EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

"MINORITY RIGHTS: A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CYPRUS PROBLEM"

October 2011

Contents

Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of the external evaluation conducted by CARDET for the project "Minority Rights: A Contribution to the Cyprus Problem". The project was implemented by Minority Rights Group (MRG) and Action for Equality, Support, and Antiracism (KISA) during the period of March 2009 to April 2011. The main aim of the project was to promote the active contribution of all communities to the efforts for reconciliation that would lead to a sustainable solution of the Cyprus problem, in accordance with human rights and gender equality. For the purpose of this evaluation, specific questions were developed to guide data collection and analysis.

The framework under which the project was developed was one of its key successes. Even though central to the Cyprus problem are the two main communities (the Greek-Cypriots and the Turkish-Cypriots), the project partners felt that all the inhabitants of the country should be involved in the efforts for a solution to the problem. In a very polarised and bipolar frozen conflict such as the one in Cyprus, the addition of a much wider range of views and some acknowledgement that it is not just about two sides, would help all stakeholders look at the Cyprus conflict in new ways.

Overall, the project was successful given the complexity of the issues that it aimed to cover. The target indicators were met and participants provided very positive input at the end of the project activities. One of the most successful parts of the project was the capacity building workshop on "Conflict Resolution, Peace Building, Human, Gender, and Minority Rights". According to participants, it was the first time that all these communities and groups attended a similar event and were given the chance to participate in a workshop in which the representatives of quite a few communities that reside in Cyprus were present.

Another successful part was the research report that was produced as part of the project. The report can be a useful tool in the future because of its uniqueness and the fact that it constitutes a novel attempt to produce a report of this kind in the context of Cyprus. The media conference for the launching of the report was another successful aspect of the project. The report received significant attention due to the wide media coverage that it received both in the southern and in the northern part of Cyprus. The journalists that covered the

event demonstrated great interest in the report and had different inquiries with respect to minorities in Cyprus, their rights, and their relationship to reconciliation efforts.

Advocacy meetings were organised nationally and internationally to present the findings and recommendations of the final report that was produced through the project. The meetings that took place in Brussels, Cyprus, Ankara, and Athens with decision-makers and relevant stakeholders were quite successful. In Cyprus, the report was presented to the representatives of officially-recognised minorities in the House of Representatives and representatives of political parties in both sides of the divide. Additional meetings were organised in order to present the report to various officials in the southern part of Cyprus. All of them were very positive towards the report and urged MRG and KISA to continue working on this issue. Furthermore, the trip to Northern Ireland provided opportunities for learning and reflection.

Overall, the project activities contributed to the increase in understanding between the communities involved and enhanced the interest of the representatives and leaders of the communities in the project. Active participation and involvement from the part of these communities, as well as increased interest in the issues portrayed in the project can have a positive impact in the Cypriot society in the long-term. Furthermore, this project not only provided substantial knowledge to people who might have not been aware of the issues discussed, but also served as a reminder to everyone that minorities also have a significant role to play in the society and they need to be taken into consideration in the efforts to resolve the Cyprus problem.

The challenges faced by the project partners are inherent of the subject matter of the project itself. Reconciliation is a tough issue to address; even tougher, is the integration of minorities in decision-making and supporting them to take an active role in such conflict resolution efforts. The status quo on the island and several failed efforts to resolve the Cyprus problem have contributed to a negative climate and pessimism that was evident in some of the project activities. In addition, time was a challenge for the project partners since they felt that due to different procedural decisions and approvals, some of the activities

had to be carried out in a shorter period of time than the one initially planned. Regardless of the challenges, all project activities were successfully completed.

Based on the data collection and analysis conducted for the purpose of this evaluation, the key recommendations that have emerged are:

- The use of the minority rights framework is an important instrument for the prevention and resolution of conflict. Therefore, more projects like this are needed in order to contribute to this aim.

- Engaging multiple stakeholders is essential for the success of projects of this nature. This project engaged politicians, NGOs, activists, minority groups, and partners in the implementation of the project.

- Projects of this nature are complex and unpredictable. Therefore, it is important to allow for sufficient time for project activities to be implemented.

- The use of both formative (continuous) evaluation techniques throughout the course of the project, as well as summative (final) evaluation techniques in order to monitor the project's progress and evaluate its impact is an important practice.

1. Introduction

This report presents the findings of the external evaluation conducted for the project "Minority Rights: A Contribution to the Cyprus Problem", which was completed by Minority Rights Group (MRG) and Action for Equality, Support, and Antiracism (KISA) in April 2011. The total duration of the project was 24 months, from March 2009 to April 2011 and the Centre for the Advancement of Research & Development in Educational Technology (CARDET) undertook its external evaluation. The main aim of this project was to contribute to reconciliation amongst all communities (including minorities) and to a sustainable solution to the Cyprus problem, in full respect of human rights and gender equality. The main activities of the project included conducting consultation research on the contribution of a minority-rights approach to a peaceful settlement of the Cyprus problem, organisation of a capacity building workshop for Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) that are active in Cyprus, an experience exchange trip to Northern Ireland, publication of a final report with outcomes and recommendations, as well as advocacy meetings and a media campaign to promote the findings and recommendations of the report. In this evaluation report, a detailed description of the project is presented, along with the methodology followed in the evaluation process, the evaluation findings, and relevant recommendations.

Within the framework of this evaluation, data were collected through the review of all of the project's available documents, as well as interviews that were conducted with project partners and independent sources involved in the project activities. The findings revolve around issues and themes that have been examined as part of the evaluation process. These include:

1. The effectiveness of the project with respect to the capacity of Community-Based Organisations (CBOs), Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), and activists involved in different aspects of the project to represent the interests of their community and work towards positive solutions.

2. The effectiveness of the consultation research in increasing awareness and attention to the situation of minorities in Cyprus.

3. The success of the media campaign in disseminating the results of the project.

4. The impact of the report on the objectives of the project but also in terms of the effect that the report had on decision-makers and their analysis of current problems as well as identification of solutions.

5. The effectiveness of the experience exchange trip to Northern Ireland in generating new ideas.

6. The project's success in achieving the set objectives.

7. The successful aspects of the project.

8. The project's challenges.

The report concludes with recommendations that relate to the project's implementation. The objective of these recommendations is to contribute to the improvement of projects of this nature that might be designed and implemented in the future.

