



P21-SC1-05-META
PARIS21 Steering Committee Meeting
9–10 June 2005
Ministère des Finances
139 rue de Bercy, 75012 Paris

WHAT IS METAGORA ACCOMPLISHING?
SUMMARY OF INTERMEDIARY PROJECT'S RESULTS AS OF MAY 13TH 2005

WHAT IS METAGORA ACCOMPLISHING?

SUMMARY OF INTERMEDIARY PROJECT'S RESULTS AS OF MAY 13TH 2005

The feasibility and relevance of “measuring” human rights, democracy and governance have long been controversial both in the human rights community and in the international statistical family. The potential of statistical analysis for enhancing rigor and reliability of reporting on human rights was evidenced by pioneer studies and work undertaken since the 80s, in particular by David Banks, Richard Claude, Thomas Jabine and Herbert Spierer, as well as by a series of successful projects conducted in the 90s in different countries by the American statisticians of the AAAS “Science and Human Rights Program”. Nevertheless, it was only in 2000 that the issue was broadly debated on the occasion of the Montreux Conference on Statistics, Development and Human Rights, attended by experts and officials from 123 countries and 35 international organizations. As a consequence of that conference, policy analysts, human rights practitioners and professional statisticians started to work together in various regions of the world to design, develop and test evidence-based assessment tools. A North/South network emerging from this process formulated the orientations, goals and working plan of the Metagora project, that received generous financial support from the European Union, France (Ministry of Foreign Affairs), Sweden (SIDA) and Switzerland (SDC and Ministry of Foreign Affairs).

Metagora, launched on the 1st of February 2004 within OECD-PARIS21, is now producing its first tangible outcomes. Today we have preliminary results and prototypes of tools from the following pilot activities conducted in the field by Partner Implementing Organizations:

- three surveys on key human rights / governance issues carried out in Mexico (on ill-treatment), in the Philippines (on indigenous people's rights) and in South-Africa (on land reform);
- two regional surveys on democracy and governance issues implemented by official statistical agencies in 8 countries of francophone Africa and in 3 countries of the Andean Community;
- a pilot database matching official and non-official data on the right to education in Palestine;
- harmonized collection of data by NGOs on human rights violations in Sri Lanka;
- a worldwide survey on initiatives aiming at measuring democracy, human rights and governance;
- a prototype of an on-line repository of training materials.

These activities were planned, designed and implemented as parts of a coherent whole - and their preliminary results therefore converge into common achievements with regard to the Metagora global objectives. The present summary of intermediary results briefly recalls the objectives, specific approach and working method of Metagora, summarizes its main accomplishments to date and highlights some significant perspectives opened by the project.

1. OBJECTIVES, APPROACH AND METHOD OF WORK

Metagora's strategic goal is to enhance proper evidence-based assessment and monitoring of human rights, democracy and governance.

Our main objectives are:

- to develop measurement methods and tools to obtain data and create indicators upon which policies promoting human rights, democracy, and governance can be formulated and evaluated;
- to provide guidance on monitoring and assessing issues related to human rights, democracy, and governance, in particular regarding proper matching of quantitative and qualitative data;
- to identify current and recent initiatives and expertise in measuring human rights, democracy, and governance, in particular at regional, national and local levels;
- to identify and make available relevant training materials for stakeholders interested in statistical applications for evidence-based assessment.

Our work is based on a specific bottom-up approach consisting of:

- identifying in each pilot country and together with the stakeholders, key human rights, democracy and governance issues for which evidence-based assessment is highly relevant;
- applying statistical methods and tools to the particular national context;
- assessing these methods for their capacity to provide policy-relevant results;
- providing stakeholders with a shared knowledge on the policy issues at stake;
- drawing “universal” lessons from our “local” experiences and formulating recommendations and guidelines for further application of the tested methods elsewhere.

Metagora works and grows through cross-fertilization, as the project relies on a multi-disciplinary and inclusive community of individuals and organizations involved in our selected pilot activities. Actors of this community regularly share their experiences, mutually review work in progress and provide each other with mutual support. Partner Implementing Organizations (PIOs)¹ are leading our pilot activities, co-ordinating the interventions of other national organizations and local experts and conducting regular consultations with stakeholders. Cross-fertilization therefore materialises both at the local level, among experts and practitioners from academic, governmental and non-governmental organizations involved in the pilot activities, and at the global level, among all partners and experts contributing to the implementation and assessment of the different actions and phases of the project.

Metagora is therefore an on-going process of mutual learning, common growth and product-oriented commitment.

1) Metagora PIOs are: Développement et insertion internationale (DIAL, Paris); Fundar, Centro de Análisis e investigación (Mexico City); Human Science Research Council of South Africa (HSRC, Pretoria); Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS, Albireh/Ramallah); Philippines National Commission on Human Rights (Manila); Secretaría General de la Comunidad Andina (Lima). A partnership agreement with the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS, Washington) will be concluded soon as the “Science and Human Rights Program” of this organization will be involved in the starting analytical phase of the project, namely in the field of human rights and governance indicators.

2. CURRENT ACHIEVEMENTS

Metagora is the first international project on measuring democracy, human rights and governance that undertakes several pilot experiences in different regions of the world simultaneously and in an interactive and co-ordinated fashion. The first and most apparent achievement of the project consists of having succeeded within a year to design, organize and implement all planned field operations, in order to produce, review and deliver preliminary results for:

- three surveys on key human rights / governance issues carried out in Mexico (on ill-treatment), in the Philippines (on indigenous people's rights) and in South-Africa (on redressing rights through land reform);
- two regional surveys on democracy and governance issues implemented by official statistical agencies in 8 countries of francophone Africa and in 3 countries of the Andean Community;
- the development of a pilot database matching official and non-official data on the right to education in Palestine;
- the establishment of a controlled vocabulary and harmonized procedures allowing local NGOs to collect and analyze data on human rights violations in Sri Lanka;
- the realization of a worldwide survey on initiatives aiming at measuring democracy, human rights and governance;
- the production of training materials and their dissemination through an on-line tool.

