



## **Metagora Progress Report**

**- as at 15 October 2004 -**

### **Executive Summary**

The PARIS21 pilot project Metagora (Measuring Democracy, Human Rights and Governance) started on the 1<sup>st</sup> of February 2004 with a 24 month budget of €2,25 millions financed by the European Commission, France, Sweden and Switzerland. From February to April 2004 the staff of the Metagora Co-ordination Team (MCT) was hired or seconded and joined the PARIS21 Secretariat. In the course of the last 9 months:

- six Partnership Agreements between the OECD and Metagora Partner Implementing Organizations (PIOs) were signed and the related funds were transferred to these;
- MCT carried out 19 missions in the project's various target countries and organized 63 missions of experts (including missions of technical assistance and experts meetings);
- MCT organized and serviced five meetings (one joint Metagora/GOVNET, two of the Metagora Partners Group, one of the Task Force on Pilot Surveys, one of the Steering Committee of Donors), and one international workshop on "Governance, Democracy and Fighting against Poverty", held in Bamako, was co-organized with IRD and DIAL (France).
- PIOs organized two large workshops with stakeholders (Palestine and Philippines), several consultation meetings with key stakeholders (Mexico), a presentation of on-going work to stakeholders (Sri Lanka), and two meetings of the Andean Community's Group of NSI's Experts in Statistics on Democratic Participation and Governance, all attended by MCT;
- the design of the pilot surveys on human rights issues (Mexico, Philippines and South Africa) was achieved; advancement of work was characterized by close interaction and mutual review of survey plans and questionnaires between the national implementing teams; data was collected in Mexico and will imminently be collected in the two other countries;
- the implementation of the multi-country activity on household surveys on democracy and governance in francophone Africa and the Andean Community progressed significantly, deepening the analysis of the data related to the African countries, producing very relevant results in Peru, processing data collected in Ecuador and starting data collection in Bolivia;
- the coding and processing of NGOs data on political and ethnical violence in Sri Lanka advanced successfully; the activity is now entering into the analysis and inter-reliability phases and first outcomes will be presented on 7 December;
- after consultation of the partners and experts, MCT launched an international survey on initiatives aiming at measuring and assessing governance, democracy and human rights and is now starting to analyze the responses to the questionnaire;
- conceptual frameworks, working methods and task teams were established in view of further design and draft of the project's expected final products (synthesis of results and formulation of global lessons, guidelines/recommendations on good practices, and training materials).

## 0. Introduction

Metagora is a pilot project focusing on methods, tools and frameworks for measuring democracy, human rights and governance. Based on innovative initiatives emerging from a North/South network, it aims at enhancing proper assessment methods. Its design is largely based on the operational conclusions of the international conference on Statistics, Development and Human Rights (Montreux, 4-8 September 2000), as well as on the results of subsequent consultations and workshops supported by the EC and Switzerland as a follow-up of that conference.

Metagora is implemented under the auspices of PARIS21, within the OECD. Its organizational link to the OECD's Development Co-operation Directorate (DCD) allows for synergies with OECD's Development Assistance Committee and its subsidiary bodies such as the DAC's Network on Governance (GOVNET).

Metagora intends to bring statistical analysis into the hearth of monitoring democracy, human rights and governance, and to promote proper matching of quantitative and qualitative approaches. It seeks to address needs for evidence-based policy-making, impact studies, aid delivery, empowerment of informed civil society and support to democratic dialogue, in particular in the context of distributive development.

Metagora's work is about:

- i) Identifying, documenting and making known current and recent work and initiatives in the field of measuring democracy, human rights and governance. The focus is laid on initiatives undertaken by national and local organizations;
- ii) Developing and enhancing methods and tools that allow for the obtainment of data and indicators upon which beneficiaries can formulate or evaluate policies promoting democracy, human rights and governance. Today, seven partner organizations are implementing or testing these approaches around the globe. Each of these co-ordinated pilot activities focuses on a specific theme and primarily aims at assessing elements of local policy implementation;
- iii) On the basis of the results of these activities, Metagora will provide outline guidelines on measuring, assessing and monitoring issues related to democracy, human rights and governance;

Metagora is policy-oriented in scope, multidisciplinary in approach, inclusive and participatory in method. The originality of Metagora in comparison to other existing international initiatives and projects in the field of monitoring human rights and governance resides in its bottom-up approach to contribute to the development of internationally agreed indicators and related measurement methods: Metagora partners all work with tools and methods that are designed for a particular issue in a particular context; however, these tools will be assessed with in view of their capacity to produce policy-relevant results and will thus provide lessons that can be applied in other situations elsewhere in the world.

The 24-month budget of Metagora amounts at €2.25 million and is financed by voluntary contributions of the EC (European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights), France, Sweden and Switzerland.

The present Metagora Progress Report, submitted to the PARIS21 Steering Committee, covers the first 9 months of the project implementation, from 1<sup>st</sup> of February to 30<sup>th</sup> of October 2004.

## **1. Installation of MCT within the PARIS21 Secretariat**

With the signature of the contribution agreement between the EC and the OECD on 23 December 2003 the whole Metagora financial scheme was completed and the OECD/DCD was therefore able to recruit the staff of the MCT. From February to April 2004, the following recruited or seconded persons joined the team, within the PARIS21 Secretariat:

- Mrs. Monica Lawrence (American), as project assistant;
- Mrs. Brigitte Julé-Demarne (French), as budget officer (post shared at 50% with PARIS21);
- Mr. Thomas Heimgartner (Swiss), as consultant, seconded by Switzerland;
- Mrs. Sylvie Walter (French), as project officer;
- Mr. Raul Suarez de Miguel (Swiss and Mexican), as general co-ordinator of the project.

The MCT was therefore installed on the premises of the OECD Secretariat in Paris (La Défense). Furniture and equipment were purchased in due time and OECD allocated to MCT the working space foreseen in the budget. The working environment is excellent.

## **2. Metagora Partnership Agreements between the OECD and the Partner Implementing Organizations (PIOs)**

The first and most urgent task of MCT was to draft and submit to PIOs a proposal for Partnership Agreement with the OECD. This required a close and intensive collaboration between MCT and OECD financial and legal services. Although the possibility to conclude “partnership agreements” with third parties is explicitly contemplated in the OECD regulations, nevertheless until the present year there was neither a precedent, nor specific guidelines for drafting such kind of legal instrument. Thus for the OECD Secretariat the foreseen Metagora Partnership Agreement was a “première” and its possible content and form merited sound examination. Particular attention was paid to reflect in the agreement the nature and consequences of a true partnership, in particular in terms of delegation and sharing of responsibilities, as well as in relation to specific issues such as shared intellectual property.

MCT used part of its launching missions in the field to discuss with PIOs and with their legal advisors on the content of the partnership agreements as well as on the related budgets. In the course of these discussions PIOs showed a strong commitment to overcome numerous problems, making tangible efforts to match their internal regulations and procedures with the terms of the proposed agreement. Finally the Executive Director of the OECD signed Partnership Agreements with the heads of the following PIOs:

- Développement et insertion internationale, DIAL, Paris;
- Fundar, Centro de Análisis e investigación, Mexico City;
- Human Science Research Council of South Africa, Pretoria;
- Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics, Albireh/Ramallah;
- Philippines National Commission on Human Rights, Manila;
- Secretaría General de la Comunidad Andina, Lima.

On this basis, OECD transferred to PIOs a first instalment of the funds required for the implementation of their respective Metagora activities. An agreement with the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS, Washington) will be signed at a later stage, as this organization will be involved in the Metagora activity in the field of human rights and governance indicators which detailed targets and schedule are still to be defined.

## **3. Missions carried out by MCT staff**

Following its mandate, MCT staff carried out 19 missions mainly to discuss with PIOs and local expert teams the working plans of each activity, to attend consultations with stakeholders and, when needed, to provide support to specific actions. The dates, destinations and objectives of these missions were:

