

Evaluation of DIHR's Human Rights Officer / Advisor Programme

Lone Lindholt, team leader/analyst

Edited version, 3 August 2007 (without footnotes and Annex 2)

Table of Contents

Conclusion and Recommendations

I. Intro (background, methodology and quantitative analysis)

1. Background
2. Objective and methodology of evaluation
3. Quantitative analysis

3.a the HRO/HRAs

3.b institution partners

3.c DIHR contact persons

II Qualitative Analysis

1. “Preparation and follow up”

“To what extent was the internship well planned, and has there been adequate completion and follow up, e.g. in terms of:

1.a Selection of and anchoring within candidate/partner institution);

1.b Clarification of issues relating to e.g. security, salary, housing, insurance, transport, equipment, office space(1.b);

1.c Clarification of relationship with contact person(s) with other stakeholders ? (1.c)”

2. Terms of Reference: “Tasks and Mandate”

2. a. “How would you describe your role(-s) (e.g. facilitator, resource person, administrator, expert, consultant); and main tasks (e.g. management, coordination, coaching, teaching giving input, controlling)”

2. b. How were these defined? By whom? On what basis? Did there, from your position, seem to be consistency in perception between all three stakeholders?”

2. c. “Describe the extent of ensuring correspondence and contribution to programme/project as formulated in e.g. project document (e.g. vision, mission, development, and immediate objectives, activities, output and indicators); describe extent of role (visible, tacit) of various project documentation in this process”

3. “Relationship with partner(s)”

3.a Describe the general relationship with other two stakeholders; exemplify positive/negative aspects in relation to the following:

- *Communication and professional exchange*
- *Daily work, e.g. support, logistics*
- *Personal interaction”*

i. Relations with the partner institution

ii. Relations with DIHR contact person

4. “Expectations and general experience”

4. a. “What were your expectations for the programme? Which? Were they met?”

4. b. Would you generally consider the programme a success or not? Why? Why not?”

4. c. “Give at least three positive and negative examples of experience with the programme, and list three most important recommendations for the future”

i. positive examples

ii. negative examples

iii. recommendations

III Annexes

Annex 1: Questionnaire text

Annex 2: List of persons receiving the questionnaire

For the sake of anonymity, this information has been deleted from this public version

Conclusions and Recommendations

In general, the programme must be described as being successful from the point of view of all three stakeholder groups, i.e. the HRO/A's themselves, the partner institution and DIHR. In all of the four areas covered by the questionnaire most of the answers are fairly positive. However, at the same time there are also clear indications that certain improvements and adjustments to key aspects of the programme could be improved to ensure that it becomes even more effective, appreciated and has even greater impact. Although there is variation in the degree of emphasis and the relative perspectives of the stakeholders, it is interesting to note that the comments address the same issues and point to similar solutions. In short, the recommendations outlined below would seem to address common concerns among the three groups.

In relation to question 1, "Preparation and Follow Up", one of the issues to be addressed, and one with implications through the rest of the questions, is the issue of partner participation in the recruitment and selection process of the HRO/HRA. The HRO/HRAs and the partner institutions presents a uniform picture, which makes it clear that there has been little involvement in this area. This would add to the comments below on the drafting of Terms of Reference and Memorandum of Understanding etc., where the lack of partner involvement is also significantly emphasized. In addition, the need for better preparation of the candidates before the posting is stressed, not just by the candidates themselves but also, indirectly, by the partner institutions.

With respect to preparation and organisation of issues relating to logistics, this is perhaps the area where the comments by the HRO/HRAs are most glaringly critical. Significant frustration relating, primarily, to the sorting out of various practical matters, which had to be dealt with by themselves or by DIHR Project Managers, who in turn have echoed that this takes up too much of their time because processes and procedures are not streamlined within DIHR and/or handled by professional staff specifically employed for this purpose.

The basic relationship between the HRO/HRAs and the partner institution seems to have been good. However in some cases this seems to have been to some extent adversely affected by the issue of clear division of roles and responsibilities (addressed below). And the relationships with other stakeholders are clearly indicated as being less than optimal, because of the lack of transferring of contacts and relationships between two HRO/HRAs being posted, i.e. the second person will have to start building the relationship all over again instead of drawing on preserved institutional memory.

With respect to question 2, regarding "Terms of reference: Tasks and Mandate", it is indicated that the HRO/HRAs have in most cases carried out a wide scope of roles and functions, much to the general satisfaction of the partner institutions, DIHR and the HRO/HRAs themselves. In this way they have been the real contributions to the daily life and work of the partner institution that is intended by the programmes. However, one aspect which has given rise to some confusion and, in a few cases even friction, is whether the HRO/HRA should identify more with the partner institution than with DIHR. This has seemingly been problematic in relation to the question of whether they should carry out a monitoring role, to some extent envisaged by the

DIHR contact persons who express a tendency to seeing the HRO/HRA as “their eyes and ears on the ground” and thus supervise the partner institutions’ implementation of the programme. In contrast, this sets the HRO/HRA apart from the staff framework of the partner institution, at least psychologically, and this may what is expressed in some of the less positive comments by the partner institutions in this regard. A similar aspect is that the partner institutions seem to perceive the Terms of Reference of the HRO/HRA mostly to be a reflection of the general programme framework for their cooperation with DIHR. This means that if this is formulated very broadly and, as it indicated, in some cases almost unrealistic in the scope of objectives to be achieved, it leaves the HRO/HRA in a somewhat unclear situation with regards to their own specific contribution. Again, the fact that the partner institution is not involved in the drafting of such specific terms of reference, their influence and ownership in relation to the posting is significantly reduced.

Question 3, relating to “Relations with partner(s)”, echoes what has already been stated above – i.e. the relationship between the HRO/HRA and the partner institution is mostly good. In some cases and to some extent it is negatively affected by the lack of clarity in relation to their expected basic relationship. However, it is stressed that the HRO/HRAs in general (i.e. with only a few exceptions) have functioned very well during their posting, professionally as well as in relation to personal interaction. With regard to relations between the HRO and the partner institution, this seems in general to have been positive, nevertheless the lack of transfer of contacts between one HRO/HRA posted and another (mentioned above) may have meant that these relationships have to be re-forged over and over again. Finally, the relationship between the HRO/HRA and the DIHR contact persons also seem to have functioned well. There are however indications from the HRO/HRAs that the general pressure of workload and lack of sufficient time for the project managers, especially as they have had to spend most of their time sorting out logistical matters has meant that there has been less “quality time” in working relations.

Finally, in question 4 where the respondents were asked to reflect on their “Expectations and general experience”, fundamentally, all of the respondents indicate that the programme has been a success. The HRO/HRAs indicate that this is due to the “objective” reason that DIHR’s programme fulfils the stated objectives as well as due to the more “subjective” reason, that they have benefited from it in numerous ways, professionally as well as privately. In most cases the partners agree on the same reason, in fact tending to reflect positively on the personal growth of the candidates, and DIHR echoes them both. It is clear that the programme from the point of view of the DIHR contact persons has been good, and similarly the HROs themselves seem to have fulfilled and even in some cases surpassed their expectations. With respect to the HRAs, there is a slight difference that in some cases they would have expected the outcome in professional terms to have e.g. made use of their full scope of competences. With respect to the partner institutions, the picture is similar, insofar as where many of the postings have been very successful from their point of view, there are also cases where the expectations do not quite seem to have been met. The arguments behind this may again reflect the lack of partner involvement in the recruitment process and development of specific terms of reference.