These activities were planned, designed and implemented as parts of a coherent whole - and their preliminary results therefore converge into common achievements with regard to the global project's objectives. Today the main accomplishments of Metagora are:

- ***Metagora demonstrates that data on human rights, democracy, and governance can be collected and indicators produced that are central for policy makers' decisions.***

Well-established statistical survey methods of sampling and field operations can be applied to measure human rights, democracy, and governance. As it is the case in all surveys that intend to capture sensitive or complex data, proper design and accurate tests of questionnaires are basic preconditions for obtaining reliable relevant data – and this is of particular relevance to ensure that a survey appropriately addresses the issues at stake within the specific national political, social and cultural environments. Although non-response is a serious problem, further study and articulation of assumptions and models can improve statistical estimates. Metagora surveys were designed and implemented as pilot experiences, within a short time frame and with few resources – and this had as a consequence a number of sampling and technical limitations. In spite of this, the sample surveys conducted in Mexico, Philippines and South-Africa are providing significant information on the nature, dimensions and magnitude of the issues at stake. The surveys' preliminary findings - such as the high incidence of ill-treatment in Mexico City, the centrality of protection of ancestral land for the effective implementation of indigenous people's rights in the Philippines or the expectations expressed by the South-African black population with regard to land reform - are particularly relevant for addressing key governance issues, for confirming or correcting stakeholders' perceptions and policy assumptions, and also for informing with evidence-based analysis appropriate design of policies and programs aimed at redressing rights and enhancing accountability.

- ***Metagora also demonstrates that quantitative and qualitative data can and should interrelate to properly inform assessment of democracy, human rights and governance.***

First outcomes of the project show not only that assessment of democracy, human rights and governance can build on the solid rock of proper quantitative reporting, but also that design and use of measurement methods and tools in these areas must be informed by accurate qualitative research and documentation on the situation and perceptions of target populations as well as on the assumptions and expectations of all kinds of stakeholders. Qualitative information is essential not only to ensure proper design of survey questionnaires, but also to focus statistical analysis on relevant issues and to provide appropriate contextual frameworks for an effective policy-oriented interpretation of quantitative data. In Metagora pilot activities the design of survey questionnaires and databases was based on systematic records of qualitative information gathered through in-depth narrative interviews with victims of rights infringements, focus group discussions with target populations, substantive reports of local experts as well as large consultations and topical discussions with all relevant stakeholders. As a consequence, it is now possible to relate the surveys' results with qualitative and contextual information in order that policy-oriented reports of the activities be based on a solid comprehensive basis. Moreover, the pilot experience of building statistically-friendly series of data from records of narrative reports on human rights violations, as well as the attempt to match quantitative and qualitative series of human rights data in a single database are providing substantive lessons with obvious universal scope.

- ***Metagora demonstrates that official statistical agencies can be strongly and efficiently involved in the measurement of human rights, democracy, and governance.***

Contrary to an inextricable prejudice, still too broadly shared within the international official statistical community, Metagora's pilot activities prove that official statistical agencies (OSAs) can conduct sample surveys on key human rights, governance and democracy issues, or provide qualified technical assistance and field logistics to other governmental agencies or human rights institutions responsible for monitoring the implementation of rights, democracy or governance, or even develop measurement programs jointly with research centres and civil society actors.

As factual evidence of the feasibility of measuring democracy and governance issues with official statistical tools, to date survey questionnaires on these issues have been attached as a supplement to regular household surveys conducted by eleven OSAs in francophone Africa and the Andean region. This experience develops and promotes a very promising tool, as using well-established official surveys presents obvious advantages: the size, the quality of the sampling frames, the effectiveness of proper data collection, the analytical potential of the data collected, as well as the moderate additional costs incurred by adding a specific questionnaire to existing surveys. Analysis of the resulting data is enriched with information on respondents collected from both the regular and supplement questionnaires, making it possible to focus on governance issues in relation to major social and development problems such as poverty and exclusion. In Peru, the more advanced country within the framework of this pilot experience, the survey on "*participación ciudadana*" is today at its fourth round, establishing therefore a routine measurement tool that now allows undertaking of analysis over time.

In terms of a universal lesson, the Metagora pilot activities in francophone Africa and the Andean region, as well as in Palestine and the Philippines, show not only that OSAs can contribute to substantial enhancements of democracy, human rights and governance assessment, but also that in doing so OSAs reinforce their specific role, their technical

independence and their capacity to interact as a qualified partner with other public institutions and with organized civil society.

- ***Metagora proves the complementary role of statistical methods in the work of human rights institutions.***

Current human rights monitoring mechanisms are mainly based on reporting of individual cases (or series of cases) to human rights institutions (HRIs), as well as on judicial decisions. This form of monitoring is certainly invaluable for purposes of advocacy on individual cases, but it does not provide relevant information on the real dimension and trends of major human rights issues considered as collective, social and political phenomena. As HRIs are primarily concerned with the promotion and protection of human rights on the basis of international norms and standards, they are more aware than any other institution of the lack of reliable information on human rights relevant large phenomena. However HRI agents are often unfamiliar with quantitative analysis and therefore tend to consider statistics as an overly reductive approach unable to capture the multiple complex dimensions inherent to their human rights work.

The Metagora activity in progress in the Philippines, conducted by the Commission on Human Rights, has proven that working mechanisms involving different institutions with the appropriate substantive and technical skills can successfully implement measurement of complex problems such as the implementation of indigenous people's rights. This pilot experience shows that a strong leadership of HRIs, political commitment of relevant institutions in charge of protection of target populations, proper technical assistance and field support from official statistical agencies, and large consultations of all concerned stakeholders constitute essential assets for the success of this kind of initiative. This experience also showed that a long process of dialogue and mutual learning is required to overcome prejudices as well as unfamiliarity of the various actors with the approaches and skills of the others. The preliminary results of this activity prove that, on the basis of a shared analysis, statistical information can effectively complement regular reporting of HRIs and can powerfully inform relevant recommendations of HRIs to executive and legislative powers, in particular on the implementation of economic, social and cultural rights. In a different context, the pilot survey on ill-treatment in Mexico City also provides evidence of the complementary role of statistical methods to the work of HRIs not only in identifying specific forms and mechanisms of massive human rights violations, but also in constructively promoting and supporting governmental policies and programs aimed at enhancing governance structures and measures to eliminate and prevent such violations.

- ***Metagora confirms that statistical methods can substantially enhance the research and advocacy of civil society's organizations in the fields of human rights and democracy.***

Following a road opened by successful projects carried out in particular by American statisticians in several countries during the 90s, Metagora embarked on pilot activities aimed at enhancing capacities of civil society's organizations (CSOs) to develop and use quantitative approaches and statistical tools in their human rights research and advocacy work.