- 20-24 January 2004: LIMA, in company of Mr. Francois Roubaud and Mr. Javier Herrera (DIAL, France), to attend a meeting of the Andean Community's Group of NSI's Experts in Statistics on Democratic Participation and Governance, in which the general framework and implementation plan of the Metagora activity in the region were adopted;
- 2-5 March 2004: NEW YORK, to attend the 35<sup>th</sup> session of the UN Statistical Commission and inform its members on the launching of Metagora, as well as to meet with Prof. Herbert Spirer (Columbia University) and with several representatives of national statistical institutes and international organisations;
- 8-12 March 2004: MEXICO CITY, to meet with the Chairman of Fundar, with his staff and associated experts, as well as with the EC delegation in Mexico City, and with the representative of the UN-HCHR.
- 3-8 April 2004: MANILA, to meet with the Chairperson and the Board of the Commission for Human Rights (CHR), to attend a joint CHR / National Statistical Co-ordination Board meeting (concluded with the signature of an agreement between both institutions on the implementation of Metagora in the Philippines) as well as to meet with the Secretary General of NSCB, with his staff and experts from other national statistical bodies for reviewing the technical plans and expected products of the activity, and for drawing up a detailed working schedule.
- 14-15 April 2004: GENEVA, to attend the 60th session of the UN Commission for Human Rights (discussion of item 18 of the agenda on "the effective functioning of human rights mechanisms") and to meet with experts of UN-HCHR.
- 9-13 May 2004: RAMALLAH and JERUSALEM, in company of Mr. Romesh Silva (Benetech, USA), to attend a Metagora consultative workshop with Palestinian stakeholders (30 representatives of non-governmental and academic organisations); to meet with the acting President of PCBS and his staff, as well as to hold short information meetings with the EC delegation in Jerusalem and with the SDC liaison office for Gaza and the West Bank.
- 24-26 May 2004: MEXICO CITY, in company of Mr. Jan Robert Suesser (ADETEF, France), to attend a consultative meeting between the Chairman and staff of Fundar and selected stakeholders (NGOs and Academia); to work with the local team of experts on the design of the pilot survey on ill-treatment, and to meet with the Chairman of the Commission for Human Rights of the Federal District (Mexico City).
- 27-28 May 2004: QUITO, to meet with the Andean Community's Secretariat to finalise the partnership agreement with the OECD, and to attend a meeting of the Andean Community's Committee of National Chief Statisticians in which half a day was devoted to discuss issues related to the launching of the Metagora activity in each country and in the region as a whole.
- 30 May – 2 June 2004: LA PAZ, to meet with the local team in charge of the implementation of the Metagora activity at the National Statistical Institute of Bolivia for discussing working schedule of the activity and coordination issues.
- 2-3 June 2004: LIMA, to meet with the Andean Community's General Secretariat for discussing particular issues related to the co-ordination between the Secretariat, the national statistical institutes, DIAL and the Metagora Co-ordination Team.
- 3-5 June 2004: CARACAS, to meet with the local team in charge of the implementation of the Metagora activity at the National Statistical Institute of Colombia for discussing the local working schedule and the coordination of the activity.
- 2-9 June 2004: MANILA and BAGUIO, to attend a large Metagora consultative workshop with representatives of indigenous people organised in Baguio by the Commission on Human Rights (CHR); to meet with the Chairman of the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP); to attend a high level meeting between CHR, NCIP and NSCB aiming at establishing an inter-agency Metagora co-ordination mechanism; to work with the Chair and staff of CHR on the draft Metagora

partnership agreement with the OECD and on the related working plan and budget; and to hold a short information meeting in the Embassy of Switzerland.

- 11-12 June 2004: BAMAKO, in company of Mr. Nicolas Meunier, Mrs Marie Wolkers (Transparency International), Mrs. Mireille Razafridrakoto, Mr. François Roubaud and Mr. Jean-Pierre Cling (DIAL), to attend a joint Metagora / IRD International Workshop on “Governance, Democracy and Fighting against Poverty”, aiming at comparing three different measurement approaches that are currently being applied in francophone Africa, with special emphasis on the case of Mali (see below, 4.c).
- 12-16 July 2004: PRETORIA, in company of Mr. Jan Robert Suesser (ADETEF, France) and Mrs. Jana Asher (StatAid, USA), to discuss with the Metagora team of the Human Sciences Research Council the implementation of the planned activities in South Africa, as well as to attend and service a meeting of the Metagora Task Team on Pilot Surveys (see below, 4.d).
- 13-18 September 2004: COLOMBO, in company of Mr. Patrick Ball, Mr. Romesh Silva and Mr. Miguel Cruz (Benetech, USA), to meet with the NGOs members of the Human Rights Accountability Coalition, with the local teams in charge of the collection and coding of data on politic and ethnic violence as well as with the Asia Foundation and the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) to discuss advancement of the pilot activity in Sri Lanka.
- 23-24 September 2004: BOGOTA, in company of Mr. Guillermo Lecaros (Secretariat of the Andean Community) and Mr. Javier Herrera (DIAL), to meet with experts and management of the National Statistical Institute of Colombia, to discuss project focus, plans and schedule in this country.
- 27-28 September 2004: CARACAS, in company of Mr. Javier Herrera (DIAL), to meet with experts and management of the National Statistical Institute of Venezuela, to discuss project focus, plans and schedule in this country.
- 18-22 October 2004: MANILA, to meet with the heads of CHR, NSCB, NSO and NCIP, as well as with the inter-agency Metagora team of experts to review progress of the activity in the Philippines.
- 27-29 October 2004: QUITO, in company of Mr. François Roubaud and Mr. Javier Herrera (DIAL), to attend a meeting of the Andean Community’s Group of NSI’s Experts in Statistics on Democratic Participation and Governance that reviewed progress of the Metagora activity in the region.

#### 4. Meetings and Workshop

At today’s date, MCT organised five meetings and co-organised one workshop:

- a) 24 March 2004: a **joint Metagora/GOVNET meeting** was held in Paris. It was attended by representatives of PIOs, Metagora associated experts, delegates of many OECD countries (representatives of national co-operation agencies and international organizations involved in the CAD Network for Governance, GOVNET), as well as by several experts and senior staff of the OECD Secretariat (DCD and Development Centre). Dr. Mark Orkin (CEO, Human Science Research Council of South Africa) delivered a speech on the Metagora objectives and Mrs. Nancy Hidalgo (National Statistical Institute of Peru), in collaboration with Mr. François Roubaud (DIAL), presented first results of on-going work in measuring governance and democratic participation through regular national household survey carried out by the NSI of Peru. Many GOVNET members expressed interest in Metagora and requested to receive regular information on the project’s implementation.
- b) 24-26 March 2004: the **first meeting of the Metagora Partners Group (MPG)** was held in Paris. It was chaired by Dr. Mark Orkin (South Africa) and Mr. Jan Robert Suesser (France) and gathered together representatives of PIOs and Metagora associated experts (28 persons). The meeting aimed at allowing all partners to:
  - know the persons involved in the “core forces” of the project (PIOs, MCT, experts);
  - contribute to build up team spirit and develop interaction and cross-fertilization;

- be informed of the rules, procedures and communication tools of the project;
- inform each other of preparatory and/or implementing steps taken by PIOs or MCT;
- confirm the commitment to the Metagora objectives;
- review the targets and profile of Metagora activities and update the work program;
- identify PIOs' specific needs for scientific/technical support and plan related missions;
- fix deadlines and agree on a consolidated project schedule.

The meeting included: i) plenary sessions to define general orientations; ii) task teams to examine particular issues and propose decisions; iii) a final plenary session to agree on decisions and draw-up a consolidated project schedule. Discussions were lively, dense, focused and outcome-oriented. Most of Metagora planned activities were examined in depth. A whole day was dedicated to present and discuss the focus, targets and method of each activity. This led the group to examine concrete problems (i.e., sampling approach of targeted populations), to comment on feasibility of PIOs plans and to identify specific needs for technical support and mutual exchanges. The group formulated suggestions to improve the profile, the technical approach, the policy incidence and the participatory process of each activity. The group agreed that mutual exchanges, cross-fertilization, and full commitment of all partners in the synthesis are essential prerequisites to ensure that the project reaches its global objectives as a whole (and not as a simple collection of single activities). The final session was concluded with an agreement on a detailed schedule of meetings and missions of technical assistance for the first 12 months of operations. This schedule is being periodically updated.

- c) 29 April 2004: the **first meeting of the Metagora Steering Committee of Donors (MSCD)** was held in Paris. It was chaired by Mr. Timothy Clarke (Head of unit, EuropeAid, EC) and attended by representatives of the EC, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France, the Swiss Development and Co-operation Agency and the Swiss Ministry of Foreign Affairs. MSCD discussed a draft inception note submitted by MCT that presented first steps taken within the project, informed on the status of donor's contributions and explained the changes that were introduced in the working plan and budget, due to the changing situation between the date of submission of the requests for grant addressed to the donors (October 2002) and the date of effective starting of operations (February 2004). MSCD congratulated MCT for the work carried out in the launching phase of the project and formulated important critical remarks and suggestions both on the form and on the content of the draft inception note. MSCD requested MCT to reformulate in particular the working plans for the implementation of the activity on governance indicators and to review the profiles, roles and membership of the foreseen working structures. As a follow up of this meeting, consultations with PIOs, associated experts and OECD Secretariat allowed MCT to clarify a number of issues and to redefine the nature and role of the working structures (see below, 11).
- d) 11-12 June 2004: an **international workshop on "Governance, Democracy and Fighting against Poverty"**, was held in Bamako, co-organised by Metagora, DIAL and IRD (France). The workshop, attended by 15 leading experts (including five Metagora associated experts) aimed at comparing the results and methods of three different survey-based tools that are being used in Africa to measure democracy and governance: the Afrobarometer (carried out twice during the past five years in 12 African countries); the UNECA survey (carried out continually in 14 African countries) and households surveys based on the 1-2-3 method (carried out by national statistical institutes in the capital cities of 7 African countries with the technical assistance of DIAL). As working documents, the attendants received in advance the results and methodological notes of the three surveys in Mali. During the workshop each survey approach was presented by a senior expert and the results in different areas (access to public service, legitimacy of political representatives, corruption, etc.) were subject to comparative analysis. Discrepancies in the results served as a starting point for methodological discussions, thus leading to identify convergent and divergent aspects of the survey approaches as well as to assess the advantages and disadvantages of these. The workshop was followed by a public conference-debate in which the results of the Malian case were discussed in a wider audience (some 150 stakeholders, including policy-makers, development experts and representatives of the civil society).

