

IPP Technical Evaluation Report

US Partner:	America's Development Foundation (ADF)
NIS Partner:	Moscow Research Center for Human Rights (MRCHR)
Location of Site Visits:	Chelyabinsk and Moscow, Russia
Date of Visits:	Chelyabinsk: October 11-13, 1996 Moscow: October 14-16, 1996
Date report submitted to IREX:	December 26, 1996

A) Discuss the strongest aspects of the technical and professional work being done by this partnership.

This partnership has strengthened local human rights groups by developing their advocacy and management capabilities and providing the means through which these groups can collaborate nationally and access national and international human rights information. The partnership goes into the regions to provide training and designate local coordinators.

This partnership also provides free, high quality information through the Internet as well as printed materials to local human rights groups.

Discuss the weakest aspects of the technical and professional work being done by this partnership.

The project's lack of strong, clearly defined leadership is perhaps its weakest element and is the cause for many of its other weaknesses. Who is responsible for project execution? Who reports to whom? Who supervises whom? Based on the results of my interviews, these questions still seem to exist, even at this late stage of the project.

Related to the leadership question is the issue of the poor lines of communication between partners and those involved in daily project execution.

There are other very weak aspects of this partnership. There is no sustainability plan. There is still no training-of-trainers (TOT) program in the area of HRE&A. The organization of regional coordinators is only marginally effective, which means that the human rights network and development of local human rights advocates are not as effective as they could be. It also means that little or no nurturing of local human rights groups will take place beyond the two HRE&A seminars over a two-year period. In

addition, little evaluation of the impact of project activities on the participants will take place.

Recommendations for Improvement:

Recommendations on aspects of the project are provided in the sections below.

B) What do the Russian or Ukrainian partners see as the "criteria for success" for their partnership project activities? How close are they to attaining them?

No clear criteria for success were presented by the MRCHR. This is related to the fact that there is no sustainability plan for the partnership project activities after the IPP/USAID funding ends.

C) Describe the technical merit and appropriateness of the following program components:

1. Training

During the site visits, the evaluator observed an entire Human Rights Education and Advocacy (HRE&A) seminar in Chelyabinsk (11.10.96 - 13.10.96) and half of an Institutional Development (ID) seminar in Moscow (14.10.96 - 16.10.96). The evaluation of these seminars is based on the seminar outlines and handouts, discussions with trainers and trainees, and seminar attendance. An offshoot of the ID seminars, an internal training only for MRCHR's directorate (18.9.96 - 20.9.96), was also reviewed, based on discussions with directorate members and Joe Rogers at ADF/Moscow.

• HRE&A Training in Chelyabinsk

This was the first of two workshops to be given in the Chelyabinsk area (the second being in February 1997). To carry out the seminar, the partnership sent five people: Rustem Maksudov (workshop leader), Maria Levina, Aleksei Lyubimov, Aleksei Aftonomov (workshop instructors), and Alexander Temerov (logistics coordinator). Aftonomov left after the first day to attend another non-partnership conference.

There were 21 participants in total, excluding the trainers and myself, though there were not always 21 people in attendance at one time. One of the trainers said that the attendance was lower than normal for their workshops, as they expected 25 attendees. In my opinion, the number of participants was optimal for the size of the training facilities and the training format.

The participants represented a range of local NGOs (focused on the environment, labor, culture, and military reform) and also included a staff member of a representative in the local Duma. The majority of the participants were new members of Soldiers' Mothers

chapters from small towns in the Chelyabinskaya Oblast. The local Soldiers' Mothers chapter organized the workshop. The regional coordinator is a member of the same chapter.

According to the regional coordinator, those invited to the workshop were individuals or organizations that had pre-workshop relations with the organizer of the workshop. Participants who did not represent Soldiers' Mothers chapters said that they had not received any announcement of the training and learned of it only by chance communication with the workshop organizer or with other colleagues. Publicity for the workshops was minimal (limited mainly to local Soldiers' Mothers chapters) and did not reach the regional human rights NGO community-at-large.

The goals and topics of the seminar were appropriate to the target audience, which had practical experience on local human rights initiatives, but had little exposure to larger issues of international or RF-wide norms and processes. The format of the workshop was lectures in the first half of the day and small group work sessions and presentations in the second half.

