

## **Management Response**

### **Evaluation of Programme Work Methods of the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law**

#### **Background**

In August 2017, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) commissioned an external evaluation (originally referred to as “review”) of programme work methods of the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (RWI). Following a call-off under a Sida Framework Agreement for Evaluation Services, the consortium partners FCG Sweden, Sthlm Policy Group AB and Tana Copenhagen were contracted by Sida to carry out the evaluation.

The purpose of the evaluation was to provide inputs for improving conditions for positive results achievement in RWI (Sida-financed) programmes aimed at developing institutional human rights capacity. The focus was on the following work methods used in RWI’s programmes: a) human rights education; b) gender mainstreaming; c) working in difficult human rights environments, in relation to human rights institutional capacity development (assessing also the comparative advantages of RWI in this respect).

The evaluation was expected to strengthen learning within RWI, as well as with Sida, when it comes to positive results achievement of work methods used in RWI international programmes. In view of this, the objectives of the evaluation of the RWI were to:

- Establish the relevance of the work methods used by RWI, and how effective they are for achieving intended institutional human rights capacity development results of sustainable nature, identifying areas of particularly strong performance as well as those in need of being enhanced
- Provide recommendations, on the basis of lessons drawn from the above findings, in terms of suggestions for relevant improvements of work methods for future positive results achievement in the areas assessed and for improving learning within RWI of positive as well as negative experiences of work methods used.

The evaluation was limited to the use of the above-mentioned work methods in RWI Sida-financed international programmes during the period 2013-2016. The evaluation did not focus on a specific RWI programme, but the application of the work methods in question across all RWI programmes. However, to ensure a manageable scope of the evaluation, the evaluation had a particular focus on four “case programmes”, two in-depth through field visits (Turkey and Zimbabwe) and two by way of desk study (Belarus and Regional Asia). The evaluation did not assess results – or performance – as such of RWI programmes nor efficiency aspects relating to programmes overall, but focused on the quality of RWI’s work and methods, in relation to achieving expected results. Finally, the evaluation did not intend to duplicate what had already been assessed in previous evaluations, reviews and audits of RWI programmes carried out during the period 2011-2016.

The results of the evaluation are expected to primarily to be used by RWI in future programmes, in terms of providing recommendations to RWI that can feed into the preparation of new programme proposals from 2017 and onwards, as well as into the

continued strategic and organisational development of the Institute, taking into account the organisational reform process and current strategic priorities of RWI. Where possible, relevant findings should also contribute to the development of ongoing activities.

Sida is also expected to be able to use the results in relation to RWI, and other, programmes. Evaluation recommendations are in this respect expected to provide input to Sida's country/region teams when considering a possible continuation of current, or starting up new, funding of RWI programmes. Also, the evaluation is expected to feed into discussions, as appropriate, between Sida and RWI regarding the development of a new General Agreement, as from 2018, to regulate the cooperation overall.

In addition, RWI programme partners are expected to be able to make use of the evaluation results in relation to future cooperation with RWI and for their own programmes. It is finally expected that other donors and institutions working with these methods could also benefit from the results of the evaluation for their work in the areas under review.

The evaluation was carried out during September – December 2017 by a team comprising the Team Leader, Nicklas Svensson (Sthlm Policy Group), and key experts Dr. Lone Lindholt and Henrik Alffram, together bringing a combination of human rights, development evaluation and programmatic experience. A final report from the evaluation was submitted to RWI in February 2018. This management response has been prepared following consultations with the RWI Board of Trustees and RWI staff. The evaluation and management response was discussed at the Board of Trustees' meeting on 12 March 2018. The Board noted the many interesting micro/macro perspectives put forward by the evaluation on the methods used by the Institute and generally agreed with the main conclusion about the importance of systematically harvesting lessons learned. The Board endorsed the management response.

### **General comments on the evaluation process, findings and recommendations**

In RWI's opinion, the evaluation was conducted in main accordance with the requirements of the Terms of Reference (ToR). The report from the evaluation is generally thorough, providing plenty of information in relation to the evaluation questions posed in the ToR. The evaluation team was able to incorporate a wide range of data from relevant documentation, interviews and site visits during a limited timeframe.

