SELECTED RESOURCES FOR HUMAN RIGHTS-BASED EVALUATION

This document provides an overview of selected accessible resources for human rights-based evaluation. It represents a snapshot as of December 2021 and may serve as a starting point to dive deeper into approaches, guidelines and frameworks as well as tools for human rights-based evaluation.

What is the human rights-based approach to development?

The "UN Statement of Common Understanding on a Human Rights-Based Approach to Development Co-operation" (2003) outlines the core elements and principles of a human rights-based approach (HRBA) to development in the UN context.

The **Human Rights Strategy** of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ; 2011) constitutes the overarching and binding strategy concerning the HRBA to development for German governmental development agencies. The strategy will be updated in 2022.

The **E-Info-Tool** on the "Human Rights-Based Approach in German Development Cooperation" provides development practitioners with an introduction to the HRBA to development. It describes the principles and characteristics of an HRBA and outlines how work in German governmental development agencies can be strengthened by using it.

The **European Union toolbox** for placing rights-holders at the centre of international partnerships gives guidance on the human rights-based approach in the context of EU development cooperation. It includes examples and links to further resources and tools.

- UNDG (2003), The Human Rights Based Approach to Development Cooperation: Towards a Common Understanding Among UN Agencies.
- BMZ, Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (2011), Human Rights in German Development Policy: Strategy, BMZ Strategy Paper No. 4, Bonn/Berlin.
- GIZ, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (2014), The Human Rights-Based Approach in German Development Cooperation, Bonn and Eschborn.
- European Commission (2021), Human Rights-Based Approach: The EU Toolbox for placing rights-holders at the Centre of International Partnerships (also: Applying the Human Rights Based Approach to international partnerships – an updated Toolbox for placing rights-holders at the centre of EU's Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation), Brussels.

Human rights-based approach to evaluation: Guidelines

Compared with the HRBA to development, the HRBA to evaluation is relatively recent. The United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) **handbook** on how to integrate human rights (HR) and gender equality (GE) in evaluation constitutes the most comprehensive guidance document on a HRBA to evaluation and serves as a reference document for UN agencies. The guidance considers the HRBA to development and gender equality mainstreaming as two complementary and mutually reinforcing approaches to evaluations. The guidance document describes the requirements of applying an HRBA in each evaluation phase. It illustrates how HR and GE aspects can be linked to the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, discusses major challenges, and includes checklists of key questions as well as links to further resources.

Since 2016 the UNEG "**Norms and Standards** for Evaluation" include a norm on HR and GE and a standard on the HRBA and gender mainstreaming strategy.

The revised **OECD/DAC evaluation criteria** published in 2019 refer to human rights, particularly in the context of the new "coherence" criterion in particular. A further OECD/DAC guidance document published in 2021 provides information on the application of these revised evaluation criteria. This document does not deal in depth with the HRBA but emphasizes the importance of considering key human rights principles such as non-discrimination and assessing unintended negative effects on human rights.

Among bilateral European donors the **evaluation manual** of the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFAF) provides concrete guidance on how to apply a HRBA in evaluations. The manual includes a chapter on integrating human rights and other cross-cutting objectives (gender equality, reduction of inequalities, climate change mitigation) in evaluations. It also explicitly mentions HR and GE aspects in many other sections related to the different phases of the evaluation process. It refers to the UNEG guidance documents and provides links to web-based resources and video lectures on an HRBA (MFAF, 2020).

The BMZ evaluation guidelines published in 2021 consider human rights principles as part of ethical evaluation standards.

- UNEG (2014), Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations.
- UNEG (2016), Norms and Standards for Evaluation, New York.
- OECD/DAC Development Network on Evaluation (2019), Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use.
- OECD/DAC (2021), "Applying Evaluation Criteria Thoughtfully", OECD Publishing, Paris.
- MFAF, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (2020), Evaluation Manual, (last updated 16.06.2020).
- BMZ, Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (2021), Evaluierung der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit: Leitlinien des BMZ, BMZ-Papier 4.

Reviews of bilateral policies and strategies on the HRBA to development

The following reviews and evaluations of bilateral donors' policies and strategies on the HRBA to development show that progress has been achieved in incorporating the HRBA in the design and programming of development interventions. However, systematic consideration of human rights standards and principles in monitoring and evaluation remains weak.