In case of negative experience indicated, it seems to reflect that the programme itself as well as the preparation and posting of the candidates have not been sufficiently

anchored within the needs and expectations of the partner institution. This in return reflects a lack of inclusion of the partner institutions in the various processes. Also, some of the negative aspects indicate that while logistics seem to pose a continuous challenge, some of the problems arise from the lack of understanding between, particularly, DIHR and the partner institution e.g. of what should be offered from both sides also in terms of preparation, clarification as well as resources as there seems to be a lack of sufficient allocation of resources for the implementation of the programme on either side.

Recommendations

In view of all of the above, the core recommendations for the programme would be as follows:

- 1. Continue and consider expanding the programme, ensuring that sufficiently qualified candidates can be drawn to the programme, and heighten its visibility both in Denmark and in the partner countries.*
- 2. Streamline the process of logistics and administrative back up relating to the posting, especially in light of existing new guidelines e.g. on posting of staff abroad, and consider focusing all of this aspect of the management of the programme on e.g. one person with sufficient time and expertise; ideally this should go hand in hand with similar processes for introduction of new staff at DIHR*
- 3. Include the partner institution to a much larger degree in the planning of the posting, as well as in the recruitment procedure, to ensure that the needs of the partner institution are sufficiently taken into consideration. In this respect, and facilitating a process of “management of expectations”, ensure that all three parties have a corresponding and clear understanding of what will be expected in terms of involvement, tasks to be fulfilled, the resources to be provided etc. before, during and after the posting.*
- 1. 4. Provide the HRO/HRA with sufficient time and other opportunities to prepare for the posting before going to the institution. When different postings follow immediately upon one another, seek to ensure a transfer of e.g. contacts, by having the two postings overlap or in other ways overlap.*
- 5. Consider and clarify the role of the HRO/HRA vis a vis the partner institution and DIHR respectively – i.e. the extent to which the HRO/HRA is to act as a coach or monitor of project implementation on behalf of DIHR and/or to be considered a staff member within the partner institution, and clarifying the expectations on the HRO/HRA, the partner institution and DIHR in this respect. In particular, seek an appropriate degree of integration of the HRO/HRA within the staff of the partner institution, and ensure that sufficient time is allocated both at DIHR and within the partner institution to manage the programme.*
- 6. Especially in case of posting of HRAs, consider their specific competences as well as the specific needs of the partner institution, and the extent to which both they and the partner institution can honour the particular expectations.*

7. *To develop a standard Memorandum of Understanding for signatures of the parties that defines and describes the roles and responsibilities of each of the three stakeholders and to which Terms of Reference of the HRO/HRA can be attached.*
8. *Especially in relation to communication between the HRO/HRAs and the DIHR programme management, staff administration and general leadership, ensure a process of regular feedback as well as responsiveness to ideas and reflections stemming from the HRO/HRAs*

I. Intro (background, methodology and quantitative analysis)

1. Background

The Human Rights Officer (HRO) Programme was initiated in the beginning of the 1990s and merged into the Danish Center/Institute for Human Rights' Framework agreement with the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs/DANIDA taking effect from January 1997. The objective was two fold: i) to strengthen the Danish resource base in the human rights field by providing young graduates from law and social sciences with practical experience from the implementation field and upon their return having them take up positions in the existing Danish institutions such as DIHR where they would be valuable additions because of their combination of theoretical and practical knowledge; and ii) to assist in developing partnership and capacity development of partner institutions that would receive the added assistance of an additional staff member who would in return contribute to their own institutional development; finally as iii), the positions have also in a few cases been utilised as a means of posting e.g. a Director in DIHR's own programme or office in specific countries where the programme implementation has contained such an element . After the DIHR human rights programmes developed significantly, the additional distinction of the Human Rights Advisor (HRA) was created under the programme. The HRA was a position for persons with a higher degree of prior experience and qualifications who would be able to assist the partner institution, typically within the state sector, e.g. at a management level and with strategy development etc., in addition to merely being a useful staff addition.

The length and format of the postings were envisaged as up to one year, with a relatively short introductory period at DIHR, followed by approximately 10 months with the partner in the country. It was completed through approximately one month at DIHR at the end, where the HRO would finish a written assignment that was prepared during the posting, not unlike a research project where the posting would be comparable to doing the fieldwork. However, over the years this particular element has been toned down, and furthermore it is now common to have postings extended for up to 2-3 years consecutively filled by the same person.

Over the years more than 40 persons have been posted in these positions, and as several of them have been extended and more than once, the number of posting "units" is significantly higher.

All postings have been advertised and candidates selected on the basis of their qualifications in general and suitability for the individual context of the posting, verified through interviews, i.e. in conformity with the principles governing the appointment of Danish public employees. Several but not all have been of Danish background, which is natural as the postings have been advertised in Denmark only. However, a few have been hired through an international process and have been of other nationalities – usually in the context of those postings where e.g. language qualifications not easily identifiable in Denmark (e.g. Spanish or French) were considered a necessity.

No systematic tracking have been made of where the candidates have gone after their employment within the programme. However, in a number of cases they have, in fact,

returned to be hired by DIHR or have been recruited by e.g. the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and have here confirmed the notion that the Danish resource bases would, in fact, be strengthened through the programme.

2. Objective and methodology of evaluation

The objective of this evaluation is to assess the outcome of the programme to date and to gather the “lessons learned”; to evaluate whether this picture is consistent from the point of view of the three groups of stakeholders (the HRO/HRA, DIHR and the partner); and to draft recommendations for the future form of the programme.

The methodology applied has been to send, by email, an identical questionnaire to as many as possible, i.e. as could be identified by contact address etc., of three groups: the human rights officers and advisors; the representatives from the partner institutions; and DIHR contact persons, programme managers responsible for those project to which the HRO/HRAs have been attached.¹

On the basis of the questionnaire responses received from all three stakeholders groups, a short quantitative as well as an extensive qualitative analysis has been carried out, forming the basis for the final conclusions and draft recommendations. Upon the first review of the responses, it was decided to adopt the format followed below, i.e. that all of the answers by the stakeholders would be attached, in the form of footnotes, so as to show the documentation on which the reflections are based. All of the answers have been made anonymous to the greatest extent possible, by removing concrete references to names, titles, countries and institutions. In some cases the responses have been separated to the extent that they figured under one heading but actually addressed different questions. Apart from these adaptations, care has been taken to ensure that the responses figure as clearly and unedited as possible.