In Sri Lanka, technical expertise was provided to the Human Rights Accountability Coalition (HRAC) in which different CSOs join efforts to systematically collect, collate, analyze, and share data on human rights violations. The objective of HRAC is to develop a massive, objective and undeniable statistical record allowing CSOs to inject scientifically rigorous evidence into the search for truth about the patterns, magnitude, and responsibility for past violations connected to Sri Lanka's ethnic and political conflicts, as well as to maintain a record of current abuses to assist in monitoring compliance with commitments

made in the peace process. Technical foundations were established with the adoption of harmonized forms to register events and of an agreed vocabulary on human rights violations that ensure standardized coding and processing of comprehensive physical records (archives of CSOs, each containing tens of thousands of individual cases of human rights violations). On this basis, and thanks to the program support of the Asia Foundation and to a generous contribution of the Danish Development Agency (DANIDA), this pilot activity developed and expanded further as to ensure rigorous data processing and quality control, and to build an impressive electronic record of human rights violations – a record that can now be properly used to carry out statistical analysis. All this demonstrates that well established methods for ensuring harmonized data collection and coding contribute to reinforce capacity building of CSOs and open promising perspectives for independent and proper evidence-based analysis of massive human rights violations.

In a different context, Palestinian academic research centers and CSOs are providing series of data to the Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS) for the development of a database on human rights and democracy that contains data from different sources. In its current pilot phase, the database focuses only on the implementation of the right to education. It should progressively be extended to cover other human rights areas and issues. This pilot activity includes a strong component of training of academic researchers and members of CSOs in order to enable them to play a double role as providers and users of relevant information. Today, in its prototype form, the pilot database is providing a common basis for gathering, coding and analyzing sets of information of different sources that otherwise may remain fragmentary, anecdotal and irrelevant for comprehensive analysis. As in the case of Sri Lanka, the pilot activity in Palestine confirms that appropriate training on data collection techniques and processing of data, as well as adequately calibrated transmission of know-how, substantially empower the monitoring and advocacy capacities of CSOs.

- ***A Metagora survey to identify ongoing activities to measure human rights, democracy, and governance reveals many heretofore unknown local and national initiatives.***

Initiatives of various natures aimed at measuring democracy, human rights and governance are emerging around the globe. Which are the scope, relevance, methods and outcomes of these initiatives? To answer this question Metagora launched an on-going world-wide survey on those initiatives, with a specifically developed questionnaire that aims at identifying their location, initiating institutions, topics covered, sources of funding. The survey has a particular emphasis on initiatives being carried out at the local, national and regional levels. The preliminary results reveal the existence of numerous on-going initiatives around the world that were until now often unknown by the human rights and statistical communities. Also the survey is providing information on international initiatives not yet included in the Essex/Eurostat database or in the UNDP/Eurostat repository of “sources of governance indicators”. The preliminary results of the survey show that many of these initiatives are relevant for informing policies and are largely convergent with the Metagora objectives. Also, experts conducting these initiatives were identified and thus can now benefit from exchanges with other experts and from collaboration and synergies with the Metagora community. As a matter of fact, the survey confirmed the need for more rigorous use of quantitative methods in collection and analysis of existing data and in producing new information. In a subsequent phase, an analytical assessment will be conducted in order to have a clearer picture of the kind of information and analysis that are being effectively produced by the initiatives.

- ***Metagora has developed a prototype of an online inventory of initiatives to measure human rights, democracy, and governance.***

Documenting the initiatives aimed at measuring democracy, human rights and governance is a major Metagora objective, as this is essential to duly reflect the large variety of experiences and lessons from the field, to enable the sharing of measurement methods and their possible uses, and to strengthen the Metagora network. With these aims, the information collected through the Metagora survey on the initiatives is being registered and classified in a systematic inventory. A prototype of an on-line database has been developed to make this information publicly available. In its operational form, this tool will allow any interested person to find a description of each captured initiative (topics, methods, budget, etc.), information on and addresses of institutions and experts involved in their implementation, and links for accessing to related publications and available technical documents. Moreover, this tool will serve as a means for updating and enlarging the inventory, as any person or institution initiating a relevant measuring project will be able to fill in an electronic questionnaire that will be subsequently controlled and registered into the database.

- ***Preliminary Web-based training materials demonstrate their utility for applying methods in other countries and other contexts.***

Much progress has been made in documenting human rights, democracy and governance measurement methods, so that others may reap the benefit of what has been learned. The production and further dissemination of training materials is therefore a clear mark of Metagora's value added. The goal of these web-based materials is to provide a large variety of stakeholders (policy makers, civil society actors, field workers and data analysts) with structured information on the approaches, conditions and methods for measuring democracy, human rights and governance. Technical vocabulary shall be adapted to the diversity of users' levels of knowledge and needs. In their final form the training materials will include explanatory documents, guidelines, definitions, case studies, and a collection of documents and tools from the Metagora project that can be used as models for future projects. These documents and tools will include training manuals for interviewers, sample analyses and reports, etc. To date, the basic website structure, the outline of the basic explanatory document and several encyclopedia entries have been created. Moreover, a case study has been selected and many example materials have been collected. A demonstration of this website will be performed during the Metagora Forum to be held in Paris on 24-25 May 2005.

3. PERSPECTIVES OPENED BY METAGORA

- ***The involvement of official statistical agencies in measuring democracy, human rights and governance merits being further deepened and extended.***

As previously mentioned, to date Metagora has demonstrated in thirteen developing countries that official statistical agencies can be strongly and efficiently involved in the measurement of human rights, democracy, and governance. This is a very important finding for international institutional actors, such as the European Union and bilateral donors, that are strongly committed both to implementing vigorous initiatives in support of democracy, human rights implementation and governance improvement, and also to enhancing national statistical capacities for ensuring proper monitoring of development goals. On the basis of such a double political commitment, it would make sense for these institutional actors to consider the possibility of extending the experience initiated by Metagora to a number of existing international regional programs of statistical co-operation such as Medstat, MercoSur, etc.

An institutional follow-up of the Metagora pilot activity in francophone Africa and the Andean region already started, as in two countries, Madagascar and Peru, the surveys on democratic participation and governance were adopted as a regular activity within the official national statistical systems. This shows that the institutionalization of this measurement tool is feasible and therefore merits to be enhanced, deepened and included in the National Strategies for the Development of Statistics promoted by PARIS21 and supported by the UN family. In this perspective, the Metagora Community would like to share with all concerned actors its current appreciation of the basic conditions that are required to obtain relevant information on democratic participation, human rights implementation and governance issues through official statistical surveys:

- the political environment in which the survey takes place should allow for technically independent implementation of field operations and processing of data, secure and free mobility of the interviewers, free and confident response from the interviewees;
- an in-depth dialogue with the various stakeholders on the survey's assumptions is highly desirable,
- the survey content should reflect the comprehensive knowledge of the issues at stake for each stakeholder,
- particular attention should be paid to the structure, content, clarity and respondent-friendliness of the questionnaire,
- high statistical competency of those conducting the survey and analysing the results is indispensable,
- recognition and legitimacy of the institution co-ordinating the survey and disseminating the results is a decisive asset.