RWI additionally observes that the **evaluation process** was inclusive and participatory in nature, in terms of both Sida's approach (involving RWI in the design of the ToR and the selection of case programmes, etc.) and the evaluation team's approach (maintaining a close dialogue with RWI throughout the evaluation process and involving RWI partners in an appropriate way). The evaluation inception and draft reports were shared with RWI for comments and inputs, and meetings were held to discuss the further framing of the evaluation and to discuss tentative findings.

In terms of **methodology and approaches** to address the substantial evaluation questions, RWI finds that the evaluation team generally followed ToR requirements and also maintained a good dialogue with RWI regarding how to realise these. How in the end the evaluation team chose to specifically assess the issues in focus of the evaluation is of course the team's choice.

RWI believes that, in relation to human rights education, it could have been interesting, for the purposes of the evaluation, to more strongly use the UN Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training as a reference, instead of approaching this area more in relation to types of activities carried out. 'Mapping' the latter also has its value (even if as presented it would not account for all RWI human rights education work), but as far as methodological

aspects are concerned the mentioned Declaration may have provided for further relevant observations and been additionally useful in light of the cross-cutting nature of the exercise.

Furthermore, RWI considers that there would have been further scope for expanding the assessment in the area of gender mainstreaming. While the activity-related focus of the review relating to human rights education would render a lot of information, assessing gender mainstreaming would have needed to further consider other aspects, including tools, quality and process.

RWI appreciates the approach taken by the evaluation team towards the aspect evaluated of 'working in difficult human rights environments' having in focus here the key qualities and characteristics of RWI as an organisation. Many valuable observations and interesting questions are put forward in this part of the report, and the fact that in several cases few "answers" are given probably only signifies the complexity of issues.

RWI is moreover uncertain whether in all ways the more stringent use of standard evaluation criteria, while noting that the ToR prescribes this, actually promoted the best analysis of the methods in question, since the methods in certain respects (in particular perhaps in relation to approaches for working in difficult human rights environments and with gender mainstreaming) are difficult to analyse on this basis. In any case, with the use of these criteria, the analysis, in RWI's opinion, is lacking in some parts.

In terms of **findings and conclusions**, the focus here will be on overall conclusions and not the details of findings, which by and large are accurate in relation to the aspects reviewed and assessed. However, as noted above, regarding gender mainstreaming, there could have been further scope for expanding the assessment, and also findings and conclusions.

In general, RWI welcomes the main conclusions of the evaluation, and notes that, when it comes to human rights education, the methods applied by RWI are found to be overall relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable. Also, it is noted that the evaluation considers that the academically based human rights education as applied in RWI programmes has emerged as a comprehensive area that seems to have added value to the global human rights environment.

Against also the above observations regarding the assessment of RWI's gender mainstreaming work, it is noted that the evaluation finds that there is strong institutional commitment towards gender equality integration and that methods are relevant and, when applied, they have also been successful.

When it comes to working in difficult human rights environments, RWI particularly notes that the evaluation finds that the "institute's distinct combination of status and organisational qualities, appears to have the strong credibility needed to establish and maintain such relations [with different relevant human rights actors]. The overall experience of the Evaluation Team in the human rights field shows that RWI through these combined aspects has a status comparable to relatively few other institutions globally. This does not imply that other institutions in Sweden or globally do not share some of the same traits – but the specific combination that characterises RWI is not, in the view of the Evaluation Team, like that of any other institutions in the human rights field."

The strong contextual understanding and relevant considerations regarding issues of presence of RWI that the evaluation emphasises are also noted. The discussion in the evaluation report on partnership arrangements is an important one, but also complex. RWI would maintain it has a strong partnership approach, and notes that there are different ways of realising such an approach. RWI would however not agree, as is suggested in one instance in the evaluation report, that RWI operates more on its own, rather than

collaborating with other international actors. There does not seem to be sufficient basis for drawing this conclusion. To the contrary, RWI defines itself as a network-based institution, which implies strong engagement with all partners and stakeholders.