The various workshop instructors were responsible for choosing the different training topics. Maksudov was the discussion and small group work facilitator. He did an excellent job stimulating both the discussion and small group work sessions. Levina was presenting rather new information to participants and was well received. Lyubimov, the RF Duma staff member, was a valuable resource. He answered participants' questions during both the seminars and breaks.

The participants were given sufficient materials (pens, paper, poster-board) to be active in the workshops.

To evaluate the workshop, time was left at the end of the training to discuss its strengths and weaknesses. A standard survey used for all of the partnership workshops was also handed out at the end. Overall, the participants found the lectures and handouts informative and useful and they enjoyed the small group work sessions and exchange of ideas with their colleagues and trainers. They found Levina's talks on international human rights issues most interesting. In the survey, the most common suggestion was that the workshop should concentrate more on practical information and less on the philosophical and conceptual development of human rights. I agree with the participants' recommendations and suggestions for improvement.

The materials that were given out by the trainers included a binder containing national and international human rights documents (conventions, declarations, etc.), guides to collecting facts on and documenting human rights abuses and advocacy work, the April-June 1996 edition of MRCHR's "Pravozashchitnik," and USIA's "Human Rights: A Difficult Struggle." Some participants also used this gathering of local colleagues as an opportunity to distribute their own materials. In the training session itself, the binder of miscellaneous documents was the main reading material.

On the whole, participants found the binder materials interesting and useful, as did I. For all the participants, reading and using international documents was a new experience. Such international documents are useful to participants as they give them an international grounding for local initiatives, an international framework in which to understand the Russian legal system, and the awareness that they can appeal to international bodies as a last recourse. Levina's notes and charts in the binder were useful supplements to explain the international documents.

Additional information and documents regarding human rights in Russia, including the process for lodging complaints and appeals about human rights violations, would have been useful. Both general information and practical information, including visual materials, would have been valuable to participants. Russia's declaration "On Human and Citizen Rights and Freedoms" was the only RF government document in the binder.

Two very useful and practical documents were at the end of the binder — a manual on collecting facts and documenting human rights violations, and materials on advocacy. Unfortunately, the materials on advocacy were not covered in the workshop. I was told, however, that it will be the subject matter of the next seminar. If this is the case, the utility of including this information in the first HRE&A seminar is limited.

Media coverage during the workshop consisted of two television cameras on the first day and a television interview with Maksudov on the second day.

Recommendations for Improvement:

The format of the workshop (the first half of the day being lecture and the second half, small group work and presentations) should be reconsidered. Several hours of lecture, even at the start of the day when attention spans are higher and people have more energy, is just too much. Every morning, 45 minutes into the several hours of lecture, eyes became glazed and most people had stopped taking notes. The addition of more participatory activities throughout all segments of the workshops should be considered. Also, trainers should be encouraged to utilize more visual materials in their presentations. This was particularly the case for Levina and Aftonomov. Although participants enjoyed Levina's presentations, they would have been more attentive and would have learned more if there were more visual materials.

The small group work was on the whole successful. Once again, Maksudov did a fine job stimulating small group work. However, there are a couple of ways in which this activity could be improved. First, Maksudov should not spend most of his time with one group, but should try to float around to all the groups. Second, all the trainers should be involved with the group work. In Chelyabinsk, besides Maksudov, the trainers had stayed together and did not circulate to the different groups during the small group work. Also, the groups should be relatively the same size and no one should be left to work alone. Mixing up the longtime colleagues, instead of letting them work together in small groups, would foster

teamwork skills and a better understanding of other local human rights groups. Finally, I had reservations about some of the work in the small groups, as it did not always reinforce the skills or knowledge presented in the workshops. All the work in small groups produced good energy and discussions, but the question which should always be asked is whether or not this activity furthered the learning that was intended. In some cases, the work reflected that they did not consider this question.

A final point about the format is related to the subject matter presented in this training. The history of the philosophy of human rights was of little benefit to participants as it was presented. The partnership should consider restructuring this lecture by shortening it or giving a brief outline of it as a handout. With the extra time made available by reformatting this presentation, more emphasis should be given to the human rights legal system in Russia. More discussion and materials on this system is needed in this training. This need was made obvious by the frequent questions of participants about this topic.