With this workshop Metagora made effective and tangible its expected role as “catalyst of a process of dialogue and comparative assessment of methods for measuring governance” (as defined in the project’s Terms of Reference). Indeed, thanks to this joint Metagora/IRD initiative, for the first time the African experts and institutions currently involved in measurement of democracy and governance gathered together in an atmosphere of mutual interest and transparency on the used methods and tools, and started a serious discussion on proper measurement methods. The technical conclusions of the workshop, together with the orientations emerging from the policy-oriented dialogue with the stakeholders, clearly confirmed the consistency and relevance of the Metagora approach and provided substantial lessons that should be further deepened in view of the expected project’s results (in particular the formulation of guidelines and final recommendations). Also, considering the success and promising outcomes of this workshop, MCT is considering the possibility of organising a similar workshop focusing on measuring tools in Latin-America that could be organised in spring 2005, back-to-back to a regular meeting of the Andean Community’s Group of NSI’s Experts in Statistics on Democratic Participation and Governance.

- e) 14-15 July 2004: a **meeting of the Metagora Task Force on Pilot Surveys** was held in Pretoria, hosted by the Human Sciences Research Council of South Africa (HSRC). It was chaired by Mrs. Maxine Reitzes (South Africa) and attended by 11 experts. As part of the interaction and cross-fertilisation processes that are inherent to Metagora, the meeting aimed at gathering together coordinators and leading experts from the national teams that are carrying out the Metagora pilot surveys on human rights issues in Mexico (survey on ill-treatment), the Philippines (survey on the rights of indigenous people) and South Africa (survey on the human rights dimensions of the national program of land restitution). In the three cases the survey-based approach to measure human rights issues aims at assessing specific key national policies and includes large participatory processes allowing stakeholders to be involved in the definition of the issues to be tackled as well as in the formulation of the hypothesis to be verified through the surveys. Although the characteristics, size and distribution of the targeted populations are quite different in the three countries, the planned pilot surveys present a number of common conceptual, methodological and technical problems. The meeting therefore allowed experts to have a lively exchange of experiences and to discuss both the various specific challenges of each survey and the common problems. The more substantive and successful part of the meeting consisted in an in-depth mutual review of survey plans and draft questionnaires. As a concrete outcome, in the course of the weeks following the meeting the national teams produced substantive working papers and pre-final versions of the questionnaires that were submitted for discussion to the MPG.
- f) 23-25 August 2004: the **second MPG meeting** was held in Paris. It was chaired by Mrs. Purificacion Valera Quisumbing (Chair of CHR, Philippines) and Mr. Jan-Robert Suesser (Director, ADETEF, France). It gathered 29 persons including representatives of PIOs and national Metagora teams, as well as experts involved at different entitlements in the implementation of the project. Representatives of EC and DAC-GOVNET Secretariat attended part of the meeting. A true gender balance within the MPG was reached as 50% of the attendants to the meeting were senior expert women. The meeting was originally scheduled to be held on early July but was postponed to allow PIOs and experts to finalize and deliver to MCT the working documents related to the advancement of the various project’s activities. The main objectives and outcomes of this meeting were:
- i) to review the advancement of each specific pilot activity, with particular emphasis on those that were imminently going to start key field operations such as data collection. An important part of the meeting was therefore devoted to examine in-depth the focus, targets, methods and questionnaires of the pilot surveys on human right issues in Mexico, the Philippines and South Africa. Partners were also informed on the advancement of the activities in Palestine and Sri-Lanka and benefited from a substantive presentation of the history, characteristics and achievements of the statistical projects on measuring human rights violations that are being conducted since the early 90s by the Human Rights Data Analysis Group (HRDAG, a team of statisticians formerly working within the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program that is now part of Benetech, an American non-profit organization). The HRDAG projects include surveys based on probability samples in Kosovo, Sierra Leone and East

Timor; qualitative statement studies based on convenience samples in El Salvador, Haiti, Guatemala, South Africa, Kosovo, Peru, Sierra Leone, East Timor, Colombia and Sri Lanka; as well as “found data projects” based on data originally collected for various non-statistical purposes that was adapted for statistical analysis of human rights violations in El Salvador, Haiti, Guatemala, Kosovo, Chad, East Timor, Colombia and Sri Lanka (this last within Metagora). The lessons of these experiences should not only inform the present Metagora activities, but should also be duly reflected in the project’s final products and in particular in the guidelines and recommendations on good practices, the training materials and the global synthesis.

ii) The MPG meeting aimed also at ensuring that the various project’s activities are coherently interlinking and moving towards the common project’s goals. The discussions showed that at this stage, and beyond the interest of specific topics and targets of each single activity, the implementation of the whole project is firmly oriented towards the formulation of global lessons and relevant guidelines. This was particularly evident when the MPG discussed on the framework, method of work and tentative schedule for the production of the training materials, the presentation of preliminary results and the expected content of intermediary synthesis report (to be delivered by end of March 2005).

iii) The MPG was requested to formulate preliminary proposals in view of the preparation of an inter-agency meeting aiming at starting the work on the platform for adoption of internationally agreed indicators of governance. A brainstorming within a task force and then a discussion in plenary allowed partners to formulate a number of key issues and, what was unexpected, also a recommendation to fill a common small set of governance indicators in all analysis and reports of the pilot activities.

iv) Finally, the meeting allowed partners to agree on a working schedule for the next months. Deadlines were fixed for delivery of reports of PIOs and experts in view for the subsequent collective work of intermediary synthesis. A couple of missions of technical assistance were scheduled (in Palestine and the Philippines) but, as at the dates of the meeting PIOs were under huge pressure to carry out collection and processing of data, it was decided to wait that these processes be more advanced before scheduling exchange missions between partners. Nevertheless, as it is essential that cross-fertilization process between the partners advances and deepens further, MCT was requested to overview the advancement of the activities and, as soon as it would be possible, to submit to PIOs a proposal and schedule for exchange missions.

## **5. Pilot Surveys on Human Rights Issues**

The pilot surveys on human right issues aim at developing and testing survey-based measurement methods that could considerably improve and enhance proper assessment of human rights implementation. The three countries where this type of activity is being implemented (Mexico, the Philippines and South Africa) appear quite different when considering their particular cultures, historical backgrounds, economic performances or social environments; nevertheless they present some common features that are of relevance. In particular they have solid institutional, scientific and technical capacities to carry out and further expand a challenging complex pilot experience such as these Metagora surveys (that is a precondition for further national sustainable development, replication and extension of the foreseen measurement approach). Moreover in the course of the last decade the three countries embarked in vigorous democratization processes, but they are still today confronted to numerous human rights issues inherited from past regimes. Also in the three cases, enhancement of human rights monitoring mechanisms is generally considered as an important contribution to the consolidation of the democratization process. Thus in these countries the implementation of Metagora activities was welcomed not only by stakeholders from the civil society and the academic circles, but also by public authorities. And this was not an “attitude de façade”: in the three countries, Metagora activities are being proactively supported by public agencies and human rights institutions. In each of the three countries, it was decided to relate the pilot survey to a specific issue of major public concern and the analysis of the data collected will be anchored to the assessment of specific key policies.

This activity is in good progress as the design of the pilot surveys was achieved in the three countries; data was collected in Mexico and will imminently be collected in the two other countries (in the course of November and December 2004). Advancement of work was characterized, in each country, by effective inclusive multidisciplinary dialogue and large participatory processes involving all relevant actors and stakeholders; and, between the three national implementing teams, by close interaction and mutual review of survey plans and questionnaires – in other terms, by a fruitful cross-fertilization process.

**a) The pilot survey in Mexico** focuses on all forms of ill-treatment of persons by police bodies, “Ministerio Publico” and jail personnel in the Federal District (Mexico City). Its main objective is to build an evidence-based tool to detect and measure ill-treatment – and thus to enhance assessment and regular evaluation of the justice procurement process. It targets a strong policy incidence as the expected outcomes of this activity should not only complement and enrich the human rights diagnosis and monitoring instruments established within the framework of the National Human Rights Program, but they should also provide governmental authorities, heads of police bodies and human rights institutions with specific evidence-based analysis that inform policy measures, management of human resources, design of training programs and formulation of clear guidelines on the use of force by police bodies. In the words of the Chairman of the Commission for Human Rights of the Federal District (CHR-FD), “Metagora should contribute, through the information and analysis provided by this pilot survey, to enhance policy-making aiming at dignifying the role of the police as institution and strengthening the professional profile of police agents”.