- Federal Ministry of the Republic of Austria, Austrian Development Agency (2021), Strategic Evaluation of the Human Rights-Based Approach Within Austrian Development Cooperation, Evaluation Report.
- Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, MFAF (2018), Evaluation: Review of Human Rights-Based Approach in Finland's Development Policy Related to Forthcoming Evaluation.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Danida (2018), Evaluation of Danish Support to Promotion and Protection of Human Rights 2006-2016, Kopenhagen.
- DEval, Deutsches Evaluierungsinstitut der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (2021), Menschenrechte in der deutschen Entwicklungspolitik; Teil 1: Das Menschenrechtskonzept und seine Umsetzung, Bonn.
- Sida (2020), Evaluation of the Application and Effects of a Human Rights Based Approach to Development: Lessons Learnt from Swedish Development Cooperation. What Works Well, Less Well and Why?, Stockholm.

Human rights-based M&E tools

Human rights-based M&E tools refer explicitly to human rights standards and principles.

The guide on human rights indicators of **OHCHR** (2012) includes a framework and illustrative tables of indicators to monitor State parties' compliance with their treaty obligations and to measure the realisation of human rights. After the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development OHCHR has updated the indicator tables by including references to the SDG indicators.

In the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development OHCHR has also published a **guidance note on a HRBA to data**. It outlines key elements and principles of applying a HRBA in data collection and analysis and thereby facilitates a common understanding on a HRBA to data. It proposes several forms of participation to ensure the involvement of all relevant stakeholders – marginalized groups in particular – in monitoring the implementation of the SDGs.

The **Praia Group** on Governance Statistics, established in 2015 by the UN Statistical Commission, has produced a handbook that integrates the OHCHR indicator framework.

OPERA is a tool developed by the Centre for Economic and Social Rights (CESR). It has been primarily designed for civil society groups to hold governments accountable with respect to the fulfilment of economic, social, and cultural rights. The framework consists of four steps (outcomes, policy efforts, resources, assessment of contextual factors) that reflect different levels of change and contextual determinants. A focus is put on analysing failures to fulfil rights, while also looking at contextual constraints facing governments.

ISE4GEMs (Inclusive Systemic Evaluation for Gender Equality, Environments and Marginalized Voices) is a tool developed by **UNWOMEN** after the adoption of the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs. It provides a framework that facilitates the analysis of multiple forms of marginalization as well as the power dynamics underlying them. The framework relates marginalization to human rights and to the principle of *leave no one behind*.

Human rights impact assessments (HRIA) measure potential impacts of policies, programmes and projects with the objective of avoiding or reducing negative effects on human rights and increasing positive ones. One example is the tool **Human Rights Impact Assessment, Guidance and**

Toolbox developed by the Danish Institute for Human Rights with the primary aim of assessing business projects and activities. The structure of the tool follows the different phases of the assessment with guiding questions and information on how to structure each assessment step. It also shows the strengths and weaknesses of conducting a human rights-based approach as a stand-alone approach versus integrating it in social or environmental impact assessments.

Human rights-based tools often rely on participatory methods that aim at an enhanced involvement of target groups/right-holders in the assessment process. For example, **UNICEF** has published a guide on participatory approaches in impact evaluation that discusses different options – from "nominal" to "transformative" for ensuring the participation of children in evaluations.

Human rights are also closely related to ethics. **DFID**s ethical guidance illustrates how ethical principles can be applied in research, evaluations, and monitoring activities. It refers to human rights in sections dealing with how to ensure participation and inclusiveness in the main stages of the research, evaluation, and monitoring cycle.

- OHCHR (2012), Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation.
- OHCHR (no year), Human Rights Indicators Tables: Updated with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Indicators.
- OHCHR (2018), A Human Rights-Based Approach to Data: Leaving No One Behind in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.
- CESR, Centre for Economic and Social Rights (2012), The OPERA Framework: Assessing Compliance with the Obligation to Fulfill Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Brooklyn.
- Danish Institute for Human Rights (2020), Human Rights Impact Assessment, Guidance and Toolbox.
- DFID (2019), DFID Ethical Guidance for Research, Evaluation and Monitoring Activities.
- UNICEF Office of Research, Guijt, I. (2014), Participatory Approaches, Methodological Briefs: Impact Evaluation 5, Florence.
- Praia City Group (no year), Handbook on Governance Statistics.
- UN Women (2018), Inclusive Systemic Evaluation (ISE4GEMs): A New Approach for the SDG Era, New York.