Under each section, the responses by the HRO/HRAs themselves are the first one quoted. It should be noted that the structuring of the responses may differ slightly from that of the two other stakeholder groups because of the extent and detail of their answers. Also, in the questionnaires it is not easily identifiable whether the person stationed in the programme was in fact a Human Rights Officer or a Human Rights Advisor, and from the answers this does not seem to have made any particular difference in relation to the questions asked. Therefore, and for the sake of simplicity, the abbreviation “HRO” in the following refers to both types of postings without distinction, unless specifically stated so.

Following the responses under each particular section of the questionnaire by the HRO/HRAs, are those of the partner institutions and then, finally, those of the DIHR contact persons. In this manner each question is analysed through the reflections of all three stakeholder groups, which should provide the clearest picture of the issues addressed and serve to highlight the variation, and in some cases even discrepancies, in relation to the various answers.

The evaluation is completed by a summing up of general conclusions and a set of recommendations to be taken into consideration for the further development of the programme in the future.

3. Quantitative analysis

All in all, the level of answering of the questionnaires, through a process including repeated reminders, reached about 30%, which is considered normal in such processes although it is not particularly high. However, given that the main emphasis is on the qualitative aspects and on learning from the concrete experience of the involved parties, the collected answers should still be viewed as reflecting various aspects of the programme as a whole, and are therefore sufficient in number and diversity to serve this purpose.

3.a. With respect to *the HRO/HRAs* them selves, 10 out of 18 (55%) responded. Not surprisingly, the majority of the response came from those who had participated in the programme in recent years (especially in 2005), and in relation to those few answers going back to before e.g. 2003, response came from persons who had had previous or subsequent closer engagement with DIHR, i.e. as staff members or associates. This means that the survey reflects few perspectives from candidates who were only attached to the programme during the period of assignment. In theory, this could have some bearing on the nature of the answers, as the respondents may feel a sense of loyalty towards DIHR. However, as can be seen from the qualitative analysis below, answers have still been given very frankly and are rich in constructive criticism, so this risk should be considered rather limited in actuality.

The variety of country placements varies, and includes, Malawi, the Gambia, Rwanda, Albania, Cambodia, Honduras and Switzerland (Geneva). Experience from HRO placements in e.g. Niger, South Africa, the UK, Costa Rica, India, Vietnam and Guatemala is thus not reflected from the point of view of the HROs.

There is an interesting gender aspect, in the sense that while there is a small imbalance in relation to the number of men and women HROs stationed (16 men and 22 women, one of these in two postings), only two of the women answered the questionnaire, while eight of the men did so. This cannot be explained by the difference in time, since the number of HROs required in the later years of the programme reflects a more or less fifty-fifty gender balance, but may have other reasons. However, the significant impact is that the survey may not adequately reflect the particular concerns differing from men and women e.g. in relation to concerns over personal safety etc., particularly in view of the nature of the posting countries in general.

3.b. With respect to response from the *institution partners (IPs)*, the degree of response has been relatively higher: 9 out of 14 have responded (64%), two of these relating to each two HROs, covering a total of 11 HRO placements. Again, the response has good geographical distribution, representing partners in Malawi (three different institutions), Honduras, Cambodia (two different institutions), the Gambia, Niger and Switzerland (Geneva). On the other hand this also excludes Rwanda (here, however, the posting was done directly with the DIHR office in Kigali and not with a local partner), South Africa, Albania, India, Vietnam, Guatemala and the UK.

Generally, the partners responding are those who have recently hosted, or are currently hosting, HROs. With respect to the nature of the partner institution, the answers represent well the programme's stronger degree of state than independent institution or civil society partners, but the latter group is represented both in the survey and among the responding partners.

3.c. Among the *DIHR contact persons*, 4 out of 9 (44%) current staff members responded, three of these on behalf of one HRO and one on behalf of four, covering all in all seven placements. In addition two former staff members received the questionnaire but did not respond. The geographical perspective is unfortunately quite limited, to Rwanda and Malawi, leaving out a number of other countries as outlined above.

II Qualitative Analysis

In the following sections, the respondents' answers to the various questions are gathered and analysed.. In order to highlight the variations which may exist between the different groups of respondents and with a focus on analysing the different aspects reflected in each question in case, all three groups of respondents' comments are dealt with together under the same question heading.

1. "Preparation and follow up"

The question was formulated as follows:

- *"To what extent was the internship well planned, and has there been adequate completion and follow up, e.g. in terms of:*
 - *selection of and anchoring within candidate/partner institution(1.a);*
 - *clarification of issues relating to e.g. security, salary, housing, insurance, transport, equipment, office space(1.b);*
 - *clarification of relationship with contact person(s) with other stakeholders ? (1.c)"*

1.a. Selection of and anchoring within the partner institution

With respect to selection of and anchoring within the partner institution, the HROs generally indicate that they were well received by the partner institutions, who had a good sense of what to expect and what to be expected to deliver.

However, some still had slightly less positive experiences, where improved contact and consultation between DIHR and the partner institution may have been useful.

There seems to have been some difference in situations where the HRO was not the first one posted; the institution may in some cases have been more certain of what to expect; nevertheless the second or third postings suffered in several instances from the problem of a lack of "hand over", i.e. the transfer of e.g. knowledge and contacts from one HRO to the next. This in particular seems to have an impact on the clarification of relationships with other stakeholders (see below). However, in at least one case there was an overlap between postings, which seems to have been useful.

In general, many of these issues seem to have had some impact on the effectiveness of the programme, as time is spent sorting them out in various ways. Whereas most of them seem to have been sorted out gradually, it should be considered that the relatively limited duration of the posting period means that it should be avoided as much as possible in order to optimize the use of time.

One aspect of the preparation, which seems to vary among the answers, is the in-house DIHR preparation of the posting, i.e. introduction and ability for the HRO to familiarise themselves with the context. While some had no particular issues or even

indicated that this had worked out well, others indicated that this could have been done better. It seems that DIHR internal materials in this area are useful and necessary, but that they may still not cover the areas needed.

The partner response indicated a very mixed picture. In a few cases the partner institution did participate in the process of hiring the HRO, and this inclusion was obviously appreciated. However, in most of the cases the partner institution played no role at all, or at least a very limited one, in relation to the identification and selection of the HRO. Whereas this in some cases this was merely accepted and did not give rise to frustration or dissatisfaction, some of the answers relating to these postings indicate that the partner institution did not feel sufficiently included in the process and that this was not conducive to the sense of partnership. In general the partners seem to have perceived that the process was done correctly and timely and with a good result in terms of identifying the right person for the position.

The DIHR contact persons' responses in many ways support this picture. They show a variation in the degree of their own involvement in the selection of the candidate and drafting of his/her ToR. They also indicate that there has, in cases, been consultation with the partners about the selection of the HRO. However, several of the answers indicate that there have been problems in ensuring sufficient anchoring with the partner institution, e.g. in one case leading to the transfer to another institution. This is mainly due to an insufficient degree of inclusion of the partner institution in the process, combined in some cases with a perceived lack of clarity on behalf of the partner institution about the implications of receiving a HRO and, as a consequence, lack of institutional readiness to benefit fully from the posting.