Moreover, the implementation of the survey, the documentation of methods and the dissemination of results must conform to the UN Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics.

- ***Comparative assessment of national governance indicators compiled by different institutions merits continuation and deepening***

Different governance indicators are compiled and published by various institutions in the same region or the same country. Most often their conceptual frameworks differ and their governance assessments are based on different measurable proxies. This diversity leads users to confusion and they may even question the adequacy of indicators and measurement tools, the consistency of their features, their explanatory capacity, as well as the elementary reliability of the figures released. From their side, producers of governance indicators evolve and work in a very competitive environment: the information market. In this context, producers tend to protect their methodological information from possible misuses or abusive intellectual appropriation – and there is therefore a serious risk of general lack of transparency with regard to methodological bases of released indicators.

Metagora addressed this situation by organizing two workshops gathering together organizations and experts who are conducting parallel measurements of governance in the same regions and countries. The first was held in Bamako in June 2004 and involved experts from UNECA, Dial, Afristat and Afrobarometer. The second was held in La Paz in March 2005 and involved experts from the Andean Community Secretariat, Dial and Latinobarometer. Both workshops showed that there are real possibilities for improving transparency of measurement methods, as experts willingly exchanged technical information on the strengths and weaknesses of their respective measuring approaches. Experts conducted a preliminary assessment of the correlation between the results of the surveys, examined possible forms of future collaboration and discussed sensitive issues in

relation with the dissemination of indicators and their public reception. This shows that improvements can intervene when appropriate informal frameworks facilitate confident exchange of experiences and knowledge; nevertheless this experience still remains incipient with regard to the objectives of a comprehensive comparative assessment and it therefore merits to be deepened and further expanded.

- ***The bottom-up approach to national indicators merits enhancement in order to complement and enrich the top-down approach that underlies international indicators.***

During the past few years, there has been a growing consensus on the need for reliable aggregate governance indicators. Nevertheless a trend is emerging from discussions in many international fora that calls for an assessment of the feasibility, the effective scope of application, and the limits of aggregate governance indicators, in particular with regard to effective monitoring of national policy efforts to improve governance. The 2005 report of the World Bank Institute on “Governance matters” stresses that: *“while... aggregate governance indicators have been useful in providing a general snapshot of the countries of the world for various broad components of governance, now for 8 years, and while the margins of error have declined over time, they remain a rather blunt instrument for specific policy advice at the country level. As we have argued in past, these aggregate indicators need to be complemented with in-depth in-country governance diagnosis, based on micro-surveys of households, firms and public officials within the country. The lessons being drawn from these combined aggregate and micro-data sets do point to the importance of moving concretely to the next stage of governance reforms, in Africa and elsewhere. These, among others, are to stress reforms in transparency (such as natural resource revenue transparency mechanisms, disclosure of assets to politicians, voting records of parliamentarians, political campaign contributions, and fiscal accounts), in altering incentives in institutions so to increasingly focus on prevention and deterrence (rather than overly relying in prosecutions), and in working more closely with other actors outside the public sector as well, such as the therefore neglected private sector.”*² It is precisely at this point and in this perspective that the top-down and bottom-up approaches effectively converge and become complementary. Complementarities of such approaches should now be deepened during two of the crucial next steps of Metagora: the Metagora Forum and the eagerly-awaited meeting with the international producers of governance indicators. The outcomes of these gatherings will subsequently be shared with policy-oriented bodies and networks dealing with governance issues – and in particular with the OECD-DAC Network on Governance, GOVNET – in order to open a broader reflection on the ways and means to ensure feasibility, reliability, policy focus and proper use of governance indicators.

AS A MATTER OF CONCLUSION:

The preliminary results and first outcomes of Metagora clearly show that the project as a whole is achieving planned steps, approaching its goals, opening new perspectives and producing a substantive change in the perception of the feasibility and relevance of “measuring” human rights, democracy and governance.

² D. Kaufmann, A. Kraay, M. Mastruzzi: Governance Matters IV: Governance Indicators for 1996-2004, The World Bank, May 2005, p. 41

Spotlights on selected Metagora pilot activities

- Diagnosis of indigenous people's rights in the Philippines
- Land reform and land administration in South Africa
- Measuring ill-treatment in Mexico City (Federal District)
- Measuring poverty, democracy and governance in Francophone Africa and Latin America
- Metagora Training Materials

Pilot Survey on the Diagnosis of Indigenous People's Rights To Ancestral Domains and Lands in three Ancestral Domains in the Philippines

The objective of this pilot activity is to develop methods and statistical tools, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches that will diagnose and measure the following aspects of the rights of indigenous people to their ancestral domains and lands:

- indigenous people's perceptions and awareness of their rights;
- reported enjoyment or violations of their rights;
- governmental measures and customary laws and structures for the realization of their rights;
- availability of governmental and indigenous people's mechanisms for fulfilling rights.

The results are of highly significant policy relevance, as the national policy at stake is the implementation of the "Indigenous People Rights Act" (IPRA), entered into force in 1997 to address the marginalization and powerlessness of the communities of indigenous people (around 16% of total population). This act recognizes and promotes in particular:


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

The development of the methods and tools was the result of a strong process of dialogue, consultation consensus building and collaboration between and among the Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines as leader of this activity, and its partners, the National Statistics Coordination Board, the National Statistical Office, Statistical Research Training Center, the academic and civil society organizations, as well as the indigenous people's representatives and governance stakeholders, resting on the particular expertise and experience of each partner.

The tribes covered were the Kankana-ey, Bago and Bugkalot. In the survey, a sample of 750 households were interviewed, from which 150 Bagos, 250 Kankana-eyes and 350 Bugkalots. Three focus group discussions were conducted per tribe, namely with tribal leaders, women and youths. Moreover, seven local consultations served to enrich the data gathered through the survey as well as the qualitative information provided by FGDs.

First survey results call for continued and sustained IPRA implementation, human rights' education, policy reviews and governmental delivery of services. Three preliminary main conclusions merit to be highlighted:

- Indigenous people manifest growing awareness of their rights under IPRA but need thorough understanding of these rights. IPRA should be further reviewed to respond to and comply with rights based norms in governance of indigenous people's affairs.
- Gains in rights enjoyment are hampered by existing violations. The government has to play a major role in empowering other governance stakeholders to respect, protect and fulfill indigenous people's rights to ancestral domain and land.
- Indigenous people still rely on and respect customary laws and practices in solving land disputes. There are potentials for convergence and collaboration among governance stakeholders in policy measures for promoting and protecting indigenous people's rights to ensure that rights based norms and standards are met.