In order to identify the main assumptions and expectations of the stakeholders with regard to the survey, Fundar conducted a consultation process including an informal meeting with a small group of key stakeholders (NGOs), a bilateral consultation with a major institutional independent stakeholder, the CHR-FD, as well as several consultations with selected experts in the fields of human rights, security issues and penal law. These consultations allowed to formulate and deepen five general assumptions:

i) in spite of the on-going firm democratic process in the country and of the commitment of public authorities to enhance the rule of law, ill-treatment is still a frequent and common behavior of members of police bodies. Although cases of torture are still being reported to the human rights institutions nevertheless all concerned actors consider that the number and frequency of these cases have considerably decreased over the past decade. However behavior of police agents appears to be erratic (“if they cannot find the criminal, they grab anyone”) and often characterized by arbitrary and sometimes brutal practices including intimidation, threats, as well as harsh verbal and physical treatment.

ii) such a behavior materializes in numerous forms of infringement of law and violation of human rights, as it extends (hopefully with decreasing recurrence and intensity) from minor abuses of power (misinformation, insults, etc.) to more severe practices such as corruption or extortion (very common), and even to huge violations such as illegal detention, brutal use of force and also degrading or inhuman practices. The harsher and more generalized patterns of ill-treatment would be found in retention centres;

iii) there is today a risk that such a behavior continues and even expands within the context of steps taken by public authorities to reinforce fight against criminality as a response to the big concern of the population of Mexico City with growing insecurity;

iv) in this context, police agents are generally considered as poor people, both in economic and educational terms. They lack respect and support on behalf of the society as much as they lack professional training, appropriate equipment and clear guidelines, in particular concerning the use of force. Also, citizens are confused by the complexity and opacity of the police and security system, as there are no less than 11 police forces in the Federal District and very few people can clearly distinguish their respective agents, roles and powers;

v) real size, trend and distribution of the phenomena of ill-treatment are still unknown as there is a general lack of reliable official data on this matter and information of other sources (such as the

registers and statistics of complains addressed to the National and Federal District's Commissions on Human Rights) does not allow to draw up proper estimates.

As the survey should cover all possible patterns of ill-treatment, it was essential to identify the various situations and circumstances in which ill-treatment by members of police bodies typically occurs, as well as the general profile of the actors. Thus the expert's team conducted by Fundar draw a basic grid of patterns of contact between the people and the public security forces, as well as a thematic guide to address the issue of ill-treatment. This thematic guide was then tested through in-depth narrative interviews of 23 selected actors, including six police officers belonging to three different security forces and seventeen victims of different forms of ill-treatment or abuse. This group of victims included persons who are or have been in prison, persons who were unduly processed, persons who for different reasons had to deal with agents of the "Ministerio Público", persons who were subject to arbitrary detention, forced eviction and police extortion, as well as a couple of teenagers victims of police extortion. These interviews provided extensive factual and contextual information that allowed the team of experts not only to refine the conceptualization of ill-treatment in all its aspects, but also to spot situations with high potential for ill-treatment, to identify circumstances of ill-treatment that experts had not taken into account until then, to detect terminology used in investigation-arrest scenarios and to gather a rich material allowing the team to draft the survey questionnaire on the strongest possible basis.

A questionnaire was drafted, discussed by different groups of Mexican experts and submitted to discussion to the Metagora Task Force on Pilot Surveys in July 2004. The questionnaire was then substantially reviewed taking into account the indications emerging from the mutual review of questionnaires with the Philippine and South African teams and finally it was presented to MPG in August 2004 and then finalized and tested in the field with 150 households. This test led to refine the structure and wording of the questions as well as to improve the instructions to the interviewers. Then the collection of data was carried out with a random sample of 7000 households. First results and preliminary analysis will be available by end of January 2005.

- b) The pilot survey in the Philippines** focuses on the effective implementation of human rights of indigenous people. It consists on a small but incisive survey in three northern regions of the country with a high concentration of indigenous people (Ilocos, Cagayan Valley and Cordillera). This survey will be complemented with a qualitative study focusing on the situation of indigenous people in Mindanao, a region of the South. The activity is therefore developing towards objectives that are much more ambitious than those originally contemplated in the Metagora general Terms of Reference. It aims at setting solid foundations for building an evidence-based assessment tool. The activity is being carried out through an impressive participatory process under the authoritative leadership of the Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines (CHR) and with strong support of two major national institutions: the National Statistical Co-ordination Board (NSCB) and the National Commission on Indigenous People (NCIP), which are both proactively committed to enhance national statistical and analytical capacities. NSCB is providing statistical expertness and coordinates the contribution of other official statistical agencies to the implementation of the survey (in particular the National Statistical Office and the Centre for Statistical Research and Training), while NCIP is supporting the process of consultation of indigenous people and provides substantive advice on the issues to be raised through the survey. Moreover, the Metagora national implementing team is supported by a consultative group including representatives of indigenous people and experts from NGOs, governmental institutions and the academia.

The expected policy incidence of the pilot survey is important, as the national policy at stake in this activity is the implementation of the "Indigenous People Rights Act" (IPRA), entered into force in 1997 to address the marginalization and powerlessness of the communities of indigenous people (estimated today at one sixth of the national population of the Philippines). This act intends to redress a historical injustice against indigenous people, whose rights, cultural identity and ancestral lands were alienated by means of application of the feudal *jura regalia* by the Spanish Crown and also, *de facto*, by their successors, the American colonial government, and thereafter, the Philippine Republic. For the first time, IPRA settles the rights of indigenous people and establishes bases for a proactive

public policy including implementing mechanisms and the allocation of appropriate funds. IPRA recognizes and promotes in particular:

- the rights of indigenous people to ancestral domains and lands;
- the right to self-governance;
- economic and social rights; and
- cultural integrity (including indigenous culture, traditions and institutions).

These different elements are closely interrelated and all refer to the essential concept of indigenous people's ownership of their ancestral domains that embraces not only agricultural lands, but also all natural resources found therein. Such an ownership is not private but community property which belongs to all generations and therefore cannot be sold, disposed or destroyed. As for today, indigenous people's claims for ancestral domains totalize 5.2 millions of hectares thus representing 17.5% of the total land area of the country. In this context, NCIP, the government agency responsible for the implementation of IPRA, plays the role of a policy making body with quasi-judicial powers. It not only delineates and titles ancestral domains and lands, but also promotes sustainable development plans and enhances indigenous people's consultative mechanisms and bodies at the provincial, regional and national level.

The activity started with consultations and experts meetings aiming at defining a general conceptual framework, based on four main criteria:

- i) the rights-based approach to governance and democracy issues;
- ii) the close interrelation between human rights / governance / democracy issues affecting indigenous people;
- iii) the need for interpreting the universality of human rights standards with regard to the specific indigenous people's cultural context; and
- iv) the assessing orientation of the survey, that should observe and measure if and how norms (IPRA and human rights international standards) are effectively implemented.

Following the bottom-up approach of Metagora, and in order to ensure that stakeholders be closely involved in the selection of the issues to be tackled by the pilot survey, CHR organized a large consultation workshop in Baguio on 4 June 2004, gathering some 40 representatives of indigenous people's communities of the North of Philippines. This consultation was followed by bi-lateral meetings with the leaders of the tribes concerned by the survey. On these occasions a large consensus emerged on a number of priority human rights issues, such as the right for ancestral land, respect for cultural integrity and fight against various forms of discrimination. It was then decided that these topics, along with some other important aspects (such as access to justice), should therefore be duly covered by the pilot survey.

The consultations also allowed to identify a number of problems that were duly considered in the survey plans. Among these, the Metagora national implementing team had to consider the fact that, as a constraint related to the specific cultural context, women and children can't be directly interviewed – and thus it had to find a solution to palliate to the expected bias within the survey. It is therefore foreseen that, in parallel to the implementation of the survey, qualitative complementary information will be collected in each community through “focus group discussions” involving, from the one side, communities' leaders and, from the other, women and children.

In order to define the geographic areas to be covered by the pilot survey, in each of the three northern regions of the country an ancestral domain was selected following three main criteria: the ancestral domain should be inhabited by one main tribe (thus guaranteeing common language and culture), it should be accessible and it should be located in an area where the survey can be conducted in safe conditions (that excludes the areas suffering from insecurity or endemic political violence). Selected areas and related target populations are:

- i) Municipality of Sugpun, Ilocos Sur (Bago tribe);

- ii) Municipality of Nagtipunan, Quirino (Bugkalot tribe);
- iii) Municipality of Kibungan, Benguet (Kankanaey tribe).

Within each tribe in each ancestral domain, strata of communities was created. A probability sample of 750 households was selected. The sampling frame was the list of indigenous persons based on actual occupants of ancestral domains issued with Certificate of Ancestral Domain Titles.