1.b. Logistics

One aspect, which seems to figure prominently in relation to many of the answers to the questionnaires, is the issue of logistics. Comments especially relate to difficulties relating to security, housing, insurance, equipment and office space, whereas e.g. transport and salary seem to have been less contentious. In some cases this is indicated as merely being time consuming, but in other cases situations seem to have developed in a manner which were, at best, highly inconvenient, problematic or even dangerous for the person involved. In at least one instance the partner institution handled these matters with a positive impact.

The partner responses all more or less indicate that their role in arranging logistics relating to the posting is very limited, usually only consisting of identifying a place to live, and then, naturally, providing office space and some equipment. In relation to the latter, it is suggested that DIHR may assist further in this respect in order to improve the quality of the programme.

The DIHR contact person responses vary on this point, where some indicate that they had almost no role to play in sorting out the logistics which were perceived by them as having been sorted out between the HRO and the partner institution. However, in other cases they support the notion expressed by the partners that they have little involvement with this beyond the basics of office space etc. More importantly though, many of them indicate that they themselves did in fact spend quite a lot of time and efforts in sorting out these matters, and, in some cases, also a frustratingly high

amount of time and energy. Furthermore, several of them point to lack of streamlined procedures as well as knowledge on important administrative issues and a lack of clear distribution of responsibilities within DIHR academic staff and personnel administration.

1.c. Clarification of relationship with contact persons

In relation to clarification of *relationship with contact persons (in the DIHR)*, most of the respondents were fairly positive, but there were also expressions that this had worked less well.

The relationship with other stakeholders seems to be closely related to the issue of transfer of contacts, which is evidently very important, mostly in relation to postings with the host institution where the HRO has a predecessor. It also seems to have been tied in with a more or less well managed introduction by the PM in Copenhagen. In general the relationship with other stakeholders seems to have worked well and been a positive aspect of many postings.

In relation to both of these, the partner responses are a bit ambiguous, insofar as many of them refer to the ToR as the place where this is formalised rather than sharing their actual experience. Whereas some of the answers directly mention that the relationship has been good and that the HRO has e.g. had good contact with many external stakeholders, there are also some direct and specific requests formulated in the responses to the effect that the issues of contact person for the HRO should be much better clarified, both through a stronger process of consultation between DIHR and the partner institution, and through ensuring that the HRO is completely clear on this as well.

Also in relation to both, the DIHR contact persons' responses do not quite fit this picture, but rather indicate that this process has been handled smoothly and with extensive inclusion of the partner institution through a process of introduction and consultation also between the DIHR and partner institution contact persons. But there is also some indication from this side that the relationships may not always be understood the same way by all three actors, i.e. in cases where the DIHR contact persons may have gotten the impression that, in particular, the partner institution was not absolutely clear on the extent and nature of their relationship with the HRO, e.g. on he/she not being in a position comparable to that of one of their own staff members.

2 Terms of Reference: “Tasks and Mandate”

The question, headed Terms of Reference: “Tasks and Mandate”, was formulated in a number of sub-sections:

2. a. “How would you describe your role(-s) (e.g. facilitator, resource person, administrator, expert, consultant); and main tasks (e.g. management, coordination, coaching, teaching giving input, controlling)”

In almost all cases the HRO/HRA has taken on a very broad variety of roles and tasks (without distinguishing between the two). One of the key words that the majority use is “facilitator”, which indicates involvement in processes and making them run more smoothly within the partner institution and between various partners, but without taking over from the partner institution. This is positive and interesting because it could be taken as an indication that this balance seems to have been found in many of the postings and that the HRO in this way has been a real contribution to the partner institution. Closely related to facilitation seems to have been participation in strategy processes, coaching of staff and management, input to documents and processes, identification of capacity building and other needs of the partner institution, and in general acting in an advisory capacity.

In cases where the partner has e.g. been a network of different institutions/ organisations, the HRO seems to have played an important role in relation to serving as a link and neutral facilitator between the various partners, as well as between different programmes in countries where DIHR has several, i.e. as a sort of country coordinator.

Another key role seems to be facilitating communication and a flow of information to and from the DIHR office in Copenhagen, not just in relation to the implementation to the concrete programme, but also in relation to identification of potential new partners. Whereas this in theory may give rise to some tension, e.g. if the HRO forwards “internal” information, this does not in actuality seem to have been problematic, which is a further indication that the HRO/HRA in most cases more or less instinctively has found the right balance of close partnership without “entanglement” in the partner institution and its problems etc.

However, even when acting mainly as a facilitator, the HRO has almost always at the same time been occupied with much more concrete and hands-on tasks as well. Such tasks have included writing of documents and reports, communication, and in general assisting and serving as a resource person in relation to all activities relating to the implementation of the project, as well as acting as an in-house expert e.g. in relation to various legal matters and law in general. This seems to have been particularly important in cases where the partner institution has been short of capacity and/or staff, but has even in some cases been taken on at the expense of actually spending time on more overall capacity building, which in this way must be considered of primarily short-term value to the partner organisation rather than the more long-term capacity building.

In this area the partner answers differ somehow due to some confusion as to whose role they talk about. On their own role, which is not strictly relevant but may be generally interesting, there is great variation ranging from senior management level through project manager, supervisor and technical assistant. On the role of the HRO/HRA, this is one area where this distinction have come through in the responses, since the response relating to, at least, one HRA indicates the role of advisor and coach to Chair and senior management and providing policy advise at this level. In contrast, at least one of the responses relating to a HRO describes it as an “intake position”. However, a common denominator in all of the positions seem to be some degree of advice and coaching of staff in partner organisation, management and coordination of programmes, teaching and other functions, i.e. generally contributing to the effectiveness and sustainability of the work within the partner institution.

DIHR contact persons similarly responded on two aspects as well, i.e. on their own role and on that of the HRO as well.

On the first aspect, the role of the DIHR contact person him/herself, this indicates a variety of project management and administration aspects, including being a dialogue partner for the HRO, financial controlling and even mediation between network partners with the HRO. In contrast to the question above, the project managers on this issue do not over-emphasize the issue of handling the logistical and personnel aspects of the placement. Instead, the answers give a sense that at least in some cases the relationship between the HRO and the DIHR contact person was of a slightly different nature because of the particular position etc. of the HRO. This could be seen as an example of e.g. the relative seniority and as a consequence, ranking between the HRO and the DIHR contact person may be different in some cases from other.

With respect to the role of the HRO as perceived by the DIHR contact person, the (relatively few) answers given show well the basic duality of this, i.e. on the one hand servicing the partner through technical assistance, advice and input; and on the other hand acting as the “eyes, ears and arms” of the project manager, following overall developments in the country, but also the implementation of the programme and, in this respect, the performance of the partner. Although this is not highlighted in the answers under this section, it comes through under some of the other sections that the basic relationship between the HRO and the partner institution is one of giving internal assistance, operating almost as an ordinary staff member, but at the same also acting in a monitoring capacity – with all of the potential for confusion and conflict when there is no common and clear understanding about the balance between the two.

2. b. How were these defined? By whom? On what basis? Did there, from your position, seem to be consistency in perception between all three stakeholders?”