Regarding materials, if advocacy is to be the focus of the stage two HRE&A seminars (as the trainers in Chelyabinsk and Rogers told me), then advocacy materials are not needed in the stage one seminars. Instead, more information, both general and specific, about human rights in the RF should be included in the stage one HRE&A seminar materials. As shown by the repeated questions of participants about the filing of human rights cases and appeals in Russia, more information about Russia's human rights legal environment should be incorporated into the handouts.

Information on the Institutional Partnerships Project should also be provided to the seminar participants, if not as a handout, at least orally at the beginning of the seminar. No such introduction to the IPP partnership or the overall program was provided, even though this was the first HRE&A seminar for participants. Related to this point, it is recommended that the 50% IPP/USAID-funded MRCHR bulletin "Human Rights in Russia" should be a standard handout for all HRE&A seminars — both because of its direct connection to the IPP/USAID-funded partnership activities, and because of its usefulness as a resource for seminar participants. Additionally, the handout about the MRCHR's website ("Human Rights on Line: Questions and Answers," last issued in October 1996) should be made available to seminar participants. Although Internet access is limited outside of Moscow and St. Petersburg, participants should at least be made aware of this resource.

More evaluation should be done during the workshops, in addition to the end-of-the-seminar survey currently used. During and after different sections of the workshop, review and assessment should be encouraged. Follow-up surveys of workshop participants should also be done to measure the impact of the workshops down the road. Getting contact information during the seminars, creating a database, and then sending a follow-up survey (with a stamped, self-addressed envelope) to all or to a randomly selected group of workshop participants, is one way to assess the impact of the training. Videotaping the workshops, both for the partnership review and for the regional coordinator's resource library, would also be useful.

Lastly, at least in regard to Chelyabinsk, the advertising of the seminar to local human rights groups was limited to a small subcommunity of the larger NGO community. Better marketing of the seminar needs to be conducted.

I also have doubts about the need to have a logistics coordinator, Alexander Temerov, traveling to Chelyabinsk (and indeed to any of the seminars outside of Moscow). As described to me, Temerov takes care of travel arrangements, lodging, and seminar room logistics — such administrative tasks are his sole function during out-of-Moscow training events. Perhaps the trainers need such a person to arrange these matters from Moscow (though I am not convinced even of this), but such an organizer is not needed in the field. Training logistics in the field should be arranged by the regional coordinator.

In general, the HRE&A seminars are greatly needed by regional human rights organizations and as they currently exist, are of value to these organizations. However, long term impact of the seminars is greatly limited due to almost non-existent complementary and follow-up measures by the partnership. For example, a local group in Chelyabinsk attends one or both of the HRE&A seminars (it is not guaranteed that the same people will be there for both trainings, and not even apparent that the same individuals are targeted for both trainings), but then there are no follow-up activities to further encourage and develop the group. There are no other seminars conducted by the partnership on any of the other myriad of issues facing human rights NGOs, no TOT programs to help local groups help themselves, and no development of regional coordinators as local resource and consulting centers. The regional groups can receive the partnership's human rights bulletin, and if they have Internet access, can use the MRCHR's website. However, with only two seminars on the basics of human rights advocacy and no other significant encouragement by the partnership, the effectiveness of local human rights organizations will not be as greatly enhanced by the partnership as it could be.

• ID Seminar in Moscow

This was the fourth seminar in the ID seminar series. The three-day seminar focused on the topic of NGO management, particularly on the basics of democratic leadership and teamwork. Igor Ovchinnikov and Zhenia Alekseeva of the Moscow-based organization Golubka, conducted the training. Excluding myself, Joe Rogers, and Janetta Nigmatullina, there were 19 participants — eight of the partnership's regional coordinators (the coordinator from Chelyabinsk did not come), five member organizations of the MRCHR, five staff members from the directorate, and one participant from another Moscow group (Memorial).

I did not see any media coverage of the training; nor did I learn of any marketing attempts done by the partnership for this training. However, as the training was targeted at a pre-determined audience and was the fourth in the series of seminars with these participants, such marketing attempts are less important.

Handouts for the training were: (1) materials for in-training exercises. In addition to being useful in class, these materials are helpful for participants wishing to try the teamwork and conflict resolution exercises with their colleagues. (2) several pages on conflicts and how to diffuse them. (3) Golubka's "Path to Success" and some of its other publications (e.g., Non-Violence Anthology). Golubka's "Path to Success" is an excellent manual covering the basics of NGO management and is utilized by many organizations throughout Russia. I would say that "Path to Success" was the most valuable handout distributed.