2. Description of the Project

In this section of the report, a detailed overview of the project "Minority Rights: A Contribution to the Solution of the Cyprus Problem" is provided, including the partners and context of the action, the objectives, the target groups involved, the expected results, and the activities that were implemented. In order to compose this section of the report, information and data were derived primarily through a thorough review of the following documents that were provided by partners: Grant Application Form (DOC_1) and a draft of the [Final] Narrative Report (DOC_27).

Even though the main evaluation findings are presented in Section 4, a preliminary evaluation of the project is also presented in this section, as the indicators that were set out in the Grant Application Form (DOC_1) are evaluated in terms of whether they were met based on the documents that were made

available to us. These documents were coded for the purpose of this project evaluation and the coding is presented in Appendix 1.

2.1 Partners

The two-year project "Minority Rights: A Contribution to the Solution of the Cyprus problem" aimed to offer a new perspective with respect to the Cyprus problem. The project was undertaken and completed by MRG and KISA. MRG is an international NGO with 40 years of experience and approximately 130 partners in more than 60 countries. The organisation actively engages in campaigning in order to ensure that the voices of the disadvantaged minorities and indigenous people can be heard.[1] KISA is a Cypriot NGO that was established in 1998 and engages in the fields of migration, asylum, racism, discrimination, and human trafficking. The organisation is active in advocacy/campaigning on issues of multiculturalism as well as equality irrespective of nationality, race, origin, colour, religious or other beliefs, gender, sexual orientation, or any other diversity. In addition, the organisation runs a Migrant and Refugee Centre, where it provides information, support, and mediation to migrants and refugees. It is a member, but also the legal representative, of the European Network Against Racism (ENAR) in Cyprus and has been an implementing partner/applicant for a range of European Union programmes.[2]

2.2 Context of the Action

The two partners believed that any settlement, which would exclude certain groups of citizens and inhabitants of the island, either due to their gender, ethnicity, colour, or religion, would be doomed to fail. Therefore, even though central to the Cyprus problem are the two main communities, namely the Greek-Cypriots and the Turkish-Cypriots, MRG and KISA believed that all the inhabitants of the country should be involved in the efforts for a solution to the problem. A durable solution to the Cyprus problem would have to incorporate and deal with new issues and problems that made their appearance in the Cypriot society in the last 20 years or so. Hence, issues such as discrimination

---

[1] Source: http://www.minorityrights.org/575/about-us/about-us.html
[2] Source: http://www.kisa.org.cy/EN/about_kisa/index.html

and racism, migrant integration, human trafficking, as well as the issue of multiculturalism and how to manage it, strongly characterise issues that have shaped the contemporary Cypriot society. Furthermore, at the programme design stage, some MRG staff also argued that in a very polarised and bipolar frozen conflict, the addition of a much wider range of views and some acknowledgement that it is not just about two sides could help all stakeholders look at things in a new way (DOC_1).

Based on the context of which communities constitute the acknowledged minority communities in Cyprus, the beneficiaries of this project included members of minority communities such as the Maronites, the Armenians, the Latins, the Roma, the Turkish settlers, the Pontians, new migrants, as well as women, who would benefit from a superior implementation of their rights. At this point it is essential to clarify that in this project, the term "minority" was not used only to denote that a group is numerically less, but it was used to denote the violation of the rights of a given group. That is the reason for which women were one of the groups incorporated in this project; due to the fact that many rights are denied to women and at many times, women are treated unequally. Thus, this project would benefit the Cypriot population all together due to the effective strategy towards reconciliation and better understanding (DOC_1).

2.3 Target Groups

The target groups involved in this project included: CBOs, local authorities, decision-makers, migrants, NGOs, women, young people, minority communities, and mass media. More specifically, based on the expectations set out by the project with respect to the target groups and the specific activities involving them, at least 20 representatives of all the communities residing in Cyprus including Greek Cypriots, Turkish Cypriots, Turkish settlers, Armenians, Maronites, Latins, Roma, Pontians, Kurds, migrants, as well as women representatives were expected to be consulted in order to spot potential solutions to the problems they face due to the Cyprus conflict.

Furthermore, training would be provided to 22 male and female leaders of different communities in order to develop their leadership skills and their capacity to effectively campaign for the rights of their communities. Also 2,000

people – both men and women - would read the report and obtain useful information towards the efforts for a sustainable settlement. This would include representatives of Cypriot CSOs, media, international organisations, as well as national and international decision-makers. Moreover, 4 leaders including 1 representative of the Cypriot government, 1 of the Turkish-Cypriot community and 2 of the civil society, would take part in a trip to a foreign country, in which an analogous situation to that of Cyprus had been successfully resolved.

In addition, decision-makers from both Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities, as well as from the international community - namely the European Union, the United Nations, USA, UK, Greece, and Turkey - would receive support for their efforts to resolve the Cyprus problem. Finally, Cypriot mass media would constitute the target of a media campaign aiming to create constructive attitude towards dialogue, bi-communal meetings, anti-racism, gender equality, and respect of human rights for every community.

2.4 Aims and Objectives

The main scope of the project was the promotion of the active contribution of all communities to the efforts for reconciliation that would lead to a sustainable solution of the Cyprus problem, in accordance to human rights and gender equality. Specific objectives included the development of trust and dialogue amongst all Cypriot communities, including minority communities, women organisations, and women CSO representatives, in order to ensure that any settlement to the Cyprus problem would be in accordance to the notions of equality and inclusion. According to the argument of the project, the only way to build an environment where disagreements are dealt through non-violent and democratic means, is by taking into consideration all the minority communities affected by the conflict. Based on this argument, it is vital to create an environment where diverse communities feel comfortable enough so as to exchange ideas and experiences, deconstruct the image of "enemy", and ultimately build and gain mutual trust. Therefore, the project aimed to create the conditions in order to achieve what is described above. This would be achieved through various events during which every community that resides in Cyprus would place efforts towards common aims. The degree to which the project's

objectives were fulfilled would be monitored by MRG and KISA though the use of specific indicators, which are presented below (DOC_1).

2.5 Indicators for the Fulfilment of Objectives

Some of the indicators that would be used by MRG and KISA in order to evaluate whether the project's objectives were met are outlined in this section (DOC_1).