Reflecting, firstly, on the process, the ToR seem in all cases to have been defined largely by DIHR, with a varying degree of partner involvement: there are examples where the ToR are defined through a joint process reflecting a high degree of agreement between the partner and DIHR, and in these cases the project document seems to have given a good foundation for doing so.

However, there are also examples of the HRO/HRA having a sense that the partner institution had had very little to do with the process of defining the ToR, and that in

some cases this role even seems to have been left to the HRO/HRA. In these cases, again, there is a real risk that the posting does not sufficiently respond to partner needs, or in worst cases even takes into consideration whether the partner institution in fact needs or desires a posting from DIHR.

Secondly, the scope and level of precision of the ToR varies. In most cases they seem to have been formulated at a fairly overall and general level, and in some cases somewhat ambitiously, which could be seen as slightly negative in the sense that they would not give very specific direction for the filling of the post. However, it seems that a positive element in this regard outweighs the negative, and that is the flexibility of the ToR to adapt the more specific tasks to the changing needs of the partner institution and the context in general. In addition, the extent of freedom hereby given to the HRO/HRA to define their work seems to have been a positive asset in relation to some postings.

Generally the partners responded that the ToR were drafted according to the framework of the project agreement, and that this process seemed to have been carried out jointly by the various stakeholders to the project. This has then, furthermore, led to ToR for the HRO which are clear and consistent with the framework of the project document, although it is indicated in one case that the role of him/her in general was somewhat unclear. This is a slightly different picture than the indication from the HROs themselves, according to which the partner involvement was significantly reduced – or, rather, this may still be the case but then does not seem to have caused problems or frustration for the partners.

Similarly with reference to the question in totality, the DIHR contact persons indicate a pattern, which fits well with both that expressed by the HROs themselves and by the partner institution, insofar as some partner institutions have been involved in this process. In most instances this does not seem to have been the case, as this process seems to have been carried out in direct collaboration between DIHR and the HRO, i.e. without much involvement by the partner. Nevertheless, the picture of clarity and consistence expressed by the partner above seems to be supported by the DIHR contact persons. The process generally seems to have been based on an adaptation of general ToR drafted by DIHR, which seems a good process ensuring consistency throughout the HRO programme while at the same time taking into account the needs of the context. One thing to be noted is that many of the answers indicate that these ToR seem to have been “generally understood” and in other ways suggest (or in one case, directly state) that the ToR could be more specifically formulated e.g. in writing so as to ensure even greater clarity and common understanding between all three stakeholders to the process.

2. c. “Describe the extent of ensuring correspondence and contribution to programme/project as formulated in e.g. project document (e.g. vision, mission, development, and immediate objectives, activities, output and indicators); describe extent of role (visible, tacit) of various project documentation in this process”

In general the posting, i.e. including the ToR, seem to take their reference point in, first and foremost, the programme document and other supporting documents designed to facilitate the cooperation between the partner institution and DIHR. In this way the postings over all seem have been ensured close correspondence between

the tasks and assignments of the posting on the one hand, and the overall framework of the programme, its objectives and the vision and mission of the partner institution on the other. In light of the reflection about ToR for most postings being very broad, but also flexible, this seems to indicate that the postings in general are well contextualised and closely tied in with the cooperation programme between DIHR and the partner institution.

Several of the HRO/HRAs indicate that the programme design in itself may not sufficiently reflect the goals and priorities pursued by the partner, in addition it may be too ambitious and unrealistic especially taking into consideration the degree of availability of resources to implement it. This reflection should be seriously considered, as it is viewed from the unique position of the HRO/HRA having “a foot in both camps”, i.e. being closely in touch and familiar with DIHR policies, programme and practices including e.g. programme design and implementation of the partnership approach – and at the same time being involved in the daily implementation of the programme from an inside position within the partner institution, with the ability to pick up conversations and sentiments which the programme manager may not be in a position to share.

While this double role may be problematic in some cases (see above/below on this), it does still provide an extremely useful link between DIHR and the partner organisation in relation to implementation of the partnership programme, and as a useful “reality check” in this relation as well.

Here, the partners responded quite extensively, at least compared to some of the other questions. Some of the answers, however, merely relate to the project implementation in general, and are therefore less relevant in relation to the specific objective of this review although they contain valuable reflections on programme implementation and relations with DIHR in general. On the aspects relating directly to the HRO, the answers do correspond to the picture indicated above, i.e. on the one hand that the partner institution has not been greatly involved in the process of formulation and/or ensuring consistency with the project framework; that there has been little or even no consultation with the partner in this respect; and that in any case there is very little documentation such as written ToR or other documents that specifically clarify these issues. Nonetheless these answers still show clearly that the HRO/HRA in fact has fulfilled important and relevant functions, in carrying out the work needed by the partner institution/organisation and fulfilling their needs for assistance at the concrete level.

DIHR contact persons’ answers indicated that there seemed to have been general correspondence between the project framework and the functions of the HRO, although this in many ways was difficult to identify as e.g. project cycles were delayed and since the project formulation was not very specific.

3 “*Relationship with partner(s)*”

Question 3, addressing the relationship between the various parties (the HRO, the partner organisation/institution and DIHR) was formulated as follows:

3.a Describe the general relationship with other two stakeholders; exemplify positive/negative aspects in relation to the following:

- *Communication and professional exchange*
- *Daily work, e.g. support, logistics*
- *Personal interaction”*

In general the HRO/HRAs express that they have managed to establish good relationships with their DIHR contact persons as well as with the staff and colleagues in the partner institution.

i. The replies with respect to **relations with the partner institution** seem to cut across the spectrum of communication and professional exchange, daily work and personal interaction. The statements addressing this seem to indicate that the HRO/HRAs establish good personal and professional contacts, in the right balance, and that they generally have been made to feel welcome and included by the partner institution – even in those cases where the partner institution has suffered from internal problems e.g. in relation to lack of effectiveness, management etc. In fact, the very positive and detailed response in this area seems to indicate that interaction and building close relations with individuals in the partner institution may be one of the most enriching, and hereby attractive, aspects of the programme. It furthermore indicates that, even in those cases (discussed above) where the partner institution has not played a decisive role in relation to the definition of task etc. for the placement, they have still welcomed the HRO/HRA and included them within the daily life of the organisation.

However, as indicated in some of the answers, the lack of clarity of the exact role of the HRO/HRA and their double function as sometime DIHR representative and sometime local staff, can give some cause for concern.

ii. In relation to **relations with DIHR contact person**, the response is also generally positive.

However, there are some indications that feedback and regular communication has not in some cases been sufficiently ensured by the DIHR project manager, formulations in this regard suggest that this may be attributed to general work pressure and responsibility for other projects as well, including travelling, rather than ill will or disregard.

On this point, the partner and DIHR contact responses all address the relationship with the HRO/HRA and do not address the relationship with e.g. the DIHR contact person.

In relation to *communication and professional exchange* the answers from the partner institution are very positive, indicating that there is good communication at the

professional level, with a high degree of daily interaction in an appropriate manner, especially in terms of respect of the professional (institutional) hierarchy, as well as among the other staff members, where the HRO/HRA seems to have been included in a manner similar to the partner institution's own personnel. The relationship in all cases seems to have been one of mutual respect and cordiality and with a high degree of inclusion of all aspects of the institutions' work. The only obstacle hampering this flow of communication seems to have been a lack of sufficient language skills (Spanish) to interact at an optimal level.