A draft questionnaire was deeply discussed with the consultative experts group and submitted to discussion to the Metagora Task Force on Pilot Surveys in July 2004. The questionnaire was substantially reviewed taking into account the indications emerging from the mutual review of questionnaires with the Mexican and South African teams and then it was presented to MPG. This questionnaire is being translated in the languages of the concerned indigenous people's communities and shall be imminently tested in view of ensuring its respondent-friendliness. Collection of data in the field will be carried out in the course of November and part of December 2004, with a total sample of 750 households. First results and preliminary analysis will be available by end of February 2005.

- c) The pilot survey in South Africa** focuses on the realization of democracy and human rights in the context of South Africa's land reform process. Its main objective is to develop a pilot tool to assess South Africa's land reform process from the perspective of good governance, participatory democracy, and realization of human rights. The activity, conducted by the Human Sciences Research Council of South-Africa (HSRC), consists in the design and test of a survey methodology that takes into account the diverse nature of the South African land question, and the particular needs of policy makers and civil society for evidence-based information about effective citizen's experiences, perceptions, attitudes and aspirations in respect of land. The expected policy incidence of this activity is obvious: it intends to contribute with evidence-based indicators and analysis to the development of a land reform policy based on principles, standards and effective people's expectations of democracy, realization of human rights and good governance.

Measuring respect for human rights and effectiveness of democratic process is of particular significance in South Africa, because prior to the first non-racial democratic elections in 1994, the apartheid state emphatically negated these principles in respect of the majority black population. The institutions and policies of post-apartheid South-Africa have therefore largely been involved by the imperative to deepen the non-racial system of governance and democracy, and established a human rights culture. However, even before the turning point of 1994, there was a common awareness that political transformation had to be complemented by economic and social transformation, in particular to redress the material deprivations and denial of opportunities experienced under apartheid. A clear expression of the inclusive nature of transformation was the 1993 framework document for ANC's Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP), which set out a broad plan of transformation that, inter alia, touched on all sectors of the economy, improved access to health care, education, etc.

One of the areas highlighted in the RDP framework document is land. Land ownership in South Africa has historically been a source of conflict and contention. Colonial and apartheid policies dispossessed millions of black South-Africans of their land and moved them into overcrowded and impoverished reserves, homelands and townships. It is estimated that more than 3.5 million people and their descendants have been victims of racially based dispossessions and forced removals during the years of segregation and apartheid. These racially based land policies were a cause of insecurity, landlessness, poverty and great hurt amongst black people, and also resulted in inefficient urban and rural land use patterns and a fragmented system of land administration. On the eve of the 1994 elections, blacks controlled only about 15% of non-public land, predominantly being the "homelands" and "coloured reserves". The RDP framework document therefore indicated that there should be land reform, and spelled out the main elements of that land reform. These elements, which were later provided for in the Constitution, are and remain:

- i) land restitution, involving the restoration of land or cash compensation to victims of forced removals;

- ii) land redistribution, through which people apply for grants with which to purchase land for farming and/or settlement; and
- iii) tenure reform, which seeks to improve the clarity and robustness of tenure rights, mainly for residents of former homeland areas.

The RDP framework document furthermore asserted that, “within five years the RDP will distribute 30% of the land through redistribution and restitution. In the event, since 1994 only around 1.5% - 2% of the land has been reallocated to Africans and coloureds through redistribution or restitution. Of the 65,000 restitution claims lodged with the Commission on the Restitution of Land Rights, roughly one third have been settled, but these have been disproportionately urban claims settled through cash compensation; the large, complex rural claims remain largely unresolved. Success with redistribution has been even more limited, not only in terms of the number of people helped or amount of land involved, but in the quality and nature of redistribution projects through which land is accessed. Frustrated with the poor instability of early redistribution projects, in 2001 a new flagship redistribution program was launched, called “Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development” (LRAD). This program represents a decisive move in the direction of promoting black commercial farmers as the main form of redistribution, the consequence being that much larger amounts of assistance are being made available to even smaller numbers of households. Tenure reform has perhaps been the most problematic of all the elements of land reform, with government struggling to develop a vision of what tenure reform should involve, especially in the light of resistance from traditional leaders who perceive tenure reform to be a threat.

One manifestation of this generally unsatisfactory performance of land reform (at least in relation to government’s own targets) is the ascendancy over the two past years of the Landless People’s Movement (LPM) as the main voice for black people wanting to see a completely different vision of land reform. The LPM motto is “Landlessness = Racism. End Racism! Give Us Our Land Now!”. Although LPM is rather weak as an organization, it articulates aspirations and frustrations that have great resonance for black South Africans. There is a growing popular perception that the failure to deliver land reform is a failure to effect post-apartheid transformation, and thus a betrayal of the mandate entrusted to the new democratic state. But as a matter of fact the task of land reform is difficult, complex, and expensive – and popular expectations seem to have outstripped what would have been possible. In this context, the government, as well as the civil society, lack sufficient information about the task that confronts them. Only one survey has ever been conducted on the demand for land in South Africa, the information derived from it is now seven years old, and the rather unsystematic manner in which it was conducted made policy conclusions based on that information somewhat tenuous. Meanwhile, South Africa’s land reform program - and especially the land redistribution component - are proceeding in the absence of hard and detailed information as to the demand for land amongst the previously disadvantaged for whom it is meant. By having better information as to the actual nature and extent of land demand, government and civil society would be in a better position to evaluate present policy and delivery trends, and to formulate new policy initiatives.

This is the challenge of the Metagora activity in South Africa. Since Summer 2003 HSRC started consultations with different key stakeholders to determine their assumptions and expectations with regard to land reform in general, and their views on the relationship of land issues to governance, human rights and democracy in particular. These stakeholders include government departments, the Human Rights Commission, NGOs (such as the National Land Committee, its affiliates, and the LPM), organized agriculture (such as the white farmers), academics, as well as the National Statistics Council and Statistics South Africa. Consultations are still ongoing and assume different forms, including bilateral discussions between the HSRC-Metagora implementing team and stakeholders, and via a reference group. Moreover, a literature review (with particular emphasis on the quantitative approach and potential applications of the democratic audit method) was followed by an in-depth analysis of the “grey literature” from various government departments to identify the many different assumptions informing land reform policy.

As a result of both the consultations and the literature review the HSCR-Metagora implementing team draw a wide picture of the issues at stake and the related assumptions and expectations of the various groups and sectors concerned by the land reform. On this basis survey design was carried out to target five main dimensions of the relation of individuals and households to land:

- i) circumstances and situation (employment status, tenure status, etc.);
- ii) experiences with land in general and land reform in particular;
- iii) knowledge and understanding of land reform and land administration issues;
- iv) attitudes towards land reform and land administration; and
- v) needs and expectations in respect of land and land reform.

Following the Metagora method of work, the survey instruments were designed in such a way that these five dimensions are not only duly covered with regard to the specific thrusts of the South Africa's land reform program (restitution, retribution and tenure reform), but also in a broader perspective, aiming at facilitating identification of global lessons and, if it proceeds, further replication and extension in other countries and cultural contexts. In order to address with relevance the particular situation and assumptions of the white and black populations, HSRC decided to draft two distinct questionnaires that were submitted to discussion to the Metagora Task Force on Pilot Surveys in July 2004. The questionnaires were reviewed taking into account the indications emerging from the mutual review of questionnaires with the Mexican and Philippine teams and then they were presented to MPG. At present this questionnaire is being finalized and data collection in the field will be carried out imminently, in the course of November 2004, with a total quota-based sample of 2000 households. First results and preliminary analysis will be available by end of January 2005.

## **6. Households Surveys on governance and democratic participation carried out by National Statistical Institutes**

This Metagora multi-country activity aims at developing a routine official statistical tool that could considerably enhance monitoring and assessment of governance and democracy. It consists on collection and analysis of data on governance, democracy and subjective poverty through household surveys that are carried out by National Statistical Institutes in francophone Africa and in the countries of the Andean Community. Data is collected through a specific module on "democratic participation" that is attached to the questionnaire of the regular surveys. This activity progressed significantly:

- a)** Data collection in **francophone Africa** has ended and an in-depth analysis is close to completion. Results promise to be of high interest; they will allow for a regional comparison of 8 capital cities of francophone Africa. These results include both objective indicators (absenteeism of public functionaries in different public services, incidence of corruption in various administrations, participation in previous elections and reasons for non-participation, etc.), as well as subjective perception and opinions (on the functioning, trustworthiness and shortcomings of institutions and policies, most important problems of the country, etc.). One of the main strengths of these results is their high level of disaggregation: once e.g. single institutions can be identified as particularly prone to corruption, the policy-incidence of the results becomes evident. In addition, since the modules are attached to surveys providing rich socio-economic information, all phenomena mentioned above can be described in relation to their incidence in poor/non poor households, households with/without higher education, households with a woman as household head, etc., thus allowing for a clearer picture of the vulnerability of different social classes.
- b)** The activity in the **Andean Community** is co-ordinated jointly by the Andean Community's General Secretariat (SGCA; responsible for the operational co-ordination) and DIAL (responsible for substantial co-ordination, technical assistance and regional data analysis). The complexity of this organization has proven to be a challenge. Nevertheless, the activity has taken major steps towards the production of tangible results:

i) In two meetings of the Andean Community's Group of NSI's Experts in Statistics on Democratic Participation and Governance (held in Lima on January 2004 and in Quito on October 2004), a common approach was adopted by all five countries (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela), allowing for a regional comparative analysis of the national results. In addition, the meetings also served as platforms for mutual exchange of experiences and lessons learnt.

ii) SGCA, DIAL and the MCT closely collaborated with the concerned National Statistical Institutes in the elaboration of national working schedules, survey plans and questionnaires.

iii) As a result, the activity implemented by five national statistical institutes, a research centre and an international organization has become one coherent, common action. Data was already collected in Peru and Ecuador and is being collected in Bolivia. Survey plans and questionnaires were completed in Colombia and Venezuela, where field work will start in January 2005;

In Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia, the data is gathered nationwide, whereas the statistical institutes of Colombia and Venezuela will concentrate on the capital cities. The totality of data gathered in the Andean Community will therefore allow for a cross-country comparison of a) Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru at a national level and b) the five capital cities Bogotá, Caracas, La Paz, Lima and Quito.