- Firstly, 10 decision-makers or international actors would report that they had gained novel ideas or a new perspective, which they would promote in their own work.
- Secondly, 20 community leaders would report that they felt more confident and skilled to work on inter-communal activities and that they showed more willingness to join forces with representatives of the other groups.
- Thirdly, at least 30 women would report that through the scheduled events they gained more confidence and felt more skilled to work on inter-communal activities and that they had more willingness to work together with representatives of other groups.
- Last but not least, it would be assured that the peace dialogue engaged representatives of the smaller minorities and groups.

As a starting point in the evaluation process of this project, we aimed at evaluating these indicators with respect to whether they were met or not. However, in our attempt to measure if these indicators were met, we realised that the indicators set in the proposal (DOC_1), with the objective of monitoring and evaluating the project's objectives, were not measurable and specific enough; therefore, it was not easy for us to evaluate them. These indicators focus more on meta-cognitive abilities of the participants and could be measured through data collection on the long-term effects of the project; based on the data that were collected within the framework of the project, these indicators cannot be measured. Thus, instead of evaluating the indicators as such, we aimed to measure whether the number of participants set in each indicator was ultimately met, based on the thorough review of the project documents available to us.

The number of people set in the first indicator was met, since 10 decision-makers or international actors participated in some of the project activities

(DOC_22; DOC_26). The same applies to the number of people set in the second indicator, since at least 20 community leaders were present in a number of activities that were organised within the framework of the project (DOC_6; DOC_22). Moreover, the number set in the third indicator was also met, since at least 30 women participated in the various activities of the project (DOC_6; DOC_13; DOC_16; DOC_20; DOC_22; DOC_24). Finally, the last indicator that is related to the inclusion/engagement of the smaller minorities and groups in the peace dialogue was also met since representatives of such communities participated in various activities of the project (DOC_6; DOC_16; DOC_24).

2.6 Project Activities and their Implementation

In order to achieve the expected results, the project involved a set of activities, which included: consultation research on the contribution of a minority-rights approach to a peaceful settlement of the Cyprus problem and the prevention of possible violent conflicts; organisation of a capacity building workshop for Cypriot CSOs; an experience exchange trip to Northern Ireland; publication of a final report with outcomes and recommendations; national and international advocacy meetings on the report; and a media campaign. All invitations, letters, and documents related to the project activities were first composed in English and then translated to Greek and Turkish so as to facilitate the participation of all the communities involved.

With respect to the consultation research, based on the project's requirements, one researcher was expected to travel to Cyprus and meet with the representatives of all the communities represented in the project. Additionally, discussions between the researcher and the communities in relation to the conflict and their ideas as far as a possible solution would follow. The researcher would interview 20 eligible interviewees for this purpose. The research conducted would contribute to the write-up and publication of the report proposing a framework for Cyprus in which the rights of all communities would be respected and all the communities would be able to express their views. Based on the fact that the consultation research and the preparation of the report were two closely-related activities, they are discussed in this section together even though chronologically they were not consecutive.

The procedure for finding a researcher and author of the relevant report began in July 2009. Once it became evident that it would be hard to find one person with all the qualifications necessary to carry out research in both parts of the divide, it was decided that it would be better if there was a team of researchers rather than a single researcher. The team would be comprised by the "lead" researcher/author and two or three local researchers. After receiving the approval of the European Commission for this change in the project's methodology, partners and associates identified candidates for the research team.

After several discussions and negotiations, Mr. Nikolas Kyriakou was appointed as the main co-author of the report and as lead-researcher, and Ms. Nurcan Kaya was also appointed as a co-author of the report, focusing more on the international perspective on conflict and minority protection (DOC_27). The research covered all communities residing in the island, as well as women representatives, representatives of human rights groups, youth, and NGOs. Great attention was placed on maintaining gender balance between the participants selected. The interviews began in July/August 2010 and 29 persons were interviewed. The research was completed by late August as planned.

The data were analysed and the report was prepared by the co-authors. It was printed in April 2011 in three languages – English, Greek, and Turkish. The title of the report was "Minority Rights: Solutions to the Cyprus Conflict" and covered everything that was stated in the proposal. The first draft of the report was completed by early October 2010 and it was circulated to a number of scholars and experts for feedback. After completing the writing of the report and the translations, the final versions of the printed reports were sent to embassies in Cyprus, political parties, members of parliament and other politicians, the authorities in both parts of Cyprus, the media, and NGOs. The English version of the report was sent to UN departments, international NGOs, and many universities. One of the main objectives of the consultation research and the report was to draw attention from the two big communities (Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots) to the condition of all other communities living on the island and demonstrate the ways in which the unresolved conflict affected all

individuals. This objective was met since these issues were covered by the report.

The other main activity of the project was related to the capacity building of Cypriot CSOs and community leaders. With respect to this activity, MRG and KISA were committed to organise a workshop directed to all the communities, with the aim of reinforcing their capacity to stand for the rights of their own community members. The workshop was expected to cover issues like human rights, minority rights, conflict resolution mechanisms, advocacy, and media work. The actual "Capacity Building Workshop in Conflict Resolution, Peace Building, Human, Gender, and Minority Rights" was held on 26-28 March 2010 in Nicosia. The workshop was attended by male and female leaders and representatives of various ethnic migrant and religious groups living in both sides of Cyprus. The interpretation to-from Greek, Turkish, and English removed any language barriers and guaranteed the smooth implementation of this activity. The workshop was attended by 20 participants, coming from almost all the communities and minorities residing in Cyprus. The programme (DOC_4) was carried out as planned with no interruptions. Active participation was promoted throughout the workshop and the participants expressed their gratitude for the opportunity provided to them to share their problems, thoughts, experiences, ideas, and needs of their communities in relation to the Cyprus problem. The participants committed themselves to participating in similar events and cooperating in future activities. A follow-up meeting took place on 23 May 2010 focusing on the creation of a project conceived by the participants and the advancement of its main parameters (DOC_27).

As far as the experience exchange trip is concerned, which was another main activity implemented in the framework of the project, it was agreed to take place on 17-18 June 2010 due to the elections in the northern part of Cyprus in April 2010 and in the United Kingdom in May 2010. KISA had identified two politicians and two NGO members, from both the Greek-Cypriot and the Turkish-Cypriot communities, in order to participate in the trip, along with project staff members from MRG and KISA (DOC_13). The rationale behind this trip was to visit a country in which a similar problem to that of Cyprus had been successfully resolved and while there, acquire a better understanding of the background of

the conflict in Northern Ireland, the peace-making process, the role played by NGOs, society, and members of parliament, and identify lessons to be learnt for Cyprus.