Human rights-based evaluation: Examples and case studies

Evaluations of human rights organisations set a strong focus on assessing the accountability of State parties to respect, protect and fulfil human rights.

For example, **Amnesty International**'s evaluation on the implementation of UNEP's environmental assessment of Ogoniland examines to what extent Nigeria's government and the Anglo-Dutch oil giant Shell have implemented UNEP's recommendations and complied with their human rights obligations.

Regarding the obligation of State parties to fulfil economic and social rights, the **CESR** has produced five case studies to share insights and learning from the use of the OPERA tool. For example, the CESR study on the state of mental health services in Kenya gathered and analysed information from key stakeholders in the mental health sector. The interviewed stakeholders raised several concerns that were included in the report published by the Kenyan National Commission on Human Rights, thus ensuring dissemination of the findings to a broader public.

Human rights and gender equality are at the core of recent **UNICEF** and **UNFPA** joint evaluations on child marriage and female genital mutilation. Both evaluations explicitly refer to the UNEG guidance and apply major elements of an HRBA to evaluation.

The evaluation of the BMZ Action Plan for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities conducted by DEval is one example of an inclusive evaluation process. International and German civil society organisations advocating for the rights of persons with disabilities and the monitoring desk for the CRPD at the German Institute for Human Rights were included in the reference group of the evaluation. At the field study level, persons with disabilities and Disabled People's Organisations were involved as national consultants in the teams, as well as in kick-off and validation workshops. DEval also published a short report in an easy-to-read format for persons with cognitive impairments.

The evaluation of the multi-country programme "My Rights My Voice" implemented by OXFAM and funded by SIDA is an example of an evaluation that focuses on the capacity of young people, particularly young women, to claim their rights. Young people were also involved as peer evaluators.

- Amnesty International (2020), No Clean-Up, no Justice: An Evaluation of the Implementation of UNEP's Environmental Assessment of Ogoniland, Nine Years on, Environmental Rights Action/Friends of the Earth Nigeria, (Friends of the Earth Europe, and Milieudefensie/Friends of the Earth), Netherlands.
- CESR, Centre for Economic and Social Rights (2017), OPERA in practice: Silenced Minds – the Systemic Neglect of Mental Health in Kenya.
- DEval, German Institute for Development Evaluation (2017), Evaluation of the BMZ Action Plan for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities, Bonn.
- UNFPA and UNICEF (2019), Joint Evaluation Report: UNFPA-UNICEF Global Programme to Accelerate Action to End Child Marriage.
- UNFPA and UNICEF Evaluation Offices (2019), Joint Evaluation of the UNFPA-UNICEF Joint Programme on the Abandonment of Female Genital Mutilation: Accelerating Change Phase I and II (2008–2017).
- Van Esbroek, D. et al. (2016), Evaluation of the 'My Rights My Voice' Programme.