RWI moreover does not agree with the statements in the evaluation report implying there would be a shift in thematic focus in RWI's work from civil and political rights to economic and social rights. To promote greater impact and integration of the work, the Institute has concentrated its work in four thematic areas. Each of the areas naturally encompass both civil and political and economic, social and cultural rights. RWI thus continues to approach human rights as universal and inalienable, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated, and finds this is even better captured in the Institute's current Strategic Plan, with also linkages to the pursuit of the Sustainable Development Goals.

Otherwise, in terms of conclusions, RWI agrees that systematic learning and experience-sharing programmatically can be improved internally. After having gone through a process of organisational change, the Institute is currently focusing on consolidation and this conclusion aligns with this focus. It is however also to be noted (see further below) that funding structures can hamper efforts to ensure and make further provision for cross-cutting mechanisms of this kind.

RWI generally agrees with most of the **recommendations** put forward to RWI in the evaluation report, and accordingly considers these recommendations both relevant and useful. In relation to the recommendations, RWI also notes that they in many cases are more general and often concern continuing or strengthening already ongoing work or efforts. As such, concrete and time-bound actions in relation to the recommendations are difficult to formulate. RWI will therefore also consider on the basis of actions formulated (see below) that each person at RWI responsible for an action develops a specific annual activity plan for realising the action in question.

In summary, RWI assesses the evaluation to largely have met its purpose and objectives. The analysis and conclusions are in main considered both valid and reliable. Usefulness for RWI as regards primarily recommendations is to certain extent affected by the mentioned general nature of recommendations. This noted, the implementation of the recommendations would still contribute to improvements of work methods for future positive results achievement in the areas assessed and for improving learning within RWI of positive as well as negative experiences of work methods used.

Responses to the recommendations from the evaluation are, together with actions to be taken, listed in the enclosed table below. Comments and responses to the recommendations (in summarised form) from the evaluation are presented in the same order as recommendations appear in the report. In all cases, RWI has sought to respond to recommendations, and, where relevant, also indicate actions to be taken. Naturally, RWI has not sought to respond to or comment on recommendations to Sida, and a mere observation in that respect is that these recommendations are also very general in nature.

A main and overarching observation in relation to evaluation recommendations is that while RWI can – and will – continue, as recommended, certain work, the success of most actions are not entirely within RWI's control, since they depend on external factors, such as partners, context and funding.

When it comes to funding, it is clear that certain cross-cutting organisational issues are difficult to cater for with RWI's current main funding arrangement. RWI has taken and continues to take many steps to address such issues seeking to optimise the use of available resources, but as the evaluation notes, RWI is very much "in its own category institutionally, being neither a non-governmental organisation nor a public institution, and

operates solely on a programme funding basis without any core support. It is a challenge to reconcile with the current funding structure the need for a strong institutional anchoring, with in-house expertise and mechanisms for knowledge-sharing across programmes, operating in the field of institutional capacity development through partnership-related processes." In this respect, more flexible and / or elements of core funding would be required in order for RWI to fully realise several of the recommendations.