In the timeline of the project, the last set of activities that took place involved national and international advocacy meetings and a media campaign. Both of these activities aimed to publicise and promote the findings and recommendations of the report. The advocacy meetings included meetings with decision-makers, as well as follow-up and networking meetings with CSOs. More specifically, MRG and KISA organised meetings with relevant stakeholders in Brussels, Athens, Ankara, and Cyprus aiming to maintain equal participation of all the communities involved (DOC_1).

The meetings that were organised both nationally and internationally for the promotion of the report were relatively successful (DOC_27). Specifically, people in Brussels and Athens exhibited great interest for the report and they welcomed MRG's and KISA's attempt to incorporate the issue of minorities in a future solution of the Cyprus problem. In Ankara, the meetings were not as successful due to the fact that it was pre-election period and for this reason, it was difficult to set as many appointments with government officials as the partners would have liked (DOC_27).

In Cyprus, after the launch of the report, KISA organised a meeting (working lunch) with representatives of the three officially-recognised minorities in the southern part of the island (Maronites, Armenians, Latins) in the House of Representatives, representatives of political parties in both parts of the divide, and people who had participated in the experience exchange trip to Northern Ireland (DOC_22). The report was welcomed by the participants and a discussion was held regarding possible future actions.

An advocacy meeting with civil society was also organised in Cyprus. In this meeting, the participants were representatives of minority communities in the northern and southern part of Cyprus, NGOs, and people who had participated in the capacity-building workshop and/or the consultation research, as well as one of the participants in the experience exchange trip (DOC_24). Participants welcomed the report and had the opportunity to exchange ideas on its main findings and recommendations.

In a final effort to disseminate the findings of the report nationally, MRG and KISA visited various officials in the southern part and set up individual meetings with them to discuss the findings and recommendations. Amongst them were Mr. Aristos Tsiartas, Head of the Authority against Racism and Discrimination in the Ombudsman's Office; Ms. Leda Koursoumba, Law Commissioner and Commissioner for the Rights of the Child; Ms. Elizabeth Solomon, Deputy Coordinator/Senior Political Affairs Officer at the Office of the Special Adviser to the UN Secretary General in Cyprus; and Mr. Toumazos Tselepis, Special Adviser to the President of the Republic of Cyprus on the Cyprus problem (DOC_26). The report was welcomed by all the officials that MRG and KISA met, who also shared comments and recommendations with the partners. Unfortunately, the authorities in the northern part of the divide did not respond to any of KISA's invitations, conveyed by the organisation's associates in the northern part, thus no advocacy meeting took place in that part of the country (DOC_27).

Regarding the media campaign, KISA organised a press conference on 11 April 2011 for the launch of the report in Cyprus and prepared invitation letters in English, Greek, and Turkish so as to guarantee participation of journalists from both parts of Cyprus. The press conference was organised at the Cyprus Community Media Centre, which is located in the buffer zone, in order to ensure attendance from both the northern and the southern part of the country. The launch of the report was very successful since it attracted wide media coverage. Furthermore, a video and a radio spot were produced by KISA for the enhancement of the dissemination of the report (DOC_27).

2.7 Expected Results

The project's expected results indicated the project's expected impact on the status of the target groups and beneficiaries; in total, these expected results were three. The first expected result was related to the improved understanding of the issues, which curtail trust among communities and avert the settlement of the Cyprus problem and of the potential strategies to address them. Representatives of every community involved in the project would be given the chance to discuss amongst themselves and together with conflict experts in order to analyse the

issues behind the Cyprus conflict, learn from the successful experiences of other countries in similar situations, and investigate potential implementations of parallel strategies in the context of Cyprus.

Also, it was expected that the needs perceived by women in all of the communities would be observed, along with the impact that solutions assumed in other countries had on them. In addition, both government as well as civil society members would be positively affected due to the experience exchange trip abroad that would take place. Moreover, the report that would be the outcome of the consultation research would contain contributions from every community and would also suggest a new analysis of the conflict involving all the communities (DOC_1).

The second expected result was related to civil society. More specifically, it focused on supporting the capabilities of civil society, together with women organisations and women representatives, in order to facilitate their active participation in the debate on a sustainable settlement by endorsing the rights of each and every community residing in the island. In addition, 22 members of CSOs that represent all the regions of the island and all the population in terms of age and gender would become involved in this action. It was estimated that the capacity of all these communities in relation to their participation in the debate for a potential solution to the Cyprus problem would be improved. Furthermore, they were expected to expand their knowledge of minority rights and the rights-based approach, and through the development of their conflict resolution skills become familiar with advocacy and campaign strategies. Following the capacity building workshop, the beneficiaries would reproduce the workshop's activities and results in their own organisations, thus educating more members and engaging the whole Cypriot civil society.

The abilities of CSOs were also expected to improve during the implementation of an advocacy campaign (civil society meeting) that was supposed to offer to CSO leaders the chance to "learn by doing" and to create relationships with national and international institutions, decision-makers, and donors. At the end of the intervention, approximately 20 CSOs would be capable to contribute to a pacific settlement of the conflict (DOC_1).

The third expected result was the improved use of the minority rights framework as an important instrument for the prevention and resolution of conflict. Through this process, it was expected that reconciliation, gender equality, and respect of the rights of every community would be encouraged. Furthermore, in the course of a media and advocacy campaign, MRG and KISA were expected to endorse their innovative contributions to the conflict settlement, on the foundations set by every community on the island. Also, regular meetings with decision-makers from Cyprus and abroad aimed to raise the awareness of the need to adopt a human rights framework, if a sustainable solution were to be found (DOC_1).

3. Methodology

This section focuses on describing the methodology that guided the data collection and the whole evaluation process of the project.

3.1 Evaluation Questions

The Evaluation Questions that guided the data collection and analysis were:

1. What effect has the project had (if any) on the capacity of the CBOs, NGOs, and activists involved in different aspects of the programme to represent the interests of their community and work towards positive solutions?