The format of the workshops was designed to be highly participatory. As Ovchinnikov said, Golubka's approach is learning through experience. The trainers facilitated discussions and the flow of activities. They did not lecture. Half the training was devoted to highly participatory exercises, such as simulations, small group and pair work, and group presentations. The other half of the training was used to assess and discuss the results and lessons learned from the participatory activities. The participants were encouraged during these assessments and discussions to move around the room and utilize the visual materials as desired.

The evaluation of the participants' learning in the workshop is sound, and is done through several mechanisms. Both Golubka and the partnership had "end-of-training" surveys for the participants. After the training, Golubka provided the partnership with a written evaluation of the workshops. In-training self assessments were done frequently by participants. At the end of every exercise, participants reviewed what they had just done and what they had gained from that activity. At the start of every day, participants reviewed what they had done the previous day and discussed any pending questions.

Recommendations for Improvement:

Overall this was a successful and useful seminar. Golubka, with its wealth of training experience in the areas addressed in the seminar, was a sound choice. "Path to Success" and other handouts were beneficial to participants. The teaching format used in the training was an effective approach.

I agree that a very effective way for someone to learn is through participation in a series of positive experiences, such as in the Golubka training. However, a little more lecture by the trainers would have been of benefit to the participants — it could help participants better digest the training by putting their experiences into a more defined context. It would also allow them to more easily bring their new knowledge back to their organizations and peers. Some brief lecturing or presentations on the mechanics of effective leadership and conflict resolution could be added to the training outline. A desire for more "concrete" discussions had been voiced by some participants.

It is also worth noting that Alexei Smirnov was not completely supportive of having Golubka do the training. He mentioned to me that he would have done it differently, although he did not provide the specifics. He thought that in general, the seminar was helpful for non-Moscow based groups, but not for Moscow groups, which were already

past the stage covered by Golubka — a statement with which I do not agree. I raise Smirnov's point here because he told me that he is active on a daily basis in the IPP project, but then indicates that he was out of the loop on the Golubka training. Blurs in program activity execution and coordination still seem to exist and need to be addressed

- Internal ID training for MRCHR's Directorate

Rogers and the directorate members interviewed found this training quite useful, though they thought it was too early to have specific hard outputs. According to Rogers, the seminar was useful because it brought all the directorate together, encouraged a dialogue among members, and helped them to focus on the future of the Center. Rogers also said that the seminar helped resolve some issues between directorate members, impressed upon the directorate a need for more strategic planning about the MRCHR and its role as the Center's staff, showed them the importance of such dialogues, provided some recommendations to the executive director, and set the topic for the November ID seminar — internal management and strategic planning issues of the MRCHR and the fate of the directorate.

Recommendations for Improvement:

The IPP project activities will clearly benefit from improved lines of communication and coordination efforts that would logically seem to follow from the heightened dialogue between directorate members. At the time of the site visit, however, it was too early to evaluate developments.

2. Products

- Information Network

During the site visits, information and materials on the IPP partnership human rights “Information Network” activities came from interviews and materials given to the evaluator by Andrei Pribylov, Sergei Smirnov, Joe Rogers, and the Chelyabinsk regional coordinator. The materials reviewed included several issues of the monthly bulletin "Human Rights in Russia" (issues 12, 20, 21 and excerpts from 17 and 22).

It should be noted that time with Pribylov and Sergei Smirnov was limited. Pribylov could only afford a half hour at the close of the business day on October 14, as he was leaving for St. Petersburg that evening. Even this half hour was conducted in a rushed manner, as Pribylov frequently checked his watch and acted as though participating in the interview was an inconvenience. Although the meeting with Sergei Smirnov was useful and informative, it could not be scheduled until the end of the day on the last day of the site visit.

Information Network products evaluated during the site visit included Internet resources, a growing network of ongoing contacts with human rights organizations throughout

Russia, the monthly bulletin "Human Rights in Russia," and a variety of HRE&A, ID, and other relevant non-Internet training materials. These are outputs indicated as IPP-related in the IREX and ADF correspondences of 8/7/96 and 8/9/96, respectively.