## **7. Coding, matching and analysis of NGOs' data on human rights violations in Sri Lanka**

The pilot activity in Sri Lanka focuses on the use of quantitative approaches and statistical tools and methods for the systematic collection, analysis, and reporting of human rights violations by NGOs. The main objectives of the activity are:

- i) to provide NGOs with tools (procedures, forms software, and technical expertise) to improve the accuracy, objectivity, consistency, and credibility of their reports, and to ensure the security of their data on human rights violations;
- ii) to facilitate the pooling and sharing of human rights violations data among NGOs and others in order to support the development of a massive, objective and undeniable statistical record of human rights violations;
- iii) to inject new, objective and scientifically rigorous evidence into the local and international human rights discourse about human rights violations connected to Sri Lanka's ethnic and political conflicts.

The policy incidence of this activity is evident, as Sri Lanka is gradually emerging from the most violent period of its post-independence history, a period in which human rights violations have been rampant. Since the late 1970s, government security forces have been guilty of widespread human rights abuses as they confronted an armed Tamil separatist movement in the North and East of the island, led since the late 1980s by the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), which has engaged in assassinations, mass killings, and suicide bombings. In 1987-89, the government also faced an armed insurrection in the South, led by the People's Liberation Front (JVP). Almost continuously since 1979, the country has operated under national security laws (the Public Security Ordinance of 1947 and the Prevention of Terrorism Act of 1979), supplemented by equally draconian emergency legislation. These laws have been used by successive governments to combat armed groups as well as to curb non-violent opposition.

As the country begins to climb out of this abyss, it is important to establish the truth about human rights violations during the past 20 years of conflict and civil war. Human rights defenders will examine the patterns, magnitude, and responsibility for past violations and document allegations of ongoing abuses. Establishing a scientifically rigorous record of reported and estimated total numbers of violations, patterns of abuse, and the nature and identity of perpetrators and victims will help to clarify the past, assign responsibility for past violations, and determine perpetrators' sense of impunity. Furthermore, maintaining a record of current abuses will assist in monitoring compliance with commitments made in the text of the peace process, and will also help to shape policy in ways that promote greater human rights protections and accountability.

The Human Rights Accountability Coalition (HRAC) has been established to support the efforts of its member non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to collect, collate, systematically analyze, and share data on human rights violations in Sri Lanka. HRAC is a diverse coalition of human rights NGOs whose programs range from legal aid assistance, to human rights education, to humanitarian support and even medical and psychological support to victims of human rights violations. All HRAC member organizations are committed to promoting an objective understanding of past and present human rights violations connected to Sri Lanka's ethnic and political conflicts. The coalition members include Consortium of Humanitarian Agencies, Forum for Human Dignity, Home for Human Rights, Institute of Human Rights, Vahilihini Development Center, and Family Rehabilitation Center. Other organizations will also be invited to join. HRAC receives program support from the Asia Foundation and technical assistance (financed through the Metagora budget) from the Human Rights Data Analysis Group of Benetech.

The pilot activity is establishing a large, objective, and accurate statistical record of past and present human rights violations in Sri Lanka. After two years of building technical foundations, (such as the design of a common basis for quantifying the magnitude and patterns of human rights violations, and the integration of systematic data collection methods into each HRAC organization's core human rights monitoring program), HRAC was able to enter into a phase of consolidation that encompasses the Metagora working schedule.

At its present stage, the activity consists in coding and processing huge physical records (archives of NGOs containing each tens of thousands of individual cases of human rights violations). Three HRAC member organizations established teams in charge of the process of controlling the physical documents, coding the information in a common format and entering the data. These teams meet once a week to review the advancement of the work and discuss on cases of human rights violation presenting particular problems for codification. The rigor of the work carried out by these teams is impressive and its result is a series of robust electronic records of high quality data. Of course, such a field work is huge, complex and expensive – and it would not be possible to be conducted without the substantial support of the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) that finances all the local costs related to the activity.

The activity will soon enter into the phase of “high-intensity” data collection, data processing across coalition partners and statistical analysis. First significant results will be presented in Colombo on 7 December. In a later stage, the most apparent result of the activity will be that the analysis of human rights conditions done by the participating groups will be augmented with quantitative findings from their work. HRAC partners will gain the capacity to monitor human rights and to identify perpetrators and trends using statistical techniques and to make more rigorous and compelling arguments about patterns of both historical and current human rights abuses. Furthermore, HRAC organizations will also develop increased institutional capacity to harness information technology tools for their human rights monitoring and strengthen their IT and data security infrastructure against unintentional damage, intentional threats, and accidental disclosure.

## **8. Matching official statistics and data from NGOs and research centres: the development of data bases and indicators on human rights in Palestine**

This pilot activity in Palestine focuses on the integration and matching of official statistical data and data collected by non-official sources within the framework of a dynamic databases on human rights and participatory democracy. The main objective of this pilot activity, conducted by the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS) in collaboration with research institutions and NGOs, is to reinforce capacity for large scale monitoring of participatory democracy and human rights in Palestine. On the basis of qualitative and quantitative criteria, the information collected from various sources shall allow to build indicators of progress. A limited set of indicators shall be designed and tested and a thematic selected focus (e.g. right to education) should allow to test statistical and analytical capacities enhanced by the pilot tool. This activity includes a strong component of training of beneficiaries in order that they can play a double role as providers and users of relevant information. The expected policy impact of this

activity is important with regard to the urgent need for reliable tools that allow proper monitoring of human rights in a situation characterized by endemic violence, growing isolation of the Palestinian population (the “wall issue”) and subsequent erosion of “internal economic” and political structures.

Today in Palestine official and non- official surveys on the living conditions of the population produce important information that can and should be analyzed for purposes of monitoring rights and democratic processes. Moreover, various academic institutions, official bodies and non- governmental organization collect various kinds of data that may be relevant in terms of information on current trends of human rights implementation. This pilot activity therefore intends to identify the most accurate available sources of information (including surveys and non-official information such as that recorded by NGOs on a case-by-case basis) and to develop a tool for integrating into a coherent and structured stock of information the sets of data provided by those sources. The final product of this work shall be a dynamic database for systematic recording and matching of data over time. This database should provide a common basis for gathering, coding and analyzing sets of information of different sources that otherwise may remain fragmentary, anecdotal and irrelevant for large scale analysis. Such a database shall not only provide up-to date data on democracy and human rights, but also enable the derivation of time series and indicators that can be sustainable over time. It shall be made available to the public, including the research community, to domestic policy makers -and planners, to NGOs as well as to the international community. Beneficiaries shall be involved all along the process of implementation of the activity, providing advice on the design of the database as well as receiving training on how to improve the skills for coding information, building databases, identifying and interpreting quantitative and qualitative data, using (and avoiding misuse) of indicators, and improving the skills for reporting. Both the expected local impact of this pilot activity and its potential global lessons in view to the global Metagora objectives are crucial, as the process of the activity itself and its tangible outcome should:

- i) reinforce professionalism, accuracy and objectivity in human rights reporting;
- ii) encourage evidence-based research on democracy and human rights in Palestine;
- iii) allow the production of policy-oriented reports on a continuous basis, with possible comparisons over time;
- iv) enhance national participatory fora and promote interdisciplinary monitoring work involving official statisticians, experts from the academia and human rights practitioners;
- v) contribute to a clearer analysis of democracy and human rights in Palestine as well as to a more transparent and democratic dialogue.

The activity started with the organization of two major consultation workshops in Ramallah attended by some 50 institutions coming from all-over the country (NGOs, academia, human rights organizations, research centers, etc.). These workshops allowed not only to increase the awareness of the attendants on the Metagora activity in Palestine but also to identify possible relevant sources of information. These workshops were the starting point of a broad participatory consultation process involving some 25 institutions nation-wide. As a result of these various consultations, PCBS’ involvement in the Palestine activity was clearly defined and PCBS will concentrate not only on the identification of the relevant sources of information but also on the development of a tool to integrate the set of official and non-official data provided by those sources into a coherent and structured stock of information. This tool will be put at the disposal of the stakeholders for further use and analysis.