2. Has the consultation research increased awareness of and attention to the situation of minorities in the island?

3. How successful was the media campaign in disseminating the results of the project?

4. How did the report contribute to the objectives of the project? Did the publication of the report influence decision-makers in terms of their analysis of the current problems and identification of solutions?

5. How effective was the experience exchange trip in generating new ideas amongst those who participated? Did it enable them to achieve perspective and try any fresh approaches?

6. Have the objectives of the project been achieved? If yes, to what degree?

7. What aspects of the project have been successful?

8. What aspects of the project have been challenging? What improvements could be made?

3.2 Data Collection and Analysis

Three main sources of data were used during the data collection process. These sources were:

- A thorough review of the project documents that were provided by project partners
- Semi-structured interviews with the project partners
- Semi-structured interviews with independent sources

The project partners provided us with documents that were related to the project, including the project's application form (proposal), various documents related to each of the project activities, as well as deliverables, and a draft of the final narrative report. These documents were coded (see Appendix 1) and they were thoroughly reviewed in an attempt to collect information and data that would help us answer the Evaluation Questions above.

In addition to the document review, we also conducted in-depth semi-structured interviews in order to collect further information and data. The first set of interviews involved interviewing the project partners. We interviewed the project coordinator in Cyprus from KISA and we also had a Skype conference-call interview with the overall project coordinator from MRG in Turkey. In order to carry out these interviews, a semi-structured interview guide was designed, which can be found in Appendix 2.

The second set of interviews involved interviewing independent sources. These were defined as people who had participated in some activity within the framework of the project and/or had expertise related with the project's activities or outcomes. Some contacts were provided by partners and the rest were identified by the evaluator. Based on the requirements set by the Terms of Reference of the external evaluation, the expectation was to interview at least 8 independent sources. In order to meet this target, we selected 23 potential independent sources and we contacted them through email by sending a request for a face-to-face, phone, or Skype interview (see Appendix 3). The response we

received to the email request was rather minimal. Most of the participants from the northern part did not respond to our emails. For this reason, we followed up on our request through phone calls where possible. We were finally able to conduct 8 interviews with independent sources, as was required. In order to conduct the interviews with the independent sources, we designed and used a semi-structured interview guide, which can be found in Appendix 4. This guide was also translated in Greek and was used to conduct interviews with some participants, who preferred to discuss with us in Greek. The interview transcripts were coded (see Appendix 2) and the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967)[3] was followed in order to analyse the data.

4. Findings

4.1 Question 1

What effect has the project had (if any) on the capacity of the CBOs, NGOs, and activists involved in different aspects of the programme to represent the interests of their community and work towards positive solutions?

It can be argued that the effect of the project on the capacity of the CBOs, NGOs, and activists involved in different aspects of the programme to represent the interests of their community and work towards positive solutions was satisfactory in relation to some aspects of the project. This was made possible by the activities that were organised before the writing of the report, but also by the activities organised after its publication. For example, this was particularly evident in the capacity building workshop on "Conflict Resolution, Peace Building, Human, Gender and Minority Rights" that was held in March 2010 in Nicosia with the participation of male and female leaders and representatives of various ethnic and religious groups living in both parts of Cyprus (DOC_6; DOC_11).

According to one of the participants, it was the first time that all these communities and groups attended a similar event and they were given the

---

[3] Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research.* New York: Aldine De Gruyter

chance to participate in a workshop in which the representatives of quite a few communities that reside in Cyprus were present (INT_4). Furthermore, within the framework of this workshop, the participants received training by members of MRG, KISA, and other experts. The training gave the opportunity to the participants to acquire knowledge on more practical matters, which could help them when they want to communicate their communities' issues and problems to the public services and the wider public (INT_5).

The pleasant environment that existed throughout the workshop encouraged the participants to actively participate by sharing their problems, experiences, and needs of their communities, particularly with respect to the Cyprus problem (INT_1). A large number of the migrants that attended the capacity building workshop did not have a clear idea about the status quo in Cyprus (INT_2). The fact that they had the chance to discuss about how the current situation affects their lives in terms of human rights definitely constituted a significant step for them in terms of their awareness of the environment in which they live and how to deal with it (INT_2; INT_3). Furthermore, the participants gave a commitment to keep communication active between them and work together on a range of activities in the future. It is important to note here that many of the people that attended this workshop were also involved in the interview process that took place for the purpose of collecting data to write the report (INT_2).

As two of the participants stated, the workshop provided them with the opportunity to become aware and knowledgeable of the existence and problems faced by other communities in Cyprus, and the discussion that took place was constructive and enlightening. They described the workshop as a good starting point towards integrating such communities in the discussion on the Cyprus problem. However, they expressed the view that follow-up workshops of similar nature should have taken place, or at least there should have been a plan for the implementation of such workshops, so that the discussion could develop and progress and also so that more people would get the opportunity to become familiar with such issues and share the experience (INT_3; INT_4).

The observations made during the interviews we conducted were also in line with the views expressed by the participants through an evaluation form

that they were asked to complete during the last session of the workshop (DOC_8). The data collected through the evaluation forms were used by the organisers in order to assess the outcomes of the workshop and measure the participants' satisfaction with respect to the programme. Based on the results presented, all the participants agreed that the fundamental aim of the workshop, which was to strengthen the capacity of the participants in order to contribute to the debate on a sustainable settlement, for the equal promotion of the rights of all communities residing in Cyprus, was accomplished (DOC_11). More specifically, in relation to the topics covered that were related to minority rights, about half of the participants stated that they had enriched their knowledge and skills to a large extent, whereas the other half believed that they did but only to some degree. As far as the issue of conflict resolution, peace building, and gender rights and minorities is concerned, 25 per cent of the participants thought that their knowledge and skills had been extended to a high degree while 58 per cent believed that their knowledge had been extended to some degree. In relation to media work, 75 per cent of the participants stated that they had extended their knowledge and skills, with 33 per cent of them stating that these had been extended to a high degree. With respect to project development, 92 per cent of the participants stated that they had increased their knowledge and skills on the topic, with 25 per cent of them stating that this had happened to a high degree and 67 per cent to some degree. The entire group of participants believed that they would be able to apply the knowledge and skills that they had acquired during the workshop in their own work as well as their community/organisation/group work. They also stated that their community/organisation/group would have the ability to set up and/or extend contacts and networking with participants from other communities/organisations/groups represented in the workshop, mostly to a high degree (DOC_11; DOC_27).