Graph 1: Organizations/Institutions where land issues & problems of Bugkalots are discussed and resolved (Percentage distribution of households)

STATE OBLIGATION: RESPECT, PROTECT, and FULFILL HUMAN RIGHTS OF IPS USING RIGHTS BASED INTERNATIONAL NORMS AND STANDARDS



POLICY INCIDENCES: Continuing and sustained IPRA implementation; HR Education, Policy reviews and government delivery of services through convergent efforts of government institutions; Expansion for nation-wide survey based diagnosis of IP rights; Inclusion of human rights, governance, democracy and poverty modules in census and other statistical projects; monitoring by CHRP as NHRI.



GOVERNANCE STAKEHOLDER: Governmental Institutions



SURVEY FINDINGS(Quantitative Approach)	FGD FINDINGS (Qualitative Approach)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ High perception and awareness of rights to ancestral domain and land (Bago,68%), Bugkalot(70.8%),Kankana-ey(60.8%) ✓ Govt as second in source of information of rights to ancestral domain and land : Bago 28.4%, Bugkalot 54.2%, Kankana-ey 22.4%. ✓ Experienced violations of rights consisting of encroachment (Bago-6%, Bugkalot 30.9% and Kankana-ey 13.2%); pollution (Bago, 4.7% Bugkalot, 17.7%, Kankana-ey, 8.8%); illegal entry (Bago, 5.3%, Bugkalot, 46.3% and Kankana-ey, 13.2%) Existence of violations on land grabbing by private individuals (Bago 50%; Bugkalot56.5%, Kankana-ey,55.6%),council of elders and others ✓ Substantial awareness and availment of governmental programs and services ✓ Enjoyment of land ownership and acquisition of right to ancestral domain ✓ Average satisfaction (68-78%) on delivery of government programs and services ✓ 90%considered customary laws helpful in solving land issues; 52% of land issues resolved by customary laws ✓ Top five primary needs: adequate food, housing, water system, livelihood and education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Tribal leaders and women with higher awareness and perception of rights to ancestral domain and land.Youth has lowest awareness. Right of ownership, to develop lands and natural resources and to stay in territories well understood. Low or no awareness of other rights listed under IPRA. Apparent confusion of rights due to lack of knowledge about distinction or difference between rights to ancestral domain and land ✓ Positive effect of IPRA on their rights to ancestral domain and rights ✓ Existence of violations and sources are tribesmates, other tribes, private mining companies ✓ Recognition of government efforts in fulfilling rights to ancestral domain and land ✓ Customary law as primary source of dispute resolution affecting rights to ancestral domain and land <p>LOCAL CONSULTATIONS(Qualitative Approach)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Demand for relevant and deeper Human rights and IPRA education ✓ Need for livelihood and organizing especially from women sectors ✓ Development aggression of private sectors permitted/not controlled by government and co-opted by some tribal leaders ✓ Lack of delivery of vital services ✓ Discriminatory policies to access rights to education and other social services ✓ Pollution of and inadequate water resources ✓ Peace and order to ensure personal security

Measuring key assumptions of a rights-redressing policy: Land reform and land administration in South Africa

In South Africa, respect for human rights and the democratic process are imbued with special significance, because prior to the first non-racial democratic elections in 1994, the apartheid state emphatically negated these principles in respect of the majority black population. The mission of post-apartheid South Africa has therefore largely been informed by the imperative to deepen the non-racial system of governance and democracy, and establish a human rights culture. One of the key reforms in this respect relates to land. The South African Constitution of 1996 enshrines the three main pillars of land reform: redistribution, security of tenure, and restitution. In the light of this, the key policy and research question is: what is the nature and extent of land demand in South Africa?

Following exploratory pilot studies, a survey was designed to interrogate five main dimensions of the relationship of individuals and households to land: current living conditions; experience with land in general & land reform in particular; knowledge & understanding of land reform & land administration issues; attitudes towards land reform & land administration; and needs and expectations in respect of land & land reform.

In order to select geographical areas on which all the land reform elements impact, three out of the nine provinces were selected, which each encompass tribal, rural, and urban areas. Those who are most affected include adults, previously disadvantaged individuals (predominantly black); farm workers who reside on farms; commercial farmers; and traditional authorities. Therefore, the following respondent groups were identified:



- Residents in black urban formal areas (160 respondents)
- Residents in black urban informal areas (250 respondents)
- Residents in traditional (all rural) areas (510 respondents)
- Farm dwellers (mainly black) (340, exploratory study since proper data on farms are lacking in SA)
- Farm owners (mainly white) (90, exploratory study since proper data on farms are lacking in SA)
- Traditional authorities (50, exploratory study since proper data on tribal authorities are lacking in SA)

The key dependent variable in this study is land demand and has been analysed in terms of: socio-economic circumstances, land loss and redress; current land access and use; knowledge about land reform; and perceptions of governance.


Preliminary descriptive analysis suggest that demand for land is least intense among those residing in tribal areas, quite clearly because, notwithstanding observations made above about the limited access to land, many people residing in tribal areas already occupy or access as much land as they are able to use, if not more. Land demand is most intense among farm dwellers and urban informal dwellers. Presumably this relates to the more prevalent tenure insecurity found among members of these two groups. In terms of what it is that people want land for, the overwhelming message is that food security is primary, followed by either tenure security or income generation,

depending on the population studied. Accordingly, the bulk of those who express a wish for land want relatively small amounts of it.

These results suggest that the general approach to land redistribution within the Department of Land Affairs caters to a particular kind of constituency – i.e. those with commercial aspirations – while neglecting a much larger group who wish to acquire land more for food and tenure security, and on a very modest scale. There is a strong differentiation in land demand and attitudes towards land reform by settlement type, and in principle this is of critical importance in designing a land reform programme that takes into account what people want and expect. The results also show a low awareness of land reform, especially among rural dwellers, and that those who regard themselves as victims of land dispossession have generally not come forward to claim land through the Land Restitution process. This might point the way towards future difficulties, especially if land redistribution is not conducted on a sufficient scale to cater for the land demand of those who are aggrieved because of past dispossession. In terms of general attitudes towards land reform, there are certain commonalities between black respondents and commercial farmers. This does suggest that, in the hopes of achieving better cooperation between government, land demanders and commercial farmers, these similarities could be highlighted. More in-depth analysis will try to explain these findings in terms of people’s perception and experiences of governance, socio-economic situation and specific land-related experiences, beliefs and attitudes.



Incidence of contact with public security and procurement of justice authorities




Measuring ill-treatment in Mexico City (Federal District)

Target population:
persons aged 15 or more living in the Federal District (6,400,000 persons)


Reference period:
events occurred between November 2003 and October 2004

Measuring method:
random sample household survey, conducted through face-to-face interviews.