Reference	Weblink (if available with alternative stable links, e.g. archive.org)
• Amnesty International (2020), No Clean-Up, no Justice: An Evaluation of the Implementation of UNEP's Environmental Assessment of Ogoniland, Nine Years on, Environmental Rights Action/Friends of the Earth Nigeria, (Friends of the Earth Europe, and Milieudefensie/Friends of the Earth), Netherlands.	• www.amnesty.org/en/documents/afr44/2514/2020/en/ • https://web.archive.org/web/20210119091303/ https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/afr44/2514/2020/en/
• BMZ, Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (2011), Human rights in German Development Policy: Strategy, BMZ Strategy Paper No. 4, Bonn/Berlin.	• www.bmz.de/resource/blob/23480/f8b949cbdbecf314a89125b1841bdbce/strategiepapier303-04-2011-data.pdf • https://web.archive.org/web/20210121150307/www.bmz.de/de/mediathek/publikationen/reihen/strategiepapiere/Strategiepapier303_04_2011.pdf
• BMZ, Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (2021), Evaluierung der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit: Leitlinien des BMZ, BMZ-Papier 4.	• www.bmz.de/resource/blob/92884/08507d1204d093141b5f00bf5cbb8db7/bmz-leitlinien-evaluierung-2021.pdf
• CESR, Centre for Economic and Social Rights (2012), The OPERA Framework: Assessing Compliance with the Obligation to Fulfill Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Brooklyn.	• www.cesr.org/sites/default/files/the.opera_.framework.pdf • https://web.archive.org/web/20210426184052/https://www.cesr.org/sites/default/files/the.opera_.framework.pdf
• CESR, Centre for Economic and Social Rights (2017), OPERA in practice: Silenced Minds – the Systemic Neglect of Mental Health in Kenya.	• www.cesr.org/sites/default/files/opera_case_study_kenya_FINAL.pdf • https://web.archive.org/web/20190726040754/www.cesr.org/sites/default/files/opera_case_study_kenya_FINAL.pdf
• Danish Institute for Human Rights (2020), Human Rights Impact Assessment, Guidance and Toolbox.	• www.humanrights.dk/tools/human-rights-impact-assessment-guidance-toolbox • www.humanrights.dk/human-rights-impact-assessment-toolbox • https://web.archive.org/web/20211122195730/https://www.humanrights.dk/tools/human-rights-impact-assessment-guidance-toolbox
• DEval, German Institute for Development Evaluation (2021), Menschenrechte in der deutschen Entwicklungspolitik; Teil 1: Das Menschenrechtskonzept und seine Umsetzung, Bonn.	• www.deval.org/de/publikationen/menschenrechte-in-der-deutschen-entwicklungspolitik
• DEval, German Institute for Development Evaluation (2017), Evaluation of the BMZ Action Plan for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities, Bonn.	• www.deval.org/fileadmin/Redaktion/PDF/05-Publikationen/Berichte/2017_API/DEval_Bericht_APInklusion_2017_EN.pdf • (Policy Brief: www.internationaldisabilityalliance.org/sites/default/files/3.3_bmz_action_plan_evaluation_policy_brief.pdf)
• DFID (2019), DFID ethical guidance for research, evaluation and monitoring activities.	• https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/838106/DFID-Ethics-Guidance-Oct2019.pdf • https://web.archive.org/web/20201001195355/https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/838106/DFID-Ethics-Guidance-Oct2019.pdf

Reference	Weblink (if available with alternative stable links, e.g. archive.org)
• European Commission (2021), Human Rights-Based Approach: The EU Toolbox for placing rights-holders at the Centre of International Partnerships (also: Applying the Human Rights Based Approach to international partnerships – an updated Toolbox for placing rights-holders at the centre of EU's Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation), Brussels.	• https://ec.europa.eu/international-partnerships/system/files/swd-2021-human-right-based-approach_en.pdf
• Federal Ministry Republic of Austria, Austrian Development Agency (2021), Strategic Evaluation of the Human Rights-Based Approach within Austrian Development Cooperation, Evaluation Report.	• www.researchgate.net/publication/350496238_Strategic_Evaluation_of_the_Human_Rights-Based_Approach_HRBA_Within_Austrian_Development_Cooperation_ADC • www.researchgate.net/publication/350496165_Strategic_Evaluation_of_the_Human_Rights-Based_Approach_within_Austrian_Development_Cooperation_Vol_II_Annexes
• GIZ, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (2014), The Human Rights-Based Approach in German Development Cooperation, Bonn and Eschborn.	• www.institut-fuer-menschenrechte.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Publikationen/E-Info-Tool/e-info-tool_human_rights_based_approach_in_German_development_cooperation.pdf
• MFAF, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (2018), "Evaluation Manual", (last updated 16.06.2020).	• https://um.fi/documents/384998/0/Evaluation+Manual_PDF_version_16062020+%282%29.pdf/176be25f-e538-c12e-e494-8cf81decf48a?t=1601880250090
• MFAF, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (2018), Evaluation: Review of Human Rights-Based Approach in Finland's Development Policy Related to Forthcoming Evaluation.	• www.oecd.org/derec/finland/finland-2018-human-rights-based-approach.pdf
• Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Danida (2018), Evaluation of Danish Support to Promotion and Protection of Human Rights 2006-2016, Kopenhagen.	• www.ncg.dk/our-services/ncg-assignments/483-evaluation-of-danish-support-to-promotion-and-protection-of-human-rights-2006-2016.html • https://um.dk/en/danida-en/results/eval/Eval_reports/publicationdisplaypage/?publicationID=D13704CB-84E2-47E2-9235-A40AC04D64FD
• OECD/DAC Development Network on Evaluation (2019), Better Criteria for Better Evaluation, Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use, December.	• www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf • (related DEval Policy Brief: www.deval.org/fileadmin/Redaktion/PDF/05-Publikationen/Policy_Briefs/2021_Evaluierungskriterien_ES/DEval_PB_1.21_Evaluierungskriterien_EN_accessible.pdf)
• OECD/DAC Development Network on Evaluation (2021), Applying Evaluation Criteria Thoughtfully, Paris.	• www.oecd.org/publications/applying-evaluation-criteria-thoughtfully-543e84ed-en.htm
• OHCHR (2012), Human Rights Indicators - A Guide to Measurement and Implementation.	• www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/Human_rights_indicators_en.pdf • https://reliefweb.int/report/world/human-rights-indicators-guide-measurement-and-implementation