<b>RWI Management Response and Action Plan regarding Recommendations from Evaluation of Programme Work Methods</b>					
<b>No</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>RWI Management Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Completion date</b>
<i>Human Rights Education</i>					
1.	RWI should <u>develop</u> and <u>implement</u> an <i>internal mechanism for anchoring knowledge and experience on human rights education</i> within the organisation and across programmes. This includes the designation of focal point(s) within the institution for this purpose. The aim should be to ensure systematic learning is anchored throughout the entire organisation; reflected in the engagement with programme partners for ongoing capacity development; and fully utilised in all stages of the project management cycle.	RWI agrees with this recommendation, and this need was in fact also recognised when adopting the current organisational structure in 2016. However, lack of funding prevented RWI from ensuring that such a mechanism / focal point could be put in place. Hopefully, this recommendation from the evaluation could further support RWI's continued efforts to ensure that funding and consequently such a position could be realised.	Continue efforts to obtain necessary funding for having an internal mechanism / focal point on human rights education. This may entail making provision for this in new funding proposals or, in dialogue with current donors, incorporating such provision in present programmes. A permanent (or at least long-term) solution in this respect would moreover be facilitated by having core funding, or at least more flexible funding.	RWI Director	Since the action to certain extent is dependent on external factors, it is difficult to set a completion date. But progress will be reviewed by the end of 2019.
2.	RWI should <u>strengthen</u> <i>internal mechanisms for RBM and programme development</i> , drawing on institutional mechanisms addressed in Recommendation 1. RWI should in particular strengthen the application of systematic and consistent procedures and routines for planning, monitoring and evaluation. This includes and	RWI agrees with the recommendation, and notes that such efforts of course are taking place continuously in terms of making further improvements to existing processes and tools. It is also noted that the basis (finding) in relation to the recommendation seems to relate to academic human rights education and thus	Continue work to strengthen programme planning, monitoring and evaluation, in line with recommendation. In 2018, and in connection with negotiating a new General Agreement with Sida, existing tools and procedures in this respect will be reviewed and necessary updates/new mechanisms will be	RWI Director of Programmes	While this type of work is continuously ongoing, progress will be reviewed (against the evaluation findings and recommendations) by the end of 2018 in relation to also updates made to guidelines, tools and procedures.

	<p>requires elaboration of an explicit 'theory of change' at the programme level, with assumptions and risks that can be monitored to make it possible to inform programme implementation on necessary changes in relation to activities, partners, thematic areas and/or strategic objectives. Furthermore, this includes the institutionalisation of such capacity across the organisation, in order to ensure staff at all levels can engage with partners in such a way that they can support them to enhance the quality of RBM while managing development processes, in particular planning and reporting processes.</p>	<p>links to recommendation 1. RWI in this respect agrees that partly such an internal mechanism / focal point on human rights education would cater for also this recommendation. However, other efforts would also be necessary while at the same time ensuring that, in line with current discussions regarding development cooperation work, the 'results agenda' does not become inhibiting only adding administration for and to actual work to achieve positive human rights results. When it comes to programme development, RWI has recently adopted guidelines on quality assurance of new initiatives and the usage of these guidelines, intended to address some of the issues noted in evaluation findings in this respect, will be evaluated during 2018.</p>	<p>made/put in place by the end of 2018. For updates being made, necessary provision will also be made to ensure staff are aware and/or receive training on how to use the tools and procedures promoting institutionalisation and enhanced capacity to engage with partners in these areas. As planned, the existing RWI guidelines for assuring quality when developing new initiatives (including programmes) will be evaluated during 2018 and necessary updates made by the end of the year. In terms of assigning / freeing up further resources for increased (and improved) work in this area, additional and more flexible funding is again a key aspect.</p>		
3.	<p>RWI should further <u>develop</u> and <u>implement</u> tools for <i>mapping and baselining</i> key aspects of human rights education, including the career trajectories of academic programme graduates, to put in place a</p>	<p>RWI agrees with the recommendation, and has developed certain such tools, including analysing career trajectories of graduates.</p>	<p>Further develop tools and assess previous efforts for further systematisation. A case study to further analyse career trajectories will be selected in 2018 in order to also assess how the fact-base in this respect</p>	<p>RWI Director of Programmes</p>	<p>Continuously ongoing. Analysis of case study to be completed by the end of 2018, while progress generally will be reviewed (against the evaluation findings and</p>