The DIHR contact persons have no particular comments to make on this issue.

In relation to *daily work, e.g. support, logistics*, the DIHR partners indicate that in general this issue does not seem to have caused any problems for a number of reasons. The reasons include the fact that these matters were already sorted out in the project document, and that the partner institution made things easier for themselves by simply taking the position that the HRO would share office space etc. with the other interns so as to ensure his/her equality in the daily life in the office. In some cases the HRO was even a general asset to the partner institution in the sense that he/she apparently assisted in other matters relating to this area within the host institution in general and not just sorting out his/her own arrangements. The only slightly negative comment is that in one case it was indicated that the HRO worked too slowly, but even that does not seem to have caused particular problems.

On this issue as well as the previous one, the DIHR contact persons have made no specific indications except for one generally positive observation that all seems to have gone well in this area.

On the issue of *personal interaction*, one partner indicates that they do not see their role as checking on the other partner's relationship and would have had to be informed specifically about doing so in order to provide a clearer answer on this point. If this is a general approach even though only specifically expressed in this case, it may indicate a low level of reflection on this point. However, other answers from the partners the partner institutions positively indicate that the HRO/HRA has had extremely good interaction with all stakeholders, "even though this can be tricky at times" (as indicated by one partner) and another partner expressing a need for all partners to know more about the true nature of partnership and ask for generally improved communication between all stakeholders.

DIHR contact persons have various positive observations to make, ranging from general "no problem" to more direct expressions of satisfaction reflecting that the level of interaction between the DIHR contact person and the HRO as well as the partner institution has been even very good. There are also a few negative comments, indicating that the HRO in one case has had even significant problems in relation to interaction with the partner institution staff, and that in another case the HRO was not sufficiently included within the partner organisation mainly due to a lack of initiative on their part, which meant that the competences of the HRO were not fully utilized. Finally, one example given is that the communication between DIHR on the one hand and the HRO as well as the partner institution on the other has been intense, but at the same time also difficult because of time pressure and technical problems.

4: “Expectations and general experience”

The question entitled “Expectations and general experience”, was formulated as:

4. a. “What were your expectations for the programme? Which? Were they met?”

This is one area where there is a significant difference between the nature of the response from HROs and HRAs, in the sense that some of the answers from the latter group are far more specific and indicate the relatively high level of ambition and aspiration of these often more experienced candidates. At the same time this, however, has also meant that responses from these sources, while still positive, in a few cases are somewhat more guarded. There is an indication that while the posting itself fulfilled expectations, the context of a developing/transitional country was a bit difficult to adjust to. Similarly, one HRA comments on the lack of full utilisation of his/her particular competences, rather than simple project management etc., as a reason for a sense of only partial fulfilment of expectation. This latter complaint may be valid enough, and ties in with the issue of defining tasks and ToR for the posting, where a clear and focused process of exchange between the HRO/HRA, DIHR and the partner institution may help to avoid such misunderstandings.

With respect to the HROs, and the HRAs in general as well, the posting seems to have fully fulfilled and often even surpassed their expectations. This is the case in terms of professional development including e.g. the ability to network and establish contacts, working in key substance areas and in general gaining working experience from different contexts in the process of development. At a more personal level the posting seems for most to have been a real growth experience, i.e. challenging as well as interesting and satisfactory, not in the least due to the unique opportunity for working inside a different cultural context, and the sense of contributing to a constructive process. The overwhelmingly positive response in this area (with just one slightly less enthusiastic indication), should be seen as a credit to the programme and to the institutions involved as well as to the persons that have managed to gain the best from their posting, even in the light of some of the more difficult issues addressed above.

Partner responses in relation to expectations are diverse; in some cases they clearly indicate that their expectations were met, e.g. in relation legal advice; to the transfer of knowledge and skills to the partner organisation as well as fundraising and strategic planning; being a fully integrated staff member and a valuable addition to the team; identification of thematic issues and of expertise; acting as a coach for the host institution, development of necessary documents for reform being a bridge to the DIHR expertise, and an “antenna” within the donor community. Especially the last one of these is identifiable as a HRA rather than a HRO posting, and clearly indicating that the expectations were higher they were fortunately still met. In other cases, however, the partner institution states that their expectations were not met, and in some of the cases it is directly stated that this is due to a lack of sufficient experience of the HRA posted, and that the competence of the HRO was not so distinctly different from that of the staff of the partner institution so as to really make a significant difference. This may apparently also relate to the lack of sufficient funding for the programme to attract highly qualified expertise, as one partner points out – still adding to the point of complaint that the person posted did not sufficiently

fulfil the expected qualifications. On a slightly different angle, the partner institutions in more than one case indicate that the lack of fulfilled expectations were primarily a question of insufficient analysis and consideration of the needs of the partner institution by DIHR, i.e. a problem of insufficient communication between DIHR and the partner before the posting. This is consistent with the indications above that it is DIHR that selects and hires the candidates for the postings and in general directs the programme. This should give rise to serious re-consideration of this basic element in the process of ensuring satisfaction with the programme by all of the stakeholders involved.

In view of this, the DIHR contact person responses are almost all positive, which should perhaps not be surprising in view of the control of the recruiting process that DIHR apparently has. In one case the response is decidedly negative, apparently because the HRO in question was not at all performing on, at least, the particular task for which he/she had been hired. However, in all of the other cases the DIHR contact persons indicate that they were satisfied with the HRO/HRA posted, primarily because they proved to be a genuine asset to the DIHR and to the partner institution activities in question, not the least in a time of expansion and reform of the programme, and by being placed in the country with the possibility of feeding back and forth information etc., in this way serving as a useful link between the partner institution and the DIHR programme officer. The DIHR contact persons in several cases comment on the extensive capacity of the HRO/HRAs whom they indicate as being very capable and able to fulfil their functions extremely well, in spite of e.g. young age and difficult circumstances such as being asked to relate to two different programmes at the same time.

4. b. Would you generally consider the programme a success or not? Why? Why not?

In general all of the respondents answer favourably to this question– the less positive response seeming to reflect on the more ambitious nature of the programme and assessment of possible sustainability, rather than in relation to the concrete posting.

A multitude of reasons for the claimed success of the programme are given, but basically they fall in two categories: firstly, the objective nature of the programme, i.e. DIHR's successful involvement and the fulfilment of programme and project objectives, general positive standing in the country, and the ability of achieving the joint objective of providing useful assistance to the partner institution while at the same time contributing to building up a professional Danish/international resource base. Secondly, the more subjective sense of success and accomplishment of the individual HRO/HRA, e.g. how the posting has affected positively their future career outlook.