Reference	Weblink (if available with alternative stable links, e.g. archive.org)
• OHCHR (2018), A Human Rights-Based Approach to Data, Leaving No One Behind in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Guidance Note to Data Collection and Disaggregation.	• www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/GuidanceNoteonApproachtoData.pdf • www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx
• OHCHR (no year), Human Rights Indicators Tables - Updated with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Indicators.	• www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/SDG_Indicators_Tables.pdf
• Praia City Group (no year), Handbook on Governance Statistics.	• www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/handbook_governance_statistics.pdf
• Sida (2020), Evaluation of the Application and Effects of a Human Rights Based Approach to Development: Lessons Learnt from Swedish Development Cooperation. What Works Well, Less Well and Why?, Stockholm.	• www.sida.se/en/publications/evaluation-of-the-application-and-effects-of-a-human-rights-based-approach-to-development-lessons-learnt-from-swedish-development-cooperation-what-works-well-less-well-and-why • (https://cdn.sida.se/publications/files/sida62333en-evaluation-of-the-application-and-effects-of-a-human-rights-based-approach-to-development-lessons-learnt-from-swedish-development-cooperation-what-works-well-less-well-and-why.pdf)
• UN Women (2018), Inclusive Systemic Evaluation (ISE4GEMs), a new Approach for the SDG Era, New York.	• www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2018/9/ise4gems-a-new-approach-for-the-sdg-era
• UNDG (2003), The Human Rights Based Approach to Development Cooperation Towards a Common Understanding Among UN Agencies.	• https://unsdg.un.org/resources/human-rights-based-approach-development-cooperation-towards-common-understanding-among-un • https://hrbaportal.org/the-human-rights-based-approach-to-development-cooperation-towards-a-common-understanding-among-un-agencies/ • https://web.archive.org/web/20210102202027/https://unsdg.un.org/resources/human-rights-based-approach-development-cooperation-towards-common-understanding-among-un
• UNEG (2014), Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations.	• Vs. 2016: www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914 • Vs. 2016 (Archive.org): https://web.archive.org/web/20210822235200/www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914 • Vs. 2014: www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1616 • Vs. 2014 (Archive.org): https://web.archive.org/web/20210118143939/http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1616 • Vs. 2011: www.uneval.org/document/detail/980
• UNEG (2016), Norms and Standards for Evaluation, New York.	• www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914 • www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2787
• UNFPA and UNICEF (2019), Joint Evaluation Report, UNFPA-UNICEF Global Programme to Accelerate Action to End Child Marriage.	• www.unfpa.org/admin-resource/joint-evaluation-unfpa-unicef-global-programme-accelerate-action-end-child-marriage • www.unicef.org/sites/default/files/2019-06/GP-2019-Evaluation.pdf

Reference	Weblink (if available with alternative stable links, e.g. archive.org)
• UNFPA and UNICEF Evaluation Offices (2019), Joint Evaluation of the UNFPA-UNICEF Joint Programme on the Abandonment of Female Genital Mutilation: Accelerating Change Phase I and II (2008–2017).	• www.unicef.org/sites/default/files/2019-06/JP-2019-Evaluation-Report-Phase-I-and-II.PDF • https://unfpa.org/sites/default/files/admin-resource/FGM_Eval_Vol1_FINAL.pdf
• UNICEF Office of Research, (2014), Participatory Approaches, Methodological Briefs: Impact Evaluation 5, Florence.	• www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/Participatory_Approaches_ENG.pdf • https://web.archive.org/web/20200928163400/http://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/Participatory_Approaches_ENG.pdf
• Van Esbroek, D. et al. (2016), Evaluation of the 'My Rights My Voice' Programme.	• https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/evaluation-of-the-my-rights-my-voice-programme-synthesis-report-618615/ • https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/er-my-rights-my-voice-final-evaluation-240816-en.pdf • Syntheses report: www.oxfam.org/en/research/evaluation-my-rights-my-voice-program

Contacts:

Dr Martin Bruder (Head of Department)

Lena Taube (Evaluator)