Incidence of ill-treatment



Type of ill-treatment




Persons with physical ill-treatment 7 %

Despite numerous legal and institutional reforms pushed forth by successive Mexican governments as evidence of their commitment to protect human rights in recent years, ill-treatment by authorities in charge of public security and procurement of justice has not disappeared and affects not only well-identified groups but the population in general. Comprehensive periodic data regarding this phenomenon does not exist. The Metagora Activity in Mexico thus consists of a pilot household survey geographically limited to the Federal District (official territorial jurisdiction of Mexico City) and of a subsequent policy-oriented report on ill-treatment of the population at large by public security and procurement of justice authorities (i.e. police forces, investigation of crime and execution of sentences).

The study provides information on acts of ill-treatment be they physical or non-physical acts. Whilst physical ill-treatment is self-explanatory, non-physical ill-treatment refers to acts such as threats to hurt the person or its family members, threats to accuse someone on false grounds, being asked for money, compelling someone to confess or give information, etc. The idea is to see to what extent ill-treatment in its various aspects contributes to weaken the relation which should prevail in a democratic and well-governed context between the population and authorities working in the public security and justice systems.

An initial qualitative study based on in-depth interviews complements the quantitative data obtained via the survey. The survey is limited to people aged 15 or more, living in dwellings in the Federal District, during a one-year period (November 2003-October 2004). Preliminary descriptive analysis indicates that 1 of 4 persons had contact with the authorities under study; 1 of 2 people with contact suffered some type of ill-treatment; and more than 1 out of 20 persons with ill-treatment suffered physical ill-treatment¹. The survey also contributes, in particular situations of contact with the authority, to identify vulnerable groups in the general population: i.e. people more likely to be stopped and taken away in a patrol car, and suffer some type of ill-treatment, are men aged 18-24 and belonging to the lowest socio-economic levels. It provides information which can be disaggregated to show the most frequent acts of ill-treatment by type of authority, the motives under which contacts and ill-treatments are most common, and so on.



Number of violations per type of non-physical ill-treatment

The survey results correspond to 2,300,000 contacts experienced by 1,600,000 persons

¹ Data for physical ill-treatment is not statistically significant.

Both the authorities under study and the population are immersed in a culture of disregard for the law in Mexico, whether intentionally or due to a lack of knowledge of the law (rights and obligations), which questions society at large with regards to rule of law and governance issues. The data collected contribute to monitor acts of ill-treatment and promote accountability on behalf of the authorities as well as define concrete policies (i.e. the occurrence of non-physical ill-treatment stresses the need for policies based on education, behaviour handbooks, personal performance evaluation, etc). Collection of data on a regular basis and its extension to the entire country, should allow for monitoring and evaluations that in the long run appropriately inform the design of policies and programs aiming at improving governance of security and police forces, enhancing accountability and preventing authorities' abuse of force.

Measuring poverty, participatory democracy and governance issues through official household surveys in Francophone Africa and the Andean Community

Following the experience and consequences of structural adjustment policies in developing countries, there is today a growing international consensus on the importance not only of the content of economic policies but also of the process by which they are implemented, particularly in the context of new international strategies for fighting poverty (PRSP, HIPC initiatives). New factors such as governance, ownership and participation are now being placed at the heart of development programs. At the same time, analysis of development paths tends today to highlight the interactions between four major dimensions: growth, distribution (of revenues or assets), the quality of institutions (and public institutions in particular) and the type of political regime (or, more generally, the society's values system). Current indicators and aggregates therefore try to incorporate these aspects to measure and evaluate development strategies.

To address this major challenge shared with Metagora, two regional institutions (AFRISTAT and the Secretariat-general of the Andean community) and thirteen National Statistical Institutes (INS) of Africa and Latin America, in partnership with DIAL, decided to explore together the possibilities offered by official households surveys as a tool for measuring and monitoring these new aspects of development. Building on the experience acquired in this domain since 1995 by the MADIO project in Madagascar – which allowed the instrument to be tested and adjusted through the identification of the most relevant questions – three questionnaires (*'Subjective Poverty'*, *'Governance'* and *'Democracy'*) have been produced and appended to regular surveys on employment, the informal sector and poverty, based on the *1-2-3 survey* technique developed by DIAL. This experience was conducted between 2001 and 2004 in seven economic capitals in the WAEMU countries (Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, Niger, Senegal and Togo) and in Madagascar, as well as three Latin American countries (Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru). The surveys covered a representative sample of more than 35,000 adults (respondents for 21,000 households) in the eight African cities, whereas 50,000 people were interviewed in the three Andean countries, with a national and regional level of statistical inference. Following the success of this operation in terms of both methodology (governance and democracy can be reliably measured) and analysis (results can shed light on public policies), a process has begun to institutionalize this approach as a regular official measuring tool. Indeed, at this date, two countries have decided to incorporate this type of survey into the national statistical system on a permanent basis. In Madagascar, the survey is now being carried out annually by INSTAT, while the INEI in Peru is running the operation on continuous basis, thus providing information on a monthly, quarterly and annual basis to build time-series indicators. The possibility of renewing the surveys is also under consideration in other countries such as Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, etc..

As a complement to the survey tool among households in the areas of governance and democracy, an expert panel survey was conducted in the eight African countries. 250 specialists from the South and the North responded to this "*Mirror Survey*" (researchers, development workers, decision-makers, high-ranking public officials, politicians, etc.) Its aim was to compare the replies received from the general public with those of the experts on questions which were common to both studies.

Although still tentative, these initiatives are already producing conclusive and promising outcomes in terms of both methodological lessons and significant results. Initial analyses of the surveys are shedding new light on phenomena which had hitherto received little (if any)

attention. For instance, surveys' results show a massive support among African citizens – and particularly among the poorest people – for the principles of democracy, in contrast to received wisdom and despite profound gaps of varying size from one country to another in the extent to which civil and political rights are respected – such as freedom of expression, electoral transparency or equality before the law. Surveys' results also illustrate the profound discredit of the political class, whose role in the crisis in Côte d'Ivoire has been particularly damaging. Also, the urgent 'need for State' is clearly and strongly expressed by the poorest groups on both continents. Moreover, the surveys show the widespread nature of petty corruption, although proactive policies have been effecting substantial reductions in this respect, as has been shown by the situation in Madagascar, where the number of cases of corruption halved between 2003 and 2004. All in all, the results of the surveys, confronted with the "*Mirror Survey*", lead to seriously question reliability of surveys which poll the opinions of experts, that are most widespread reference sources of international institutions and donors (who use this information in particular to decide on allocation of development aid. Last but not least, it is important to stress that the surveys' results in Africa and Latin America provide with precise information for evaluating local governance.

