**FCO SPF PROJECT EVALUATION**

1. **Project Details**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Number | GB-3-PHR 331301 BUR |
| Project Title | RE-ACTIVATE – reintegration and skills development for political prisoners |
| Project Cost (total cost / cost to FCO if different) | £ 29,970 |
| Project Start/End Dates | June 12 – February 13 |
| Programme | Human Rights and Democracy Programme Fund |
| Country/Countries | Burma |
| Official Development Assistance Y/N | Y |

1. **Project Purpose** (from proposal form)

|  |
| --- |
| To assist in the reintegration and reactivation of former political prisoners so that they have the necessary skills, knowledge and confidence to take an active and effective role in the electoral democratic processes moving towards elections in 2015. |

1. **Project Background / Context** including what the project set out to achieve (150 words max)

|  |
| --- |
| On 13 January 2012, the Burmese government released 651 political prisoners, including “88 Generation” leaders, monks, and others involved in the 2007 Saffron Revolution. Many had been in prison for decades, and often lack the confidence and skills to take part once again in Burma’s political process.  In February 2012, the British Council began two capacity-building courses aimed at increasing the knowledge base and confidence of recently released prisoners, and strengthening the networks between them. This was just the beginning of what will be a long road towards reintegration and building up the skills of individuals who have demonstrated their commitment to the democratisation of Burma and wish to continue working towards it.  The 88 leadership have often expressed their desire to take part in the political process, whether it be as a political party itself or supporting other pro-democracy parties. This project aims to support them in this process. |

1. **Evaluation summary** (150 words max)

|  |
| --- |
| The project aimed to provide training to “reactivate” former political prisoners so they could have an active role in politics leading up to the 2015 election. It was originally targeted at “88 Generation” leaders and a “younger generation” of political prisoners. It took place at a time of great change, and this proved a distraction for some participants; they had just been freed from prison with personal and political demands on their time. From those interviewed it was clear that the course was high quality, and had great impact on some participants: “it changed my life”. The project was worthwhile and generally delivered well, although the indicators were over-ambitious. However, ultimately the project was pitched by implementer and Post as able to influence Burmese opposition politics at a high level, but it did not do this, since the 88 Generation leaders did not participate, which was a lost opportunity. |

1. **Questions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Did the project achieve the project purpose? | Partly. |
| Did the project come in on budget? (Y/N)  If no, why and what was the difference in cost? | Yes. |
| Was the project completed on time? (Y/N)  If not, why not? | Yes. |
| Were the Project benefits sustained after project completion? | Partly. |

1. **Overall Red / Amber / Green rating** for project

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Overall Rating for project (put **X** in relevant box) | | |
| Red | |  |
| Red | Amber | **X** |
| Amber | Green |  |
| Green | |  |

Guide to overall rating:

Green- project performed well under each of the evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and management

Green/Amber – project performed well under most criteria and adequately in others

Amber/Red – project performed adequately under some criteria but poorly in others

Red – project performed poorly under most criteria

1. **Top 5 Lessons learned**

|  |
| --- |
| The main lessons for this project relate to taking greater care over the requirements of participants and project reporting:   1. For projects involving training courses the risk of non-attendance by key stakeholders should always be addressed. Courses need to be held at the right times and locations for participants, and some may need financial support if they are foregoing work or they are not ordinarily resident where the course is located. 2. Where training is aimed at political leaders, or other high-level individuals, careful thought and flexibility is needed for design and delivery, bearing in mind their busy schedules. 3. When working with socially vulnerable groups, in this case young former political prisoners, it is important that implementers show sensitivity and awareness of the welfare of individuals and group (as was done in this case). 4. Even where a project does not deliver exactly as planned it can still have an important impact on individuals. 5. Implementers need to submit project reporting on time and report against the indicators in the original bid. Post needs to make sure this happens. |

1. **Recommendations for future projects**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Post needs to ensure that the quality of project reporting is acceptable before submitting reports to London and to make sure implementers deliver reports at the appropriate time. (The Evaluators invited the British Council to resubmit the Project Completion Report (PCR) so that it properly reflected this evidence. Post should make sure this happens and that the revised PCR is submitted to the Programme Team in London.) 2. There appears to still be a demand for this type of training. Generation 88 said they were open to bespoke training of their members on their premises. Generally there appears to be a strong appetite for training on human rights and democracy related issues; provided they are targeted at the right issues for the right audience at the right time, and with financial support for those not resident in Rangoon. |