According to Pribylov, there are several levels of the partnership's network of human rights organizations throughout the country. First is a mailing list of the 500+ organizations and individuals to whom printed versions of "Human Rights in Russia" are distributed. These 500+ organizations and individuals are active in the network to varying degrees. The second level consists of about 50 organizations that are considered to be actively exchanging human rights information with each other and are therefore considered the core of the network. Pribylov did not explain how the MRCHR monitors this activity and is thus able to label these groups as actively using the network, nor what the network is actually doing to stimulate these exchanges. The third level of the network consists of 12 network partners (not counted as part of the 50 organizations actively exchanging information) with whom the MRCHR has formal contracts and ties. These 12 network coordinators overlap with the nine IPP regional coordinators. According to Pribylov, documentation of the growth of the network is sketchy and the documentation of the rate of growth since the start of the IPP project is not available.

To facilitate the development and reach of its information network, the partnership hired local coordinators in nine cities outside of Moscow. The coordinators are supposed to assist in the distribution of information in their areas, promote networking among local groups and between local groups and their peers nationwide, and provide access to computerized resources. The only coordinator I was able to interview during the site visit was the coordinator for the Chelyabinsk area, the representative of a Soldiers' Mothers chapter. The representative has been a coordinator since December 1995. He said his two roles as coordinator are to organize partnership seminars in the region and to distribute literature received from the partnership. The coordinator did not mention facilitating access to computerized resources as one of his activities. He had found no problems working with the partnership while arranging the seminars in the representative's region. The coordinator was most grateful for the materials, computer, printer, fax, and photocopier given to the Soldiers' Mothers chapter by the partnership.

It should be noted that two weeks before the site visit, the fax and photocopier had been stolen. However, neither Rogers nor Pribylov had known of this theft when asked about it during the site visit. This and the coordinator's focus on other local Soldiers' Mothers chapters raise questions about how frequent the communications are between the coordinators and the partnership and how much oversight the partnership provides over the efforts of the coordinators.

The Chelyabinsk coordinator's information distribution efforts seems to be focused on local chapters of Soldiers' Mothers. The first example of this is that when asked about their literature distribution efforts, the coordinator said that they receive literature from the partnership and then distribute it to the parents of Soldiers'. The second example was found in the HRE&A seminar that I observed. As already mentioned, most in attendance

were new members of Soldiers' Mothers chapters. The non-Soldiers' Mothers attendees learned about the training only by chance. Though members of Soldiers' Mothers are important human rights advocates to encourage and although they appear to have considerable representation in the Chelyabinskaya oblast, the information distribution efforts of the Chelyabinsk coordinator need to be more widely cast to include the entire local human rights community.

Regarding the monthly bulletin, "Human Rights in Russia," Pribylov said that IPP project funds were used for the financing of the bulletin starting with issue number 21, the summer 1996 issue. Before that, no IPP project funds were used for the bulletin. However, the IPP project had been occasionally covered in the bulletin and was cited as a sponsor on its back cover (at least for issue number 20, which is the earliest complete issue I had of the bulletin since the IPP project started).

The bulletin is available in printed form, at a Glasnet conference area, and on MRCHR's new website, "Human Rights On-Line." The bulletin regularly has sections on the following:

- NGO management issues—working with the media, fundraising, financial management, etc.
- HRE&A articles
- Grant announcements and profiles of funders
- Overviews of regional human rights groups and their activities (unfortunately the bulletin rarely provides contact information for these profiled organizations).
- Announcements of upcoming events and reviews of past events
- Issue articles and analyses

Overall, the bulletin contains concise, accessible information which is useful to human right advocates and human rights NGO leaders.

Sergei Smirnov cited the following IPP partnership coverage in the bulletin: a large article in issue number 17, an interview with Joe Rogers, and coverage of seminars and articles by Maksudov. What I had seen in the bulletin about the IPP project or partnership was very brief and indicates to me that the bulletin has only been marginally used for marketing the project and its activities. IREX provided me with an article from issue 17 which was written by the former HRE&A leader, Tatiana Matveeva. The eight-page article gives a paragraph in the beginning describing the IPP project with which Matveeva was affiliated. Maksudov writes an article in issue 21, but it does not mention his IPP affiliation. Issue 22, which had been available only on Human Rights On-Line at the time of the site visit, did have a useful IPP marketing piece — it contained a listing of IPP seminars. Better marketing of the IPP project is needed and this bulletin is a natural outlet for such marketing.