Metagora's relevant global lessons from these experiences are:

- The approach offers all the acknowledged advantages of a statistical household surveys: transparency of measurement procedures, representative nature of collected information and quantification of phenomena, providing benefits such as the ability to compare indicators across different time periods.
- The richness of the collected information allows conducting in-depth policy-oriented analyses that are much more appropriate to follow and support improvement of governance and democracy than analyses based on international indicators and aggregates.
- While collecting data on both objective (behaviour, actual experiences) and subjective information (perception, satisfaction) with regard to poverty, governance and democracy, we consider the possibility to monitor and to relate the two fundamental dimensions of these phenomena.
- Moreover, these two dimensions can be combined with traditional variables related to the socio-economic characteristics of individuals and households (income, occupation, sex, age, ethnic group, etc.). It is thus possible to disaggregate the results and highlight the specific characteristics or disparities between different population categories, studying in particular the cases of the most disadvantaged or those who suffer the greatest discrimination. This approach therefore allows for providing indicators for comparing the situations (or perceptions) of, for instance, men and women, the poor and the rich, or even from one ethnic group to another.
- Furthermore, this approach opens a new interesting perspective of international comparability.
- In Peru and Ecuador, infra-national representativity makes it possible to produce regional indicators (spatial disaggregation). This is of particular relevance in piloting existing decentralisation processes and in assisting local democracy.

An evaluation of the conducted surveys and related studies clearly shows that it is possible to develop indicators for evaluating how well institutions and democracy are working, and for measuring the degree of support for policies among the general public. These indicators are generally less complex to implement than traditional socio-economic indicators; such as, for example, monetary poverty. The non-response rate with regard to questions on governance and democracy is generally lower than the non-response rate observed with regard to questions on revenues. A scientific comparison with other international initiatives (the

Afrobarometer and *Latinobarómetro* projects) revealed both the strong convergence of the obtained results across the common fields – which confirms the robustness of the proposed indicators – and the areas in which the various instruments complement each other.


The strong involvement of Official Statistical Agencies in measuring governance and democracy, and the accuracy of estimators and the intrinsic link with traditional economic indicators, particularly poverty, constitute major assets of this Metagora pilot experience. Also, the wide diversity of political contexts, in terms of liberties and rights, amid which the surveys were conducted, shows that the approach may be implemented across a vast range of developing countries, extending well beyond the scope of just the new democracies. Furthermore, in countries which have experienced serious political upheaval (for example, the Côte d'Ivoire, Madagascar and Togo in Africa; Ecuador and Bolivia in Latin America), where the general public have shown particularly strong support for democracy, the survey provides a better insight into the nature of the problems, and could probably be used for the implementation of targeted preventive measures before the identified tensions degenerate into open conflict.

The process for setting up the surveys constitutes one of the tool's major advantages. The situation in Peru is a good example of this: national appropriation of the survey, under the joint co-ordination of the INEI, the Ministry of Finance and the Prime Minister's office, the expanded participation of civil society in the questionnaire design and data analysis, the institutionalisation of the process for revising the survey over time, and the South-South co-operation opportunities for Peruvian experts with other countries in the region. Downstream, experience shows that in many cases, there is a greater demand for governance and democracy indicators than traditional socio-economic indicators – as has been shown by the strong reaction from the public and the media at events for announcing results held in the countries under study (Madagascar, Mali, Peru, etc.). Furthermore, by providing fuel for public debates over policies and the big development issues, this type of survey represents a force for strengthening democracy, revealing the wishes of the public and, lastly, empowering 'voiceless' sectors of the population.

This pilot experience is leading to crucial next steps: in the very short term, existing databases will be leveraged, producing a certain number of analyses, as key survey results for wide dissemination *in situ* (at the national level, but also at the regional level where permitted by the survey) and in-depth academic analyses. In the medium term, the goal is to consolidate the method. The survey is ready to be replicated geographically (inclusion of new countries) and, more importantly, in time. The initiation of time series (already under way in Madagascar and Peru) will lay the foundations for a genuine instrument for monitoring governance and democracy indicators. It will also provide a test for the robustness of the indicators. Furthermore, in terms of the political process involved, the institutionalisation of this tool within the official statistical information system must be further enhanced, deepened and included in the national strategies for the development of statistics promoted by PARIS21, and supported by the UN family.


In addition to each country's own interest and the possibilities opened by this pilot experience for South-South co-operation, with the launch of the statistical surveys on governance and democracy, it is at last reasonable to hope that, for the first time, transfers will not follow the traditional route from North to South; but instead, methodological expertise flows could travel from the South to irrigate the North.

In Peru: Support for democratic regimes weakens as corruption perception increases and democracy performance worsens



Source: Our estimation based on ENAHO may 2003-december 2004.

Support for democracy varies across countries



Sources: SIE-ENEMDU-2004, INEC, Ecuador; ENAHO 2003-2004 INEI, Peru; Encuesta Contínua de Hogares, INE, Bolivia 2004, authors calculations.

INCIDENCE OF CORRUPTION WITHIN PUBLIC AGENCIES

	<i>National</i> %	<i>Urban</i> %	<i>Rural</i> %	<i>Poor</i> %	<i>Non Poor</i> %
Policía	30.3	31.5	24	33.4	29.2
Poder judicial	14.9	14.3	17.4	16.2	14.4
Min. Agricultura	6.8	9.1	5.7	4.3	9.3
Dir. de Migraciones	6.4	5.0	32.2	18.2	5.7
Municipalidad	5.9	6.2	5.0	4.6	6.7
Oficina de Arbitraje y Conciliación	4.8	2.9	13.5	7.6	3.4
FONCODES	3.2	1.7	3.7	4.7	1.1
ONPE	2.8	3.3	1.0	3.0	2.6
JNE	2.7	0	12.8	6.9	0
RENIEC	2.0	1.8	2.6	2.1	2.0

Elaboración nuestra a partir de ENAHO 2002-IV.

Note: has been asked, felt forced or gave voluntarily gifts, tips, gratuities, bribes, etc.

➤ *Regional/local level:*

- some regions may suffer more than other from governance problems
- There are local-specific governance issues (ie. decentralization policies; local accountability).

Do you agree that the decentralization process has implied?