One participant expressed the opinion that more communities needed to be represented in the event, even though she did acknowledge that many communities participated in the event (INT_5). It should be noted here that the workshop organisers invited a number of minority communities to the workshop, but not all participated, despite efforts to engage them via formal

invitation letters, emails, and phone calls (DOC_11). The participant also stated that people who participated in the event were already aware of many of the issues and were in fact people who were in favour of migrant integration and the involvement of minority communities in peace resolution efforts (INT_5). According to the project coordinator in Cyprus from KISA, most of the communities that did not participate, declined to do so because they either disagreed with the concept of the project or opposed the idea of a federal solution.

During the last session of the workshop, it was decided that a follow-up meeting would be organised so that participants would be provided with the opportunity to further extend the capacities of their communities and develop their contacts and networking. This meeting took place on 23 May 2010 and focused on discussing the design of a project suggested by the participants and the development of its main parameters. It was agreed that the finalisation of the project would be carried out through continued discussion via email (DOC_11; DOC_27).

4.2 Question 2

Has the consultation research increased awareness of and attention to the situation of minorities in the island?

The effort that was placed in order to conduct consultation research that would address the topics explored in the project indeed managed to increase awareness of and attention to the situation of minorities in the island to some extent. Project partners took the necessary measures and steps to assure that data would be collected from every community in Cyprus, including Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots, the three officially recognised minorities (Maronites, Armenians and Latins), Roma, migrants, Turkish settlers, as well as representatives of women's rights, human rights, youth organisations, and NGOs. Moreover, emphasis was placed on maintaining gender balance amongst the participants (DOC_27).

This is the first time that research of this kind is conducted in Cyprus and it was very important that the opinions of almost all of the communities that are

present in the island were exhibited. As one of the participants pointed out, this mere fact was very important and it was encouraging to see that efforts like this one were being made (INT_4). Anything that could contribute to the efforts of giving a voice to the migrants is considered to be useful and should take place, both for the migrants and for the host country (INT_4; INT_8), especially when such efforts contribute to the resources that stakeholders have when providing assistance or resolving issues related to minorities in Cyprus (INT_9).

Another participant expressed the opinion that the report that was produced as a result of the consultation research was not in-depth in relation to the issue of minorities in Cyprus and that it mainly focused on the Cypriot issue (INT_6). However, through our own evaluation and review of the report (DOC_16), this aspect does not seem to be completely accurate. It might have been useful to discuss more extensively about the minorities; however, the extent to which the issue of minorities was covered in the report was satisfactory. Furthermore, it is important to acknowledge here that a longer report might have been even less likely to be read and/or remembered by policy-makers.

Due to the fact that the results of this research were used in writing the report that was disseminated to a significant number of people, including politicians and the media, it could be argued that the aim to increase awareness of and attention to the issue of minorities in Cyprus was rather successful (INT_1; INT_7). In the case of Cyprus, as pointed out by the project coordinators, hard copies of the report were delivered to the target groups.

4.3 Question 3

How successful was the media campaign in disseminating the results of the project?

The media campaign was relatively successful in disseminating the results of the project given that there was limited time to carry out a full-scale range of activities for disseminating the results of the report. Due to the fact that the English version of the report was completed first, it was also the first to be launched to the international media and community through the MRG's communication team in London (INT_2).

After the launching of the report in London, KISA organised a media conference for the launching of the report in Cyprus. The event was well-organised, and invitation letters were prepared in English, Greek, and Turkish and were sent to the press, in order to guarantee that journalists from both the northern and the southern part of the island would participate (DOC_27). Apart from the letters, phone calls to individual journalists as well as written reminders just before the media conference ensured maximum participation to the event. Another procedure that was followed and proved to be very useful for the purposes of the media campaign was the publication of the report in the local languages, Greek and Turkish (INT_1).

The media conference took place at the Cyprus Community Media Centre in the buffer zone, since the organisers wanted to ensure the attendance of journalists from both sides of the divide. The media conference was attended by five journalists from the northern part, six journalists from the southern part, and two journalists from international press agencies (DOC_20; DOC_27). Moreover, many newspapers and web portals from both sides of the island published news on the report (DOC_27). The journalists who participated in the media conference were very interested in the findings of the report and they wanted to become more informed about the project's main theme and topics (INT_2). The speakers were very concise and what they presented was very informative for the journalists, since most of them were not knowledgeable of the issues covered by the report to the extent to which these were covered through the presentations (INT_7). As pointed out by the project coordinator in Cyprus from KISA, a press release was also issued in all three languages, and it was handed out at the press conference, as well as sent to all the media outlets in Cyprus.

4.4 Question 4

How did the report contribute to the objectives of the project? Did the publication of the report influence decision-makers in terms of their analysis of the current problems and identification of solutions?

The report that was published within the framework of this project was produced by two authors. The first author, Mr. Nikolas Kyriakou wrote the parts

of the report that were related to the situation in Cyprus, while the second author, Ms. Nurcan Kaya wrote a chapter on international perspectives and experiences with respect to conflict and minority protection. The title of the report was "Minority Rights: Solutions to the Cyprus Conflict" and it discussed issues relevant to the project, such as the historical setting behind the conflict in Cyprus, earlier peace-making efforts, the legal and institutional framework on human and minority rights, as well as problems faced by all minority and immigrant communities in both sides of the divide. Furthermore, the report covered issues such as the extent and the ways in which conflict influenced the lives of all communities, thoughts of community members on the conflict and a peaceful solution, evaluation, and recommendations (DOC_16; DOC_27).

The methodology used in this report, enabled to some extent the accomplishment of the project's objectives. It can be argued that the fact that 29 interviews were conducted with equal number of members of minority groups residing in Cyprus on both parts of the island has contributed to the expression of views on reconciliation amongst all communities and to a sustainable solution of the Cyprus problem, in full respect of human rights and gender equality. More specifically, it contributed towards the improvement of trust and dialogue among all Cypriot communities, including minority communities with an active participation of women (INT_9). Therefore, the overall objectives of the project were met to some extent through the interviews that were conducted within the framework of the report. The information and experience provided by the members of each minority/community, as well as crucial issues regarding each community related to issues arising from the conflict in Cyprus were addressed in the report (DOC_16). The report contributes new ideas on reconciliation amongst all communities and enhances the trust and dialogue amidst all Cypriot communities (INT_1; INT_9).