	fact-base to document the longer-term effects of academic human rights education programmes.		can be strengthened and further baseline information can be used in relation to results assessments regarding longer-term effects of academic human rights education programmes.		recommendations) by the end of 2019.
4.	RWI should <u>consider</u> , in dialogue with partners and when relevant, moving beyond basic and general academic human rights education programmes, towards <i>providing for graduate- and post-graduate-level in-depth specialisation in key human rights areas</i> .	RWI agrees with the recommendation pointing to an important consideration, and has since 2017 commenced explorative work on how further such programmes might be designed. However, what type of academic human rights education programmes that would be relevant to support will depend very much on context and partner needs. Such programmes require strong existing expertise and may thus be linked to the four overall thematic focus areas with RWI.	Continue to make careful considerations as recommended	RWI Directors of Offices, in consultation with Directors of Programmes and Research	Continuously ongoing. An assessment will be made towards the end of 2019 and against the evaluation findings and recommendations whether there is basis for further moving towards providing support to more specialised graduate and post-graduate academic human rights programmes.
5.	RWI should <u>ensure</u> and <u>systematise</u> the development of methodologies and concepts on <i>clinical legal education</i> . RWI should also promote exchanges of experience between partners and internally, and ensure partner ownership and	RWI agrees with this recommendation, and notes that work as recommended is already ongoing. The priorities for the period 2017-18 in the area of Fair and Efficient Justice and in relation to realising the RWI Strategic	Continue work to systematise the development of methodologies and concepts on CLE, promoting exchange of experiences (internally and externally) as well as partner ownership on the	RWI Team Leader for Fair and Efficient Justice	Ongoing. Progress will be reviewed (against the evaluation findings and recommendations) by the end of 2018 (as also implementation of institutional priorities for the year are reviewed) providing a basis for

	institutional commitment to CLE for sustainability.	Plan 2017-21 include further defining and developing RWI methods for working with CLE and several activities in this respect have already been undertaken, also between RWI offices.	same, in line with institutional priorities set.		continued work in this area beyond 2018.
6.	RWI should <u>strengthen</u> internal and associated <i>research capacity</i> . The aim should be to enhance linking between research and the international programmes, in order to effectively design evidence-based local interventions. This should include drawing on thematic and geographic networks and on research capacity already developed through programmes and in partner contexts. Furthermore, as addressed under Recommendation 1 on institutional learning, RWI should develop good practice from programme experience on how to support and develop local and regional research capacity. Finally, efforts in this area should cover the publication of research, including strategic and funding mechanism enabling this.	RWI agrees with this recommendation, and notes that this work is already ongoing with several improvements made in recent years, including in terms of linking existing research expertise to international programmes and including research as a core part of new programmes. More flexible and / or core funding would be an important factor to further facilitate this work.	Continue work to strengthen research capacity (in relation to all dimensions recommended), considering how enhanced provision for this can be made in new funding proposals or, in dialogue with current donors, be further incorporated in present programmes. Sharpening geographical priorities to facilitate cross-cutting research and analysis is related element to this, while dialogue with donors also extends to obtaining more flexible funding conditions so as to allow catering for cross-cutting research needs. An analysis of good practice from programme experience on how to support and develop local and regional research capacity will be completed by the end of 2018 as will an updated note on	RWI Director of Research, in consultation with Director of Programmes	Continuously ongoing. Progress will generally be reviewed (against the evaluation findings and recommendations) by the end of 2019, while good practices from programme experience on supporting research capacity and publication possibilities will be analysed by the end of 2018.