In relation to success, partners in general indicated that the posting had been a success, both because the project to which he/she related in itself was completed fully and on time, and because the HRO/HRA seemed to have grown with the process. A useful indicator may be that in one case the HRO was hired by the partner organisation as a regular staff member following the posting by DIHR. However, there are also indications from the partner institutions, consistent with the comments made above, that in some cases the programme had not been a complete success

primarily because the needs of the partner institution had not been properly identified and/or taken into account, and therefore the distinct contribution of the HRO/HRA was less visible to the partner institution than may have been hoped for. Finally, one case indicates that the output produced by the HRO was less than expected, which is also consistent with some of the remarks made above, and echoed by the DIHR contact person response as well.

The DIHR contact persons answers are very much in conformity with those of the partner institution, in fact more so here than in relation to most of the questions addressed above: while they generally indicate that the programme has been a success, they also admit that certain aspects of the management of the programme in relation to the definition of tasks, responsibilities etc. could have been clarified.

4. c. “give at least three positive and negative examples of experience with the programme, and list three most important recommendations for the future”

i. Similarly to the previous question on success of the programme, the many **positive examples** of good experience gained falls in the two categories of more overall and programme-related examples, primarily illustrating how DIHR’s work and the partners’ commitment comes together very constructively. And then examples are given of how the posting has contributed to the HRO/HRAs individual professional and personal process of development, particularly through the process of working in the partner institution and having a sense of making a difference there.

Positive examples quoted by the partners include a broad range of areas most of which have already been pointed out previously. This covers the actual work of the person posted (transfer of skills and knowledge, capacity building and technical assistance in key areas, and in this way “making the partner organisation able to do what it could otherwise not do”), the personal presence and human qualities of the HRO/HRA (intelligence and competence, ability to interact well with the various stakeholder groups and the easy adsorption into the organisation because of their skills and knowledge), and their mere presence (acting as a liaison with e.g. donors and government authorities – but, interestingly enough, not mentioning of their usability as a link from the partner organisation back to DIHR).

DIHR contact persons give positive examples mostly relating to the usefulness of the HRO/HRA as a service provider, facilitator and manager of follow up in relation to DIHR missions and other visits to the project. In addition, the ongoing presence in the project implementing institution means that effectively the DIHR contact person has an additional “pair of eyes” aimed not just at the progress of the project but also in relation to the country context and human rights situation in general. In this way the HRO/HRA is indicated as being a very useful sparring partner for DIHR project manager.

ii. With respect to **negative examples**, a number of these are quoted as well, illustrating accurately and consistently some of the issues already addressed, but even more concretely bringing forward examples, which underline the nature of these problems as seen from the point of view of the individual HRO/HRA.

Basically, the negative experiences listed fall in four categories: firstly, the issue of logistics seems to have caused frustration in a number of cases. Mainly, this concerns lack of sufficient (in the eyes of the HRO/HRA) handling of issues such as work permit, insurance and bank account and, to a lesser extent, computer hardware. The issue of remuneration is indirectly addressed in the form of insufficient compensation in the form of overtime and hardship postings.

Secondly, some of the negative experience/comments relate to insufficient time for preparation before the posting, both in terms of familiarisation with DIHR and in relation to the country and regional specific context etc.

Thirdly, a large number of the negative examples quoted relate to communication and relationship between the HRO/HRA and DIHR; and perhaps this is an area where critique is less well reflected above, where answers to questions in this area were relatively positive. The major direction of the critique goes towards lack of sufficient feedback on performance and in response to questions, as well as administrative backup. This can most likely be attributed to the PMs in question exhibiting a combination of lack of awareness of how important this task is and inability to do so because of general work pressure. Finally, one of the apparently negative experiences reflected a sense of being overruled in assessment of needs and direction on the project implementation and potential new initiatives. While this to a large extent may be seen as a lack of understanding of the relative responsibility and mandate of the HRO/HRA, the PM and DIHR management, it also illustrates that decision making processes may depend on the individual persons involved, and enhances the need for clear and transparent channels of decision making.

Fourthly, some of the negative experience quoted relate to the situation of the partner institution. Some of these reflect in reality more general complaints about the institution being characterised e.g. by a less than constructive approach to personal allowances, or partner organisations affected by crisis or simply too small and weak to fully absorb the competence and potential of a HRO posting. However, again some of these negative experiences reflect back on lack of a full understanding in the partner institution of DIHR as a distinct institution and e.g. not a donor, of the fundamental nature of the role of the HRO. In general it reflects a lack of a sufficiently developed common understanding between DIHR and the partner institution of the posting, which again may reveal a lack of sufficient communication and clarification process between the two at the time of initiation of the programme.

As concerns negative examples from partners, some of them strongly indicate that there have in fact been no negative experiences to report in relation to the posting, which is of course positive. However, in one case it is admitted that the actual use of the HRO was adapted to the actual needs of the situation rather than conforming strictly to the formal description in the programme documentation – a statement on the basis of which one may gather that had this flexibility not been applied it may have resulted in a less positive experience for all the involved. Also, it is indicated that the HRO may have wished for more discussion and consultation on policy issues, i.e. a question of greater inclusion in the decision making processes regarding the HRO/HRA programme. The responses of the HROs themselves, however, do not really address this issue specifically. Some of the partners, in contrast, also give indications of negative examples, including the failure (of DIHR?) to attract and

recruit a sufficiently senior and qualified expert to meet the expectations of the partner including the time frame planned for at the beginning. Along the same lines, but much less severe and stated, more as an observation than as a point of critique was that the “youthful appearance” of the HRA may have caused some challenges in relation to maintaining seniority in relation to other stakeholders. A serious point of critique in one case is a lack of satisfaction with the qualifications of the HRO posted, both in terms of being sufficiently prepared in terms of country and programme knowledge before departure from DIHR, which corresponds well to some of the similar points of critique raised by the HROs themselves about insufficient preparation time before the posting. In the same case the partner institution also indicates that the work of the HRO was flawed in relation to basic skills, such as work speed and attention to details such as grammar etc., i.e. clearly a sense of disappointment with the performance of the HRO. Finally, another set of negative comments relate more to the rather subtle balance relating to the HROs primary point of reference, i.e. whether they would follow DIHR working hours and holidays, whether e.g. their language skills are sufficient, and in general addressing issues such as not complying with the conditions of work normally imposed on their local colleagues in the partner institution. In those examples there is a clear sense of frustration that the HRO/HRA has apparently operated outside the framework of control and direction by the partner institution, once again addressing the issue of lack of specific clarification of the relative roles of the stakeholders in the programme and, in particular, whether the HRO/HRA refers primarily to the management of the partner institution or to DIHR at different levels.