As far as the influence that the report had on decision-makers in relation to their analysis of the current problems and identification of solutions, for the time being it does not seem that the report had a significant influence on the way that they analyse problems and identify solutions (INT_1). The fact that most political parties, both in the northern part of the island as well as in the southern part, did not show interest in participating in the launch of the report and only

two parties from each part attended the working lunch, could indicate that the majority of the mainstream political scene of the island was not very interested in the project and its outcomes. It could also be the case that, because that was the period before the parliamentary elections in the southern part, political parties had other priorities (INT_1; DOC_22).

One needs to acknowledge the fact that aims such as the ones of this project, are not easy to accomplish, nor measure. These aims require years of active work and strong political will in order to bring about change. Furthermore, this question cannot be easily answered since due to limited time in the project's timeframe, it was not possible for the partners to examine how the findings and recommendations of the report were used by people and by decision-makers in particular. However, this report can be useful in the future due to its uniqueness and due to the fact that it constitutes a novel attempt to produce a report of this kind in the context of Cyprus. In addition, it is the only piece of work, and a significant one, that one could refer to when interested to receive information on minorities and human rights in Cyprus (INT_2; INT_8; INT_9).

4.5 Question 5

How effective was the experience exchange trip in generating new ideas amongst those who participated? Did it enable them to achieve perspective and try any fresh approaches?

The experience exchange trip and relevant meetings in Northern Ireland were interesting; yet, some participants were a bit pessimistic about the whole trip's value, as they felt that they were already familiar with the situation in Northern Ireland (INT_1). The participants attended some very interesting meetings such as the first event of the trip that was a roundtable meeting with the title "Exchange of Civil Society's Experience in Conflict Prevention/Resolution: Northern Ireland-Cyprus". Participants exchanged information with respect to the conflict and peace-making procedures in the two countries, as well as the role of NGOs, communities, members of parliament, and the European Union. Another part of the meeting that was very useful was a discussion about the current situation in Northern Ireland and conflict resolution projects, especially

bi-communal ones (INT_10). The fact that the participants had the opportunity to compare the situation in both countries and in particular the role played by civil society and politicians from diverse political backgrounds, gave them the chance to interact with other people, discuss new approaches, and generate new ideas (DOC_27; INT_10).

Furthermore, the second event of the trip, a meeting with a member of the parliament that participated in the peace-making process in Northern Ireland, was again very important for the participants since they had the chance to discuss with politicians and acquire new perspectives and ideas (DOC_27).

The main purpose of the trip was for the participants to benefit from the experience of people in another country that had faced a similar conflict to that of Cyprus, and which had been resolved. For this reason, the trip to Northern Ireland was considered by MRG to be an ideal opportunity. Nevertheless, some of the trip participants were held back at points and were not able to contribute to a constructive discussion due to their subconscious perception that classified the case of Cyprus as a unique case that could not be compared to other countries' experiences. Thus, it was difficult for these participants that were "dominated" by these feelings to be positively affected by the trip and acquire new ideas (INT_2).

4.6 Question 6
Have the objectives of the project been achieved? If yes, to what degree?

After thorough review of the project documents, it has to be noted that all the activities of the project were completed as planned and the objectives of the project have been achieved. This project gave the chance to minorities/communities that live in Cyprus to meet each other and agree to work together. Furthermore, the stakeholders together with the main actors, such as the United Nations, Greek and Turkish ministries, the Cypriot government, and European Union officials were all informed about the project (INT_2). Overall, all the activities that constituted part of the project were very beneficial for the participants (INT_2; INT_3; INT_4; INT_5; INT_6; INT_7; INT_9).

As far as the specific objectives are concerned and whether or not they were met, it is difficult to respond with a yes or no answer, especially in regards

to some of them. For example, it is difficult to know at this point if participants in project activities have communicated the knowledge and experiences acquired within the framework of this project to their community's members (INT_2). Also, some of the project's objectives cannot be easily measured especially without the provision of follow-up activities that would gauge the progress made in relation to the achievement of the project's objectives (INT_2). It should be noted, however, that only a small number of the capacity building workshop participants responded to the organisers' invitation to take part in the follow-up meeting that took place, as pointed out by the project coordinator in Cyprus from KISA.

4.7 Question 7
What aspects of the project have been successful?

A significant part in the process of evaluating this project is identifying some of its most important successes, since this is useful information that needs to be taken into account when similar projects are implemented in the future. There were quite a few instances where some of the project activities or even better some aspects of the activities were successful.

Firstly, it should be noted that the capacity building workshop on "Conflict Resolution, Peace Building, Human, Gender, and Minority Rights" was very successful. The participants were very pleased by the workshop and the feedback received through the evaluations was quite positive (INT_2; DOC_11). The workshop constituted the first time that participants from all these communities and groups attended a similar event (INT_4). The creation of a pleasant environment during the workshop, and the availability of interpretation to-and-from English, Greek, and Turkish, encouraged the participants to actively contribute to the discussion that was carried out throughout the workshop, by sharing their problems, experiences, and community needs, particularly with respect to the Cyprus problem (INT_1). Another sign of success was the fact that a large number of the migrants that attended the capacity building workshop did not have a clear idea about the status quo in Cyprus; however, after this workshop they acquired knowledge about the situation in Cyprus and developed relevant skills that they would transfer to their community (INT_2; INT_5).

Furthermore, the fact that the participants had the chance to talk about how the current situation affects their lives in terms of human rights definitely constituted a significant step for them in terms of their awareness of the environment in which they live and how to deal with several aspects of it (INT_2; INT_3). A positive development was also the fact that the workshop's participants committed themselves to keep active communication with each other and work together in a range of activities in the future (DOC_11; INT_2).

Additionally, at the end of the workshop, the participants completed an evaluation form (DOC_8) in which they expressed their overall satisfaction with the workshop. As an illustration, all the participants agreed that the fundamental aim of the workshop, which was to strengthen the capacity of the participants in order to contribute to the debate on a sustainable settlement, for the equal promotion of the rights of all communities residing in Cyprus, was accomplished (DOC_11; DOC_27). In general, this event was successful and this was confirmed by the interviews that were carried out within the framework of this evaluation (INT_3; INT_4; INT_5).