Once this initial consultation process was achieved, PCBS started elaborating a first exhaustive list of indicators. This list was extensively discussed both inside PCBS, with external experts and then presented to MPG. The major outcome from these discussions was the decision to adopt a more focused approach and to orient the exercise on the issues of right to education and the impact of the Wall on this right.

PCBS is currently working on the design of the database still in close consultation with the beneficiaries. As discussed and agreed during the second MPG meeting, an international expert will provide technical assistance on this aspect to PCBS. The expertise has been scheduled for the month of November 2004.

## **9. Inventory of Initiatives on Measuring Democracy, Human Rights and Governance**

Since the first submission of the Metagora project outline to the donors, in early 2002, it was considered that the project should aim at identifying, documenting and making known current and recent work and initiatives in the field of measuring democracy, human rights and governance. Nevertheless since then a number of projects similar to this activity have been launched namely by international institutions. Taking this into account, in the course of its first meeting MPG was unanimous in considering that:

- in order to avoid duplication with on-going work focusing on the identification of initiatives undertaken by international institutions (i.e., UN-HCHR mapping project, Eurostat/Essex project, UNDP work on sources of governance indicators, etc.),
- in order to ensure clear division of responsibilities with regard to outcomes,
- and taking into account the specific bottom-up approach that characterises the project,

the Metagora activity should mainly focus on the identification and assessment of local, national and regional initiatives in the North and the South with particular emphasis on developing-countries. Indeed, it was assumed that information on the initiatives in developing countries, often not accessible through internet or other conventional means, would be precious for experts and institutions interested in benefiting from other's experiences and lessons on assessing DHRG. This activity therefore consists in the implementation of a world-wide survey covering research centers, governmental agencies, NGOs and single experts.

In the course of the first meeting of the MPG, a task force examined and amended a MCT proposal of questionnaire. The reviewed questionnaire was submitted to written consultation and then tested with some selected NGOs based in developing countries. The questionnaire was then finalized and the survey was launched in July 2004 and a Task Force of four persons was established to conduct next steps of this activity. The Task Force benefit from the support of senior experts from the Danish Center for Human Rights and the National Statistical Institute of Italy (ISTAT, institution that also kindly provides a substantial in-kind contribution to the implementation of this activity).

Finally, it is important to stress that, even if Metagora will avoid duplication with other current activities aiming at mapping international initiatives in the field of measuring human rights and governance, the MCT and the experts involved in this activity can and should collaborate in different forms with the international agencies involved in those activities. In particular, the Metagora task team will closely collaborate with UN-HCHR in the design of a tool which would allow collecting information on relevant initiatives taken by treaty bodies and international agencies.

## **10. Governance Indicators: Conceptual and Operational Platform for Adoption of Internationally Agreed Indicators**

The Terms of Reference of the project states that this activity, of a cross-cutting nature, is a key strategic element of the whole Metagora implementing process. Resting on the multidisciplinary North/South critical mass of expertness that is gathered together within the various working structures of the project, it aims at facilitating an informal but structured process of dialogue between outstanding experts and relevant institutions wishing to contribute to an effective advancement of international agreement on a number of key concepts and standards in the field of governance assessment. This activity must be outcome-oriented, focusing on reachable concrete targets. Taking benefit from the findings of the parallel Metagora activity aiming at identifying and assessing initiatives in the field of monitoring DHRG, this activity shall in particular:

- i) facilitate constructive assessment of work in progress in the international agencies as well as in relevant national organisations and research centres;
- ii) allow to identify key concepts, frameworks, methods and standards that would be best candidates for policy and technical review and subsequent formulation of agreed recommendations;

- iii) draw a map of the institutional frameworks and channels that would be concerned by a process of agreement on key governance indicators.
- iv) produce a catalogue of issues that could be addressed by the relevant bodies on the international community with reasonable chances of agreement in the short and medium terms;
- v) formulate a proposal for a plan of action, including clear concrete targets and a general time-schedule, to be proposed to the UN Statistical Commission.

The same reasons that led MPG to review the content of the activity on the “inventory of initiatives” should also be considered when reviewing the content and targets of the activity on governance indicators. As it has been explained, a number of new initiatives are looking to identify and even to assess current work on governance indicators. An important part of the work originally planned within the framework of Metagora is now being carried out by international organizations such as UNDP that already identified and published a series of sources for governance indicators. Also, networks such as GOVNET and international bodies (for instance, within the framework of NEPAD) established “task forces” on governance indicators.

In this context, the role of Metagora should be twofold: on the one side, its clear bottom-up approach should complement and balance the global approaches of international agencies; on the other side, it still can and should act as “facilitator and catalyst of the international agreement process”. Of course, Metagora can’t take alone the lead of such a process but it is certainly in a good position to stimulate its take-off, in collaboration with some key international actors and with the support of the donors (and in particular of the EC). MCT already started to contact international governmental and non-governmental organisations (such as Transparency International) in view to do so.

MCT will therefore take the following steps:

- i) to convene by November 2004 the major international producers of indicators, as well as major stakeholders such as the EC, to meet in early 2005 (e.g. back-to-back to the UN Statistical Commission) to identify possible common steps to be undertaken towards the formulation of a joint plan of action;
- ii) to request international agencies that are currently carrying out mapping of international initiatives (UNDP, UN-HCHR, Eurostat, etc.) to present on that occasion a summary of findings and a set of proposals aiming at defining key concepts that would be good candidates for an international agreement in the short and medium run;
- iii) to submit on the occasion of this first meeting a schedule of work of 12 months in view to produce a report and concrete proposals to be submitted to the session of the UN Statistical Commission to be held on spring 2006;
- iv) to invite GOVNET to act as the advisory body of the group of international agencies and NGOs involved in the agreement process and thus to include the review of this process as a permanent item of its agenda.

As first steps in view of the implementation of this plan of action, MCT already started bilateral contacts with relevant organizations and experts and MPG had a brainstorming on the issues that should be tackled by the interagency group.

## **11. Reviewed Metagora working structures**

Metagora is based on a bottom-up approach and is being implemented by a community of institutions and experts from various regions of the world working together in close partnership. The organisation of Metagora is largely based on a decentralised network of forces, capacities and expertise. The success of the project depends on the effective convergence of the various locally-based pilot activities and of the technical and scientific contributions of different experts into a common framework, a common schedule and common goals. The Metagora Terms of Reference therefore originally outlined working structures aiming at ensuring:

- effective overall project management;
- efficient organisation and strong co-ordination of operations;
- rigorous focus of various activities on project's objectives;
- internal methodological and substantive cohesion of the project as a whole;
- cross-fertilisation and interaction between the actors and between the activities;
- timely provision of technical and scientific support to partners;
- participatory mechanisms to discuss work in progress and to provide policy-oriented advice on the expected outcomes;
- proper design and elaboration of final products;
- in depth evaluation of relevance, quality and reliability of methods, processes and outcomes of pilot activities and of the project as a whole;
- periodic reporting to donors on the advancement of work and on the use of funds.

The Metagora Steering Committee of Donors (MSCD) while recognizing the need for ensuring the above mentioned requirements, expressed concern with the complexity of the working structures as defined by the Terms of Reference of the project. MSCD therefore requested MCT to review the whole design, roles and membership of the foreseen working structures. In particular it was requested to reduce the number of instances in the flow chart and to make a clear distinction between the membership of:

- implementing instances (MCT + PIOs + experts associated with the implementation of activities),
- the assessing instance (a panel of experts that must be totally independent from the implementing actors as well as from the donors);
- the MSCD.

Following these orientations, the reviewed working structures include inception note therefore presents the roles and membership of the following working mechanisms:

- the **project co-ordination team** (unchanged);
- the **seven PIOs** (unchanged);
- the **Metagora Partners Group** (replaces the former “panel of experts”);
- the **Independent Panel of Experts** (new)
- the **Metagora Steering Committee of Donors** (reviewed),

The former “Advisory Board” does no longer exist as a working structure. It is replaced by an open-ended policy-oriented Forum which will gather together twice at key periods of the project. Such an open-ended meeting is a crucial event as it is a mean to gather together all the major actors who since the Montreux Conference are expressing interest to be informed on the development of the project and also to confront the project's intermediary and final findings with the effective needs of stakeholders in the field of monitoring democracy, human rights and governance. It is essential that such a gathering takes place once the first preliminary results of the project be available (March 2005) in order to get policy-oriented inputs that allow us to take into account international stakeholder's needs and expectations within the analytical work and the production of the final products to be carried out in the second year of operations.

## **A. PROJECT CO-ORDINATION TEAM**

**Nature of this structure:** leading management body.

**Main responsibilities:** overall project management, budget follow-up, internal and external communication, advocacy for Metagora objectives and delivery of expected project results. MCT brings together all actions and elements of the project into a whole coherent common operation. It

ensures timely information flows and efficient organisation, and provides strong co-ordinating leadership.