Distribution of HRE&A, ID, and other relevant non-Internet printed training materials by the IPP project, seem to be focused on developing the libraries of the nine regional

coordinators. Rogers has a six-page reading list of materials to be given to each of the regional coordinators. Materials cover a wide range of international and Russian HRE&A and ID materials from various international and Russian sources. Though some distribution of these materials has been completed, progress on dissemination is unclear and it sounds like this activity has only recently been started.

The development of the regional coordinators' libraries complements the non-IPP funded book distribution project under the auspices of the Information Network. The April 1996 bulletin included a list of legal materials that readers could get free-of-charge from the MRCHR. Most of the titles on this list are also mentioned on the six-page list of materials for regional coordinators. Once a regional coordinator receives all the items on the list, he or she should have a comprehensive resource center for local groups and individuals. This proposed development of the regional coordinators' libraries is the only example I was shown of distribution of HRE&A, ID, and other relevant non-Internet printed training materials by the IPP project.

There are several on-line resources of the Information Network — a bulletin board on Glasnet (glas.hrights) and two websites, www.openweb.ru/windows/hr and www.glasnet.ru/~hronline. A tour of the Glasnet bulletin board was not given, but the two websites were reviewed. The first mentioned, www.openweb.ru/windows/hr, is the older site and has not been updated since July 1996. It has information, in both Russian and English (though little in the latter language), on Russian NGOs (i.e., contact information), including the Moscow Center and Karta, a Ryazan group which works with Sergei Smirnov to manage the websites. It also contains fundraising information, various human rights documents, and coverage of human rights related events. Sergei Smirnov did not say how many hits this website has received.

In September 1996 the new website, www.glasnet.ru/~hronline ("Human Rights On-Line"), was developed. According to Sergei Smirnov, it was created because it is more accessible than the previous site. It is managed by Sergei Smirnov, Karta and Memorial. The IPP project is not listed as a funder of it. As of the site visit, the website had received 57 hits.

This website contains a wide range of HRE&A and ID materials: contact and project information for Russian human right groups, discussions on human rights advocacy, coverage of hot topics (like Chechnya), Russian legislation (both the actual documents and commentary on them), international human rights legislation and documents, grant information, and other human rights publications. Included on the website is the "Human Rights in Russia" bulletin. In regard to marketing of the IPP project, the project did not have its own page on the website at the time of the site visit.

At this early stage in its development, the new website still has not been linked to other sites, though there are plans to do so in the near future. Sergei Smirnov cited the lack of suitable Russian language websites as another reason for no linkages so far. Linkage should be done as soon as possible.

Recommendations for Improvement:

To assist in the development of a network and to monitor its growth, a database should be created and made available through the MRCHR, the regional coordinators, and the Internet. Printed directories of the database should be available through the MRCHR and the regional coordinators. Information in the database should cover topics such as contact information, registration information, and each group's specific areas of work. The first step should be to incorporate into the database the 500+ organizations and individuals mentioned by Pribylov as receiving the monthly bulletin, as well as the 269 groups which requested legal materials offered in the April 1996 bulletin.

At every HRE&A seminar in the field, trainers should have a sign-in sheet and collect all the contact information for the attendees. This information should then be added to the database and the network. Funders, when evaluating the partnership activities, could also use this information to solicit the opinions of the seminar attendees.

Regional coordinators should solicit contact information from groups they work with in their areas, add this information to their own databases, and pass it on to the partnership to include in its inter-region database.

The bulletin should be better used to market the IPP partnership and activities. For example, perhaps an IPP news section could be added to the bulletin. It could be used to give information about developments in the partnership, activities of the partnership, announcements of seminars, reviews of seminars conducted, etc.

To better promote networking by readers of the journal, contact information should be provided for all regional organizations profiled in the bulletin.

In regard to marketing the IPP project, the project did not have its own page on the World Wide Web at the time of the site visit. I would recommend constructing such a page and including in it information suggested for an IPP news section of the bulletin. Also, I would suggest linking the Center's websites to IREX, the Siberian Center for the Civic Initiatives Program (CIP), Center for Civil Society International, and CivicNet.

3. Resource and Learning Centers

There are no Resource and Learning Centers for this partnership.

