

OUTCOMES



This step interprets socio-economic outcome indicators in light of relevant human rights standards to uncover patterns and trends in rights deprivations experienced by different groups.

This step assesses the laws and policies that give effect to the state's human rights commitments. It seeks to determine the extent to which they have translated into adequate goods and services on the ground and to identify the capacity gaps that have led to shortcomings in their implementation.



POLICY EFFORTS

The steps of the framework represent four broad dimensions, within which an inventory of relevant issues is grouped. They need not be carried out in a strict sequential order and can be adapted to focus on one step or sub-step over another, depending on the context. For more information visit www.cesr.org.

Measure aggregate levels of rights enjoyment

Measure disparities in rights enjoyment

Measure progress over time

Identify legal and policy commitments

Examine policy content and implementation

Analyze policy processes

WHAT CONCEPTS ARE WE MEASURING?

Minimum core obligations: Widespread deprivations suggest obligations of result (e.g. to reach minimum essential levels of a right) are not being met.

Non-discrimination and equality: Differences in the enjoyment of a right raise concerns about possible discrimination or failure to address disadvantage.

Progressive realization and non-retrogression: Identifying trends in the enjoyment of a right over time indicates whether there is progress or backsliding and whether disparities are growing or reducing.

WHAT CONCEPTS ARE WE MEASURING?

Obligation to take steps: Whether the government is taking adequate legislative, judicial, administrative, social and other measures towards the full realization of rights.

AAAAQ: Whether the goods and services needed to fulfill a right are increasingly available, accessible, acceptable and of adequate quality, without discrimination.

Participation, transparency, right to a remedy: Whether rights holders can actively participate in the design, implementation and oversight of policies and have avenues to hold government to account or seek redress when they are negatively affected by them.

HOW CAN WE MEASURE THEM?

Compare socio-economic outcome indicators to relevant benchmarks and/or analogous countries. Deviations can point to whether or not a country's performance is reasonable.

Disaggregate socio-economic indicators by relevant social groups (e.g. ethnicity, religion, gender, region, income, etc.) to uncover any particular or intersecting disparities.

Compare the same socio-economic indicators over time (aggregate or disaggregated).

HOW CAN WE MEASURE THEM?

Identify indicators that demonstrate commitments made and analyze the provisions of relevant laws and policies against international standards, guidelines, etc.

A range of techniques can be used to gather primary or secondary data that measure these criteria. Cross-country comparisons, disaggregated and temporal data all help in judging the reasonableness of the state's performance.

Qualitative techniques (e.g. focus groups, interviews) can gather feedback from particular rights holders. Quantifiable studies (e.g. perception surveys and governance indicators) may provide a general overview.

WHAT CONCEPTS ARE WE MEASURING?

Progressive realization according to maximum available resources: Whether expenditures (planned and actual) in relevant sectors are a transparent, equitable and effective use of available resources.

Progressive realization according to maximum available resources: Whether sufficient revenue is being mobilized transparently, equitably and effectively from different sources.

Participation, accountability and transparency: Whether the budget process is open and accessible to citizens and whether they have avenues for review of budget decisions or redress.

WHAT CONCEPTS ARE WE MEASURING?

Indivisibility and interdependence: Socio-economic, political and cultural factors may inhibit people's ability to enjoy their rights or seek redress if they are violated.

Obligations to respect and protect: The capacity of the government (influenced by third parties and structural limitations) is also relevant to explain why its efforts have not been more successful.

Obligation to fulfill: To make a conclusion about a government's compliance with its obligation to fulfill economic, social and cultural rights.

HOW CAN WE MEASURE THEM?

Allocation ratios, judged against relevant reference points and over time, show reasonableness of amounts earmarked for key sectors and population groups. Various governance tools (e.g. social audits) review the disbursement of funds.

Identify the state's main revenue sources (e.g. taxation, borrowing, international assistance). Evaluate relevant fiscal, monetary, and macro-economic policies against human rights principles.

Evaluate channels for participation in budgeting. Assess to what degree people have access to budgetary information. Evaluate administrative, judicial or other avenues for review of budget decisions and redress.

HOW CAN WE MEASURE THEM?

Although sophisticated quantitative methods, such as econometrics, can be used, qualitative approaches, such as capacity gaps analysis, can help facilitate the participation of rights holders.

Again, these constraints can be uncovered through qualitative approaches or quantitative methods from various fields, e.g. political economy analysis.

By triangulating the findings from the first three steps, a picture should emerge from which to judge the state's efforts to progressively fulfill rights and the results of those efforts on the ground.

Analyze resource allocation and expenditure

Analyze resource generation

Analyze policy processes

Identify other determinants

Understand state constraints

Determine state compliance

RESOURCES



Drawing on tools of budget and economic policy analysis, this step evaluates the state's fiscal policies to uncover cases where underfunding is related to a failure to efficiently and equitably generate and distribute resources.

This step provides a broader analysis of contextual factors impacting on rights holders' ability to claim their rights and the state's capacity to meet its obligations, which is synthesized with the findings from the previous three steps to make a final assessment.



ASSESSMENT