**Tasks:**

- organisation of meetings of project bodies, technical assistance and experts missions;
- planning and contracting provision of intellectual services for the project;
- support to the Metagora Partners Group and its various task forces and service their meetings;
- follow-up of the activities of and support to PIOs and other project partners;
- collaboration with GOVNET and other relevant international networks and bodies;
- analysis and synthesis of project results and reports;
- advocacy for project's goals in local and international fora;
- reporting to project's advisory and governing bodies;
- development and management of Metagora information tools, documentation and editing of project's documents.

**Composition:** 5 persons, fix-term contracted by OECD-DCD as "project staff":

## **B. SEVEN PARTNER IMPLEMENTING ORGANISATIONS (PIOs)**

- American Association for the Advancement of Science, AAAS, Washington;
- Développement et insertion internationale, DIAL, Paris;
- Fundar, Centro de Análisis e Investigación, Mexico City;
- Human Sciences Research Council, Pretoria;
- Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics, PCBS, Albireh/Ramallah;
- Philippines National Commission for Human Rights, Manila;
- Secretaría General de la Comunidad Andina, Lima.

**Nature of these bodies:** scientific, governmental and non governmental organisations.

**Main responsibilities:** PIOs are financed through the project's budget for (1) preparing and carrying out field operations and studies and/or (2) co-ordinating regional actions and/or (3) providing technical assistance and intellectual services. Each PIO signs a "partnership agreement" with the OECD that fixes the amount granted to the activities, defines responsibilities and stipulates deadlines for payments and delivery of results as well as rules for narrative and financial reporting.

**Tasks:**

- management, organisation and reporting on progress of local activities;
- contracting, supervision and co-ordination of local experts;
- setting participatory local teams and fora;
- preparation, participation and follow-up of Metagora Partners Group activities;
- development of interaction and synergies among the different pilot activities, conducting direct exchanges and carrying out visits and assistance missions;
- active participation to meetings of the Metagora Forum;
- contribution to the global synthesis, to the drawing of global lessons and guidelines and to the finalisation and presentation of the expected Metagora products.

**Composition of local teams:** In each target country, multidisciplinary local teams include PIO's own experts, human rights practitioners, statisticians and researchers from the academia. Moreover, PIOs set up participatory advisory mechanisms gathering together all stakeholders and representatives of relevant national governmental and non governmental bodies.

## **C. METAGORA PARTNERS GROUP (MPG)**

**Nature of this structure:** leading scientific and technical body (project’s effective intellectual engine)

**Main responsibilities:** ensuring internal methodological consistency and substantive cohesion of the project as a whole; providing effective and efficient expertness to PIOs and to local teams; fostering substantive interactions between the various activities; guiding and checking the adequacy of each activity with overall project objectives; guaranteeing restitution of know-how and effective partnership; designing and producing final project outcomes.

**Tasks:**

- examines PIOs plans and closely follows progress of pilot activities;
- identifies and evaluates partners’ needs for scientific support;
- ensures timely provision of relevant technical and scientific support to PIOs;
- reviews the technical and policy oriented reports submitted by PIOs;
- reports on progress of work and on project’s findings;
- fosters multidisciplinary and participatory processes of collaboration between experts, PIOs and stakeholders;
- draws global lessons based on the results of pilot field operations and studies;
- conducts an internal evaluation of the process and outcomes of the whole project;
- designs, elaborates and agrees on the content of the final products.

**Composition:** MPG is chaired by Dr Mark Orkin (CEO, HSRC, South Africa) and gathers together experts from PIOs (local co-ordinators and leading local experts), as well as senior experts from the South and from the North involved in the implementation of the project either as providers of technical assistance or as members of the task team “inventory of initiatives” or of the following task forces:

- “pilot surveys” (leader to be selected at a later stage),
- “synthesis and final report” (leader: Mr. Jan Robert Suesser, ADETEF, France),
- “training materials” (leader: Mrs. Jana Asher, StatAid, USA),
- “outline guidelines” (leader to be selected at a later stage),
- “platform on indicators” (leader to be selected at a later stage).

**Meetings:** MPG will hold 6 technical meetings over the 24-month duration of the pilot project (3 plenary and 3 reduced groups).

#### **D. INDEPENDENT PANEL OF EXPERTS (IPE)**

**Nature of this structure:** scientific assessing body

**Main responsibilities:** providing independent review, reporting and advice on the technical and scientific processes and methods; guaranteeing rigorous peer review of project’s results; formulating recommendations.

**Tasks:**

- assesses quality and reliability of methods and tools generated and used in each activity;
- reviews the MPG internal evaluation of the process and outcomes of the whole project;
- organises rigorous scientific peer reviews of the project’s results and products;
- provides advice and guidance for the validation of the final products; and
- formulates recommendations on the possible follow-up of the project.

**Membership:** outstanding personalities and scientists would be invited to be part of the IPE.

**Meetings:** IPE will hold three meetings.

## E. STEERING COMMITTEE OF DONORS

**Nature of this structure:** steering body

**Main responsibilities:** Approve any substantial modifications to the workplan or any substantial budget reallocation; approve proposals by the MCT of modifications in the mandates or in the membership of the Metagora working structures; closely follow the advancement and results of the project, providing support and guidance to the MCT; examine issues raised by the MCT related to the use of resources allocated to the project; approve when needed decisions on substantial changes in the working programme; offer advice on all documents for publication; confront the development and findings of the project with the policies of donors.

### **Tasks:**

- examine the intermediary and final activity and financial reports;
- examine all documents produced by the project that would be of relevance for the donors (eg reports and recommendations regarding the internal evaluation of the process and outcomes of the project, reports on progress of work and on project's findings, summaries of missions);
- approve any substantial modifications to the plans of activity or any substantial budget reallocation;
- examine and decide on proposals for substantial changes in planned activities;
- in case on non-performance of duties by the MCT or by a PIO, decide on concrete steps to be taken or on important changes to be introduced in the working plan and structures of project;
- decide on the need for an external evaluation of the project and provide the financial resources required for its implementation;

**Composition:** representatives of EC and of the donor institutions of France, Sweden and Switzerland, as well as of OECD-DCD and the PARIS21 Secretariat. The Committee will hold five meetings in the course of the 24-month period of execution of the project.

## F. METAGORA FORUM

The Metagora Forum will be an informal open-ended policy-oriented meeting.

**Main objectives of this meeting:** confront the development and findings of the project with effective needs of stakeholders in the field of monitoring democracy, human rights and governance; comment on policy incidence of the development and outcome of the project; foster interaction and synergies between Metagora and other similar projects and initiatives; formulate proposals to integrate specific project achievements and findings within existing or planned monitoring mechanisms; formulate recommendations aiming at fostering use of proper assessment methods and measurement tools in the fields of human rights and governance and at initiating and supporting processes of adoption of internationally agreed indicators in these fields; formulate proposals in view to a coherent follow-up of Metagora achievements after the end of the pilot phase.

**Composition:** open-ended forum. Invitations to attend the Forum (on informal and voluntary basis) will be addressed to: members of the PARIS21 Consortium, representatives of major relevant actors and stakeholders, including the EC and other donors, the PIOs associated with the project, as well as some 30 national and international governmental and non-governmental organisations that are involved or strongly interested in the project. The Metagora Forum will therefore be of a participatory and multidisciplinary nature. It is expected that participants will be high-level experts who will be able to present the policies and views of their organisations with full authoritative voice. Travel costs related to the attendance to these meetings will be at the charge of the participants.

**Frequency:** The Metagora Forum will be convened twice in April 2005 and January 2006 (hopefully back-to-back with the meetings of the PARIS21 Consortium).

## 12. Conclusion: strengths and weaknesses

As a general assessment by the MCT, at this stage of its development the project presents the following strengths and weaknesses:

- The main original characteristics of Metagora are clearly and successfully confirmed as: i) the voice of stakeholders is being expressed and heard through large participatory processes in the target countries; ii) the cross-fertilization between the single activities is now a reality, in particular in the case of the teams conducting the pilot surveys on human rights issues; iii) the ownership of the project by the community of partners is attested through multiple forms of commitment, volunteering of support and even risky pre-financing of actions before the signature of partnership agreements; iv) the multi-disciplinary and outcome-oriented method of work is evident and fruitful both in the local teams and within the MPG.
  
- Nevertheless the project is not reaching all its targets within the planned schedule as: i) there have been a number of mistakes in the communication between MCT, the partners and the experts; ii) MCT was not able to deliver as planned all the information tools and namely the Metagora Internet site is not yet operational; iii) technical assistance is being requested by PIOs with a very short notice and thus this can not be properly planned and timely provided; iv) working documents and reports from PIOs and experts are generally being delivered to MCT with big delays with regard to the planned deadlines thus jeopardizing proper preparation of agendas, meetings and missions.