4. Consulting Services

There are no specifically required or performed consulting services by the partnership in Moscow or by its regional coordinators. Moroz does some ad hoc consulting on NGO

management issues for members of the MRCHR. Many members, however, feel that they do not need such consultations. Moroz had sent a letter to the regional coordinators offering her consulting services to them. According to Rogers, only 50% accepted the offer. Rogers also said that they were still deciding about whether or not Moroz should make trips to the locales of the regional coordinators.

Recommendations for Improvement:

Consultations by the partnership in Moscow and especially outside of Moscow by the regional coordinators, both in the areas of HRE&A and ID, are critical for the sustainability of the partnership's efforts. Groups need outlets of support and advice between, before, and after the two HRE&A seminars. For ID issues, in some regions it will be possible for local groups to utilize the services of other US government-funded projects, such as CIP's regional coordinators in southern Russia and Siberia. For HRE&A issues, the burden of such consultation services will fall more onto the partnership and its regional coordinators.

There is also a need for a TOT program in the regions. The partnership's TOT activities should focus on developing HRE&A trainers and utilizing ID trainers developed under other US government-funded projects such as CIP and the Johns Hopkins TOT program.

D) What additional technical assistance do you believe the Russian or Ukrainian side could use to improve their work in general?

MRCHR would benefit from further technical assistance in the following areas:

- creating a TOT program
- developing, operating, utilizing, and coordinating a network of NGOs
- devising a sustainability plan
- improving marketing techniques

E) What new directions do you see as a natural follow-on for this project? Are there others working in the sector that this group might contract and/or collaborate with?

Instead of waiting for further technical assistance from others in the areas mentioned above in point D, I would recommend that MRCHR contact and get more information from its Western and Russian colleagues who are working on similar issues. For example, the MRCHR should contact organizations already doing TOT programs, study these programs, and then adapt lessons learned to the human rights field, so as to train the HRE&A trainers. From discussions with Maksudov and Rogers, there seems to be uncertainty not about the subject matter that the trainers should be taught to pass along, but about how to prepare the trainers. The partnership could gain much by observing and talking to its peers.

To develop and utilize a network of NGO coordinators and to examine different options for sustaining such a network, I would recommend that the partnership contact the

Siberian Center for the Civics Initiatives Program in Novosibirsk. The Siberian Center has been successfully grappling with these issues for two years now.

F) How do you assess the partnerships sustainability plan? What is your sense of how close the partners will be to meeting these goals?

Questions of sustainability fall into two areas. First is the sustainability of the ADF-MRCHR relationship supported by IPP. Second is the sustainability of MRCHR's activities stemming from IPP financing.

Neither Rogers, nor Alexei Smirnov expressed a desire to continue the type of relationship that ADF and MRCHR have under the IPP project. A return to the type of relationship that the two organizations had before (ADF secured funds for projects done by the MRCHR) was envisioned by both. Alexei Smirnov was particularly vocal about the return to the former style of relationship.

Save for attempts to secure future grants for projects, it appears from conversations with Rogers and individuals from the MRCHR that the partnership has no sustainability plan. Pribylov said that he would continue his work with or without funding. I did not hear anything about contingencies. There was no discussion about the viability of a scaled-back network or a network with a different structure (e.g., more decentralized, or an association of regional coordinators with Moscow being one among equals). There was no examination of what is already in place and what will remain despite whatever level of future funding is available — i.e., experienced trainers and regional coordinators, that if developed properly, could train their peers in their locales; needed equipment and materials for regional coordinators to act as resource centers; and an existing network of organizations. There was no extensive exploration of other possible fundraising initiatives besides grant writing, such as establishing fees for services like training, access to publications, or membership to the Information Network.

The only answer provided by partnership representatives for the continuation of the work started under IPP is more grants. Though this is the easiest way and may be the only way to continue work at the current budget level, other contingencies should have been designed or discussed much earlier in the project. Judging from my conversations with representatives of the partnership, no attempts at developing a sustainability plan beyond writing grant applications have been made, even though an April 1996 plan was submitted to IREX by ADF.

G) Other comments:

A few points made conducting and completing this technical evaluation more challenging than it needed to be. In Moscow, getting adequate time to meet with MRCHR staff was difficult. When arriving at the site, the evaluator was responsible for locating people and scheduling meetings with them. Principles to be interviewed had to participate in an ID seminar, were leaving town on a business trip, or were just plain difficult to reach. In the

future, the partnership should be responsible for organizing meeting times (with staff, regional coordinators who are in town, etc.) in advance of the site visit.