<i>Departments</i>	<i>Greater participation in decision making</i>	<i>An improvement in public services</i>	<i>Better attention to peoples' demands</i>	<i>More injustices and abuses</i>
Amazonas	38,4	41,7	42,2	39,9
Ancash	41,8	51,4	51,2	54,1
Apurímac	32,9	35,4	35,9	33,6
Arequipa	69,6	82,9	81,1	48,3
Cusco	56,1	61,1	63,3	40,2
Huancavelica	55,1	61,9	61,5	34,2
Huanuco	44,5	49,2	48,5	43,8
Ica	76,1	80,9	89,9	76,8
Junin	66,9	80,7	78,5	39,3
La Libertad	50,3	60,1	57,1	38,0
Lambayeque	48,4	66,1	76,3	81,8
Lima	43,3	49,5	54,7	38,4
Loreto	35,9	37,7	34,1	44,4
Pasco	77,2	70,4	76,9	26,9
...
Total	50,6	57,4	59,4	43,9

Source: our preliminary estimation based on ENAHO 2004
 Note: a lot + more or less

Times series


- Relevant to evaluate policies. Allows to construct a baseline against which public policy can be monitored and outcomes compared over the intervention period.
- Replication over time increases data quality; is a necessary condition for policy impact and causality analysis

Assessment of the corruption evolution in Peru
 (Percentage of population considering that corruption has increased in past 12 months)



Source: our estimates based on ENAHO 2003-2004 household survey

Perceived and observed corruption and governance indicators



Source: our estimates based on ENAHO 2003-2004 household survey

Corruption and poverty


Expenditure Quintiles	<i>Incidence</i> (total number of individuals)	<i>Incidence</i> (Individuals in contact with Public services)	<i>Average Cost</i> (Soles per capita/year)	<i>Weight of corruption</i> (% of food expenditure)	<i>Reason for non reporting:</i> <i>Fear of the consequences, don't know how to</i>
<i>I</i>	2.6%	3.1%	4.8	0.8%	49.3%
<i>II</i>	4.4%	5.3%	8.4	0.9%	41.1%
<i>III</i>	5.0%	5.8%	7.2	0.7%	22.5%
<i>IV</i>	6.2%	7.1%	21.6	1.4%	30.9%
<i>V</i>	7.9%	8.9%	33.6	1.2%	29.5%
HHs Condition					
<i>Non Poor</i>	6.8%	7.9%	69	1.3%	29.6%
<i>Poor</i>	3.9%***	4.6%***	15***	0.7%	36.5%***
Total	5.2%	6.1%	48	1.1%	32.3%

Source: Authors calculations based on ENAHO 2002-IV, 18,598 households

Note: the incidence represents the ratio of individuals who live in households where at least one member has been victim of corruption.

*** The differences between Poor and Non Poor are significant at 1%.

Civil servant salaries and corruption levels in Madagascar 1995-2004




Source: Razafindrakoto, Roubaud (2001) and Labour Force Surveys 1995-2004, INSTAT/MADIO.

Note: The corruption "module" was not included in the survey in 1996, 1997 and 1999.

The corruption figures are derived from an objective indicator (percentage of victims of corruption during the previous year).

How far can we trust the experts' opinion on corruption? Discrepancies between real extent of corruption and experts' perception in Francophone Africa







Sources: *General Household Survey* (35,594 persons interviewed; 4500 for each country in average); *Expert panel survey* or *Mirror survey* (246 persons surveyed; 30 experts for each country in average). * In Madagascar, results are drawn from the 2003 survey.

Assessment of the different political regimes and monetary poverty

	ALL	Quartiles of revenu per capita			
		1 ^{er} quartile	2 ^{ème} quartile	3 ^{ème} quartile	4 ^{ème} quartile
Assessment of the different political regimes :					
A. Having a strong leader	18	20	19	18	16
B. That the army runs the country	14	14	16	15	12
C. That experts decide on what is good for the country	35	36	34	36	33
D. To have a democratic political regime	86	88	86	86	87
Weaknesses of democracy :					
A. In democracies, the economic system doesn't work well	31	33	33	31	28
B. Democracies are unable to maintain order	34	35	35	35	32
C. Democracies have difficulties in decision-making	47	47	48	47	47
D. Democracy is better than other forms of government	81	81	80	80	82

Sources : *Enquêtes 1-2-3*, modules Démocratie, 2001/2003, Instituts Nationaux de la Statistique, AFRISTAT, DIAL, nos propres calculs.

Perception of the main democratic principals by the population Are they fundamental? Are they respected in the country?



Metagora Training Materials

The basic goals of the training materials are to allow:

- 1) Policy makers to understand both how indicators and statistics are created, and also of what use they can be in the creation of evidence-based policy;
- 2) Civil society activists to create statistically reasonable and well-thought-out proposals for data collection projects;
- 3) Field workers to be able to replicate projects like those tested during the METAGORA pilot phase;
- 4) Data analysts to interpret data collected using methods like those developed during the METAGORA pilot phase; and
- 5) Policy creators, civil society activists, and statisticians to form a common ground of understanding.

In order to accomplish these goals, the training materials will take the form of a website with four main components. This website will be available in several formats: via the Internet for those with Internet access, in CD format for those with access to computing facilities, and in paper format for those without access to the Internet or computer facilities.

The first component of the training materials will be a basic explanatory document titled "Guidelines for Informing Policy via Data." This document will cover all topics related to its title: what policy is and how it is created, where data come from and how data are collected well, how data can be translated into policy decisions, and how the impact of such policy decisions is monitored and evaluated. This document will be concept-based, but detailed definitions of topics and tools specific to particular fields of expertise will be available via links to an associated encyclopedia. For example, if the word "barplot" is used, clicking on that word within the basic explanatory document will yield a side window in which the definition of a barplot is given. In this way, people of different expertise levels in policy creation and analysis, as well as statistics, will be able to learn from this basic explanatory document without needing to review the definitions that they already know.

The second component will be the encyclopedia that will be associated with the basic explanatory document. The encyclopedia will contain definitions and discussions of the statistical and public policy terms that appear in the basic explanatory document, and will contain references to other resources on the topic discussed. For example, while the term "barplot" will require a relatively simple definition and discussion of the interpretation and use of barplots, the term "discrimination" will require a more complex entry describing different definitions of discrimination within different contexts and cultural groups.

The third component will be one or more detailed case studies of data collection projects within the Metagora community. The goal of the case study is to outline the various decisions, steps, mistakes, and solutions that occur during the process of data collection and analysis.

The final component will be a collection of documents and tools from the Metagora projects that can be used as models for future projects. These documents and tools will include training manuals for interviewers, sample analyses and reports, etc.

To date, the basic website structure has been created, the outline of the basic explanatory document has been created, several encyclopedia entries have been created, a case study has been outlined and begun, and many examples materials have been collected together. A demonstration of this website will be performed during the Metagora Forum to be held in Paris on 24-25 May 2005.