			avenues for supporting publication of research.		
7.	RWI should <u>continue</u> to <u>consider</u> how best to <i>support library development</i> and ensure sustainability with partner institutions by ensuring their commitment to maintaining all aspects of these facilities. This includes <u>developing</u> and <u>implementing</u> tools to assess the usage of materials to better evaluate long-term effects.	RWI agrees with this recommendation, and notes that such work as recommended is continuously ongoing. Many of the lessons learned and good practises in this area were included in the RWI publication from 2015 entitled “Developing a Human Rights Library” (see <a href="http://rwi.lu.se/publications/developing-human-rights-library/">http://rwi.lu.se/publications/developing-human-rights-library/</a> ).	Continue to consider how best to support library development ensuring commitment with partners and sustainability, making further efforts to develop and implement tools to assess the usage of materials to better. In this respect, RWI will also, during 2018, consider updates to the publication “Developing a Human Rights Library” as well as preparing shorter briefs on the basis of this publication on how to best support library development, including a special briefing note on how to assess usage of materials to better evaluate long-term effects.	RWI Librarian	Continuously ongoing. Progress will be reviewed (against the evaluation findings and recommendations) by the end of 2019, and necessary updates to previous documentation on how to best support library development will be assessed by the end of 2018.
8.	RWI should <u>continue</u> to <u>support academic networking</u> and <u>identify</u> ways to ensure more effective facilitation and the durability of networking platforms.	RWI agrees with this recommendation, which is in line with RWI networking strategies. RWI also agrees with the evaluation that appropriate solutions need to be ensured in each case, i.e. there is no “one size fits all” solution.	Continue to support academic networking and identify ways to ensure more effective facilitation and the durability of networking platforms, carefully assessing in each case ownership, formalisation and facilitation aspects. A mapping will be carried out during 2018 of existing academic networking initiatives	RWI Director of Research (for academic networking overall) and the Director of Programmes (coordinating with networking in programmes)	Continuously ongoing. Progress will be reviewed (against the evaluation findings and recommendations) by the end of 2019, on the basis of also mapping carried out in 2018 of academic networking initiatives support by programmes.

			supported by programmes to inform the further work in this area.		
9.	RWI should <u>continue</u> to <u>support societal dialogue/outreach involving multiple actors</u> , utilising academia as well as institutional qualities to bring rights-holder and duty-bearer representatives together. This also includes the <u>development and implementation</u> of measures for the systematic use of research findings and capacity to ensure such dialogue is fact-based.	RWI agrees with this recommendation which is in line with the aim of using better the convening power of RWI	Continue support in line with recommendation, including developing and implementing measures for further use of research findings to ensure dialogue is evidence-based. This will build on the systematic assessment of dissemination avenues for major research projects already conducted further exploring different formats to disseminate and use research findings.	RWI Director/Director of Programmes/Director of Research	Continuously ongoing. Progress will be reviewed (against the evaluation findings and recommendations) by the end of 2019.
<i>Gender Mainstreaming</i>					
10.	RWI should <u>maintain</u> and further <u>support</u> an internal institutional <i>gender focal point</i> .	RWI agrees with this recommendation, and has also taken steps to ensure further support through allocating, at an institutional level, further human resources to work with gender equality.	Maintain the gender equality focal point and continue to ensure further support for this function, assessing measures taking in the latter respect in 2018 for their future institutionalisation.	RWI Director	Continuously ongoing. Progress will be reviewed (against the evaluation findings and recommendations) by the end of 2019, considering also developments in 2018 to strengthen such a function within RWI.
11.	RWI should <u>continue</u> and <u>strengthen efforts to develop and implement tools and methods</u> for ensuring gender mainstreaming throughout the portfolio in light of lessons	RWI agrees with this recommendation, and notes that many relevant tools are already in existence and need to be systematically used	Continue work in line with recommendation and take stock during 2018 of already existing tools and methods with a view to assess how they can be	RWI Gender Focal Point/s	Continuously ongoing. Progress will be reviewed (against the evaluation findings and recommendations) by the end of 2019, on the basis of also stock-taking in 2018 of

