of the participants were detached from the issues and so had a low level of interest in the event.

11.6 MRG should think very seriously about trying to design longer programmes when trying to tackle instances of entrenched inequality and discrimination as these can rarely be solved in three years.

Sector and developmental lessons

11.7 One of the lessons learned is that projects executed jointly through a partnership need very careful management of the partnership in order to create a sense of joint ownership and commitment to the activities of the project. Where there is acrimony between the partners, a lot of time that would have otherwise been spent on the project activities will be spent on managing the partnership. MRG was able to respond to save the project from collapsing under the weight of the partnership problems. MRG monitored some of the activities that should have been monitored by the other partners and took decisions in cases of unresponsiveness on the part of the other partners.

11.8 Joint ownership of a project if not matched with joint funding responsibilities has the potential of creating a hollow-partnership. Where one partner contributes all the funds or a big proportion thereof, as was the case in this project, power imbalances and suspicion may arise. This is especially so where an impression has been created that the funds being sought are joint funds yet after funds have been secured only one partner becomes accountable to the donor agency.

11.9 On-going evaluation of a project can be as important as the activities of the project. The evaluation processes should be properly planned and evaluation meetings including major decisions properly documented. The process should be given adequate time and not held on the sidelines of project activities when people are worried about other issues such as missing flights to go back home. Planning

and evaluation meetings should be attended consistently by persons with knowledge of the project and in a position to bind their organisations.

11.9 Where project funds are to be obtained from two different donor sources, it is important that evidence of commitment to the project of each donor is obtained at the project planning stage before the project commences. There is also need for transparency at every level in dealing with the respective donors.

12 Information, dissemination and networking

12.1 The project publications including the thematic reports, training manual and advocacy briefs have been disseminated both in electronic and hard form. The recipients include governments, NGOs and international organisations. One limitation though is that some of the documents have not been translated into local and other languages as had been anticipated. With regard to networking, the project has created international, regional and local networks as has already been illustrated.

13 Recommendations

13.1 There is need for follow-up on the successful outcomes of the project if these are to be sustained and their benefits multiplied. The capacity built in the training should not be left to go to waste; there is need to involve the trainees in additional international, regional, and domestic advocacy, research and other activities with relevance to minority rights issues.

13.2 The African regional human rights system, in spite of its old age, has been a slow evolving system requiring a lot of consistency and persistence to put issues on its agenda. It is therefore necessary to continue to advocate for minority rights before the ACHPR and other AU structures in a persistent and consistent manner. What the project has done is to lay the foundation for such further advocacy and in this respect has been very successful.

13.3 There is need to sustain the outcomes realised from some of the national advocacy projects and to continue working with the indirect partners that performed very well. To avoid the monitoring problems which were encountered, the project needs to be spread thin as far as national advocacy is concerned. Projects should be implemented in a few countries and spread out in a gradual and carefully planned manner. The countries where national advocacy could be sustained include Uganda, Nigeria and Kenya.

13.4 There has not been an irretrievable break-down in the partnership arrangement. All the partners appreciate the importance of the project and the problems that were encountered in the management of the partnership. The partners could still be brought together in a carefully managed genuine partnership to work jointly on sustaining some of the outcomes of the project. This would require funding

responsibilities to be set out with precision and with funds being raised jointly and jointly managed.

13.5 Partnership projects between Northern and Southern organisations need careful management because of their sensitivity arising from a perception in the South that Northern NGOs are over-domineering because of their international status and easy access to donor agencies. DFID needs to appreciate its positioning and the fact that it has a very important role to play in changing this perception. DFID could also play a role in ensuring that joint projects have genuine partnerships. This could be done by involving all the partners in the fundraising processes and ensuring that there is joint reporting and accountability for the funds.

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Claire Thomas, Deputy Director, MRG
Paile Chabane, International Human Rights Officer – Africa, MRG
Yobo Rutin, Executive Director, CEMIRIDE
Geoffery Omwando, Finance & Administration Officer, CEMIRIDE
Hannah Fosrter, Executive Director, ACDHRS
Adama Cooper, ACDHRS
Wilson Kipkazi, Secretary, Endorios Welfare Council
Geofrey Kipkuto, Vice Secretary, Endorios Welfare Council
Charles Kamuren, Chairperson, Endorios Welfare Council
Timothy Twikirize, Executive Director, AICM
Richard Turyamwesimira, Programme Coordinator, AICM
Young Kigbara, Programme Officer, MOSOP
Ag Aly, activist and member Touarege community in Mali
Ahola Ejembi, Project Coordinator, Civil Liberties, Nigeria
Silver Bauma Kabale District Council Vice-Chairperson
Jalia Bintu Honourable Member of Parliament, Uganda (until recently the chairperson of the Equal Opportunities Committee of the Parliament of Uganda).
Dr. George Mukundi, Consultant on Project and author of thematic report
Kabahoze, Gombolola Internal Security Officer, Bufundi county, Kabale

Generous Hope, Member of Batwa Community Kabale
Rwegymere Jackson, Member of Batwa Community,
Bitarabeho Christopher, Member of Advocacy Committee, Batwa Community
Kabale.