The negative examples quoted by DIHR contact persons address similar issues, highlighting commonly identified problems such as the case of HROs whose postings was clearly not successful. A somewhat ambiguous comment relating to “mistaken recruitment” could either address a similar issue, i.e. that the person hired turned out not to be the right one for the job, or simply that the process of recruitment did not run smoothly enough and with sufficient clarity of the various stakeholders. Still revolving around aspects of the same basic issue, is the lack of communication and agreement between, especially, DIHR and the partner institution about what should be expected, apparently leading to perceived sense of partner frustration which is, in fact, consistent with the negative comments made above by the partners in relation to expectations from the posting. And a similar consistency can be observed in relation to the HRO in at least one case having to facilitate two different projects and institutions, making even more complicated the question of balance of workload and reference points etc. And, finally, the DIHR contact persons comments clearly express frustration over having to deal with and spending significant amounts of time on dealing with the logistical side of the posting such as salary, flights insurance etc., and handling these without being fully prepared because of lack of clarity relating to rules and policies. This, in fact, echoes some of the comments to the same effect made by the HRO/HRAs themselves in relation to the handling of logistics, who on their side have also experienced frustration that this was not sufficiently professionally handled by DIHR. Another set of comments which are not really negative comments but may be addressed here, are the statements from some of the DIHR contact persons that in a couple of cases the requirement for e.g. drafting a final academic report was waived, as other tasks were considered more essential. This again relates to some of the comments made by all of the stakeholders above that the definition of tasks etc. are not always suited to the needs of the partner institution, and raises some confusion as

to the overall objective of the posting and how this assignment actually fit in or falls outside this.

iii. Finally, the various stakeholders provide a number of **recommendations**, which once more can be clustered around certain issues.

Some of the recommendations from the HRO/HRAs directly reflect, especially, the issues relating to logistics and sufficient preparation, as well as ensuring regular communication and feedback to and from DIHR. The recommendations stress the need for better handling of specific practical aspects, more time for preparation before posting, more regular and systematic processes of feedback, communication and mid-term evaluation, and the need to relevant PMs in Copenhagen to coordinate work among themselves (relevant in relation to certain postings where the HRO serves more than one projects). In general there seems to be a demand for DIHR to plan the various aspects of the posting better.

Other recommendations deal with the need for clarification of issues between the partner institution and DIHR, particularly in relations that ensures that the partner institution is in fact ready, willing and able to receive the HRO/HRA and to use their competences sufficiently.

Along the same lines it is interesting to note that some of the recommendations point to the future direction of the programme in relation to specific types of posting, in one case advocating for a more senior, in another case for another more junior person to be considered as suitable for particular postings. In a third case the recommendation goes even further, suggesting new types of arrangements to secure a more prominent country presence. These considerations are interesting and valuable, again because they stem from the unique on-the-ground experience gathered from the programme so far, and should definitely be taken into consideration for shaping the future of the HRO/HRA programme. On a final note, some very sensible and quite interesting recommendations are put forward, suggesting a general strengthening of the programme, an expansion to other countries and regions as well facilitated through dialogue with the Danish donor and local representations, and aiming at a higher degree of visibility of the programme in general through an expanded media policy.

Some of the recommendations submitted by the partners are simply positive, wishing the programme of posting the HRO/HRAs to continue and even to be expanded, and on a similar constructive basis of balance and inclusion of partner needs and interests as so far, including the application of the incentive policy. Other recommendations are more specific and seek to address some of the issues raised above. This includes involving partners in the selection process and especially securing that the needs of the partner institution are sufficiently reflected in the recruitment profile, so that the partner institution has a sense of active involvement in the process. In addition, the relationship between DIHR and the partner institution must be formalised to a greater extent, e.g. in the form of a MoU and not simply the ToR for the posting, expressing in a similar manner that there is equality between the two parties to the agreement. MoR will also be a tool to clarify roles and responsibilities between stakeholders. The final aspect of the recommendations still indicate a wish by the partner institutions to play a greater role in the programme, by having the HRO/HRA integrate even further into the local staff structure. This would necessitate greater clarification between all

three parties of the working conditions, but also that the HRO/HRA would to a greater degree conform to e.g. local working arrangements, office hours, coordinating holiday plans with the host organisation etc.

Recommendations by DIHR contact persons very much echo those of the partner institution; they call for full inclusion and consultation with the partner institution. They similarly call for improving the recruitment procedure, although the suggestion here is not so significantly addressing partner contribution but rather the general level of professionalism so as to prevent “disappointment”, i.e. reflecting some of the really negative experiences described above. And, interestingly, one of the recommendations from the DIHR contact persons also suggest the use of more highly qualified candidates in the programme, while acknowledging that this will require changing the programme towards longer duration and better conditions. And, further on the latter subject, there is also a very concrete suggestion for the logistical, employment and other personnel issues to be handled centrally by DIHR and the DCISM administration, rather than by the individual project managers, with a view to ensuring consistency and in general a professional administration of these matters.

This is, again, echoed by another recommendation that the practical condition for the posting should be taken fully into account, again ensuring that this is handled professionally. Addressing the same topic from a slightly different angle, one of the recommendations also suggest that the HRO/HRAs themselves should be better prepared to handle e.g. administrative and budget issues. In relation to clarifying the relationship between DIHR, the HRO/HRA and the partner institution through laying down terms and conditions, as well as specified guidelines and conditions for the daily work, in a formal agreement, there is also alignment between the recommendations by the partner institution and DIHR. And, finally, it is suggested that the HRO should only be responsible for one project rather than several, as has been the case in one or two instances, as it is difficult to “serve two masters”, a comment which in principle could refer both to the partner institution and to the DIHR contact person.

III Annexes

Annex 1: Questionnaire text

“Human Rights Officer / Advisor Programme Evaluation / lessons learned

Objective: to assess the outcome of the programme to date and to gather the “lessons learned”; to evaluate whether this picture is consistent from the point of view of the three groups of stakeholders (the HRO/HRA, DIHR and the partner); and to draft recommendations for the future form of the programme.

Methodology: Questionnaire submitted to all three stakeholders groups; analysis of results; follow up interviews; and final conclusions and draft recommendations.

Questionnaire

Identical/corresponding questions to be asked to:

- **HRO / HRA**
- **DIHR contact person**
- **Partner contact person**

1) Preparation and follow up

- To what extent was the internship well planned, and has there been adequate completion and follow up, e.g. in terms of:
 - selection of and anchoring within candidate/partner institution;
 - clarification of issues relating to e.g. security, salary, housing, insurance, transport, equipment, office space;
 - clarification of relationship with contact person(s) with other stakeholders?

2) Terms of reference; tasks and mandate

- How would you describe your role(-s) (e.g. facilitator, resource person, administrator expert, consultant); and main tasks (e.g. management, coordination, coaching, teaching, giving input, controlling)
- How were these defined? By whom? On what basis? Did there, from your position, seem to be consistency in perception between all three stakeholders?
- Describe the extent of ensuring correspondence and contribution to programme/project as formulated in e.g. project document (e.g. vision, mission, development and immediate objectives, activities, output and

indicators); describe extent of role (visible, tacit) of various project documentation in this process

3) Relationship with partner (-s)

- Describe general relationship with other two stakeholders; exemplify positive/negative aspects or experience in relation to the following:
 - Communication and professional exchange
 - Daily work, e.g. support, logistics
 - Personal interaction

4) Expectations and general experience

- What were your expectations for the programme? Which? Were they met?
- Would you generally consider the programme a success or not? Why? Why not?
- Give at least three positive and three negative examples of experience with the programme, and list three most important recommendations for the future.”

Annex 2: List of persons receiving the questionnaire

For the sake of anonymity, this information has been deleted from this public version