	learnt from programme implementation in this area.		institutionalised while noting any possible gaps.		existing tools and methods and their institutionalisation.
12.	RWI should <u>strengthen in-house research capacity on gender equality</u> and <u>consider supporting</u> , also as part of programme activity and in collaboration with partners, the further development of <i>field-based research on gender equality aspects</i> relating to human rights.	RWI agrees with this recommendation	Consider means to strengthen in-house research capacity on gender equality in light of available funding provisions and institutional priorities, while exploring opportunities for the implementation of further field-based research on gender equality aspects relating to human rights. Part of these efforts will be to look into developing guidelines on how gender equality can be better integrated into all research projects.	RWI Director of Research, in consultation with Gender Focal Point/s	Ongoing. Progress will be reviewed (against the evaluation findings and recommendations) by the end of 2019, and relating in particular to having guidelines in use on how gender equality can be better integrated into all research projects.
13.	RWI should <u>continue</u> and <u>systematically engage</u> in dialogue with partners on how to ensure the presence of active and committed <i>gender focal points within their institutions</i> (at appropriate levels) and how to <u>engage</u> them in all aspects of the programme management cycle.	RWI agrees with this recommendation, noting that each context and conditions will determine the exact possibilities of how this action can be pursued with partners.	Continue engagement with partners on how to institutionally and programmatically strengthen their gender equality integration work. An important first step concerns the planned co-hosting of a stock taking conference for partners and others in 2018.	RWI Directors of Offices, with support of Gender Focal Point/s	Progress will be reviewed (against the evaluation findings and recommendations) by the end of 2019, making also an assessment of drivers and key inhibiting factors in this respect.
<i>Working in Difficult Human Rights Environments</i>					
14.	RWI should <u>actively draw</u> on its <i>distinct status</i> in programme engagements.	RWI agrees with this recommendation and it	Continue to draw on the Institute's distinct status in programmes and pursue	RWI Director in consultation with Director of Programmes	Continuously ongoing. Progress will be reviewed (against the evaluation

	Furthermore, RWI should continue and critically and speedily examine how to ensure institutional anchoring and support of current as well as future programmes under its current Strategic Plan and organisational structure. This includes engaging with Sida on how to flexibly adapt, if necessary, current results frameworks.	resonates well with already ongoing work.	processes of alignment of programmes with current strategic priorities, as well as continue dialogue with Sida on flexibility in programmes, including in relation to results frameworks. The updated annual planning cycle at RWI seeks to promote further alignment of operations with strategic priorities and once the first full cycle of this process has been implemented in spring 2019 it will be assessed how RWI can further improve in this area.		findings and recommendations) by the end of 2019, including in terms of coherent and harmonised annual planning across the organisation further linking operations to strategic priorities.
15.	RWI should, in close dialogue with Sida, <u>identify</u> various ways to <i>support cross-programmatic and institutional anchoring of lessons learnt</i> for continued efficiency in terms of applying methods and approaches. This includes, in particular, maintaining designated and internal focal points and internal learning processes, as addressed in the recommendations above.	RWI agrees with this recommendation and notes that this indeed relates to recommendations above, as well as the issue of funding arrangements.	Continue the dialogue with Sida on funding arrangements and budget modalities to support the realisation of the recommended cross-programmatic processes and mechanisms.	RWI Director in consultation with Director of Programmes	Ongoing. Progress will be reviewed (against the evaluation findings and recommendations) by the end of 2018.
16.	RWI should <u>continue</u> and <u>strengthen efforts</u> to <i>institutionalise context understanding</i> beyond that of individuals, especially at the	RWI considers that the contextual knowledge is broadly shared at regional and bilateral offices.	No specific action		

	level of country- and region-specific programme management and offices.				
17.	RWI should <u>increase efforts</u> to <i>implement programmes through a further strengthened partnership approach</i> , which, when relevant and possible, could also transfer increased responsibility for the management of funds to partner institutions, including through an increased presence of accountability mechanisms.	RWI considers there is already a strong partnership approach in programmes, and notes that the evaluation generally finds RWI's approaches to be much appreciated by partners. The partnership approach includes, when relevant and possible, transferring increased responsibility to partners. RWI on this basis finds it difficult to relate to this recommendation.	No specific action		
18.	RWI should <u>increase efforts</u> to develop <i>programme frameworks</i> as addressed above in Recommendations 1 and 2, which are specifically tailored to implementation in difficult human rights contexts. This should include the development of specified and credible theories of change and risk analysis and mitigation, within the framework of Sida requirements and in dialogue with Sida and partners.	RWI agrees with the need to continuously develop programme frameworks to be relevant and effective in difficult human rights contexts.	Continue to consider the most relevant and effective programme frameworks to achieve results in view of the human rights context prevailing, including risks, taking into account the implementation of above-listed action points.	RWI Director of Programmes	Continuously ongoing. Progress will be reviewed (against the evaluation findings and recommendations) by the end of 2019.