Another important aspect of the project that was addressed in the project's objectives and estimated results was the fact that the consultation research conducted within the framework of the project, was expected to cover all the communities residing in Cyprus, as well as representatives of women's rights, human rights, youth organisations, and NGOs. This was a substantial component of the consultation research, since it needed to include all the different minorities and target groups, as defined in the project's proposal (DOC_1), if the voice of these communities would be taken into account. The sample selected for the consultation research's interviewees was indeed representative of the groups that needed to be included so that their perspective would also be represented in the report (DOC_16). Women's participation in particular was also a significant and essential aspect of this project and project partners aimed right from the beginning to include women in every activity of the project (INT_1; DOC_27).

The media conference for the launching of the report was another successful aspect of the project. The fact that five journalists from the northern part, six journalists from the southern part, and two journalists from

international press agencies (DOC_20; DOC_27) covered this event demonstrates how successful it was since it attempted to disseminate the report's findings and recommendations to a broader audience. It should be noted that the report received great attention due to the wide media coverage that it received in both sides of the divide (DOC_27). At the media conference, the journalists were provided with a press release (DOC_19) and also had access to hard copies of the report that were available at the entrance; that was helpful in orienting them with the project's results (INT_7). The journalists that covered this event were very interested in the report and had different inquiries with respect to minorities in Cyprus, their rights, and their relationship to reconciliation efforts (INT_2).

Furthermore, the advocacy meetings that took place in Brussels, Cyprus, and Athens were quite successful. In Ankara it was difficult to meet with as many officials as the project partners wanted, because it was a pre-election period and the officials were busy with that priority (INT_2). In Brussels, the project coordinators from MRG and KISA met with the officer of Turkey's Desk at the European Commission, as well as with two officials from the Turkish Cypriot community's Task Force. People from the Task Force in particular, exhibited great interest in the report (DOC_27).

In Cyprus, the report was initially presented to the representatives of officially-recognised minorities in the House of Representatives, representatives of political parties in both sides of the divide, and participants in the exchange trip to Northern Ireland. Additional meetings were organised in order to present the report to various officials in the southern part of Cyprus. Amongst them were Mr. Aristos Tsiartas, Head of the Authority against Racism and Discrimination in the Ombudsman's Office; Ms. Leda Koursoumba, Law Commissioner and Commissioner for the Rights of the Child; Ms. Elizabeth Solomon, Deputy Coordinator/Senior Political Affairs Officer at the Office of the Special Adviser to the UN Secretary General in Cyprus; and Mr. Toumazos Tselepis, Special Adviser to the President of the Republic of Cyprus on the Cyprus problem (DOC_26). All of them were very positive towards the report and urged MRG and KISA to continue working on this issue (INT_1; INT_2; INT_9). Regardless of KISA's efforts through its associates in the northern part of Cyprus, it was impossible to

arrange similar meetings there, since the authorities did not respond to KISA's invitations (DOC_27).

A similar pattern as the one followed in Brussels was pursued in Athens. The project coordinators from MRG and KISA, as well as a Turkish-Cypriot project staff member, visited Athens in order to meet with stakeholders there (DOC_26). The meetings that they had with officials from different ministries and parties in Athens were very constructive and in general very successful, since people seemed to be interested in the project and appreciated the fact that a project team from Cyprus had visited them in order to inform them about it (INT_1).

Overall, the success that some aspects of the project's activities had contributed to the increase in understanding between the communities involved and also enhanced the interest of the representatives and leaders of the communities in the project. Active participation and involvement from the part of these communities, as well as increased interest in the issues portrayed in the project can have an effect in the Cypriot society in the long-term (INT_2; INT_8). Furthermore, this project not only provided substantial knowledge to people who might have not been aware of the issues discussed, but also served as a reminder to everyone that minorities also have a significant role to play in the society and they need to be taken into consideration in the efforts to resolve the Cyprus problem (INT_7; INT_8).

4.8 Question 8
What aspects of the project have been challenging? What improvements could be made?

Despite the fact that there have been quite a few successes in the course of this project, it is also important to discuss the aspects that have been challenging for the two organisations that carried out the project, and for which there could be room for improvement. Such discussion is significant since these points need to be taken into consideration during the design and implementation of similar projects in the future.

According to the project coordinators, there were two main challenges that they had to face along with some minor ones. An important challenge that

they encountered had to do with the subject matter of the project itself; that is, the solution to the Cyprus problem and the political climate in the country (INT_1). Another challenge, which relates to the aforementioned ones, was time. The coordinators felt that due to different procedural decisions and approvals, some of the project activities had to be carried out in a shorter period of time than the allotted one based on the original timeframe (INT_1; INT_2). Even though all the activities were carried out as planned, the lack of sufficient time made it more difficult for the project partners to carry them out in a more comprehensive way. At this stage, it is important to briefly refer to the aspects of the activities that have been affected by time. To begin with, the consultation research was definitely one of the activities that was affected by this. It should be noted that this time shortage was created because after the project's approval by the European Commission (EC), MRG and KISA had to change the research plan, due to the withdrawal of the main researcher and author, and were therefore obligated to send a request for revision to the EC. The EC took quite a long time to approve the revision request, thus all the activities were postponed until the final approval was received. Therefore, the research was conducted between the months of July and October. Even though the report was completed on time, this affected the time that was available for its dissemination (INT_2).

In addition to the consultation research, the other activity of the project that was affected by the time factor was the experience exchange trip to Northern Ireland. The challenges with this activity began even before the organisers and the participants travelled to Northern Ireland. KISA wanted to have a politician on the team and initially Mr. Takis Hadjigeorgiou, Cypriot member of the European Parliament, agreed to participate. Nevertheless, he had to unexpectedly withdraw from the project. KISA experienced difficulties in finding politicians that would be willing to travel to Northern Ireland for this project. The contacts that KISA had with politicians from the two biggest parties - AKEL and DISY - were not successful. At the end, Mr. Mikis Shianis, Secretary General of the United Democrats, was selected to go (INT_1). The inclusion of a politician from one of the two biggest parties could have attracted much more attention in the local press, but there was no other option at that point.

Another challenge that was experienced while in Northern Ireland was the fact that some of the participants had a relatively pessimistic view when it came to comparing the Cyprus conflict to the conflict in Northern Ireland. Their argument was that the case of Cyprus was a unique one and could not be compared to the conflict in any other part of the world. This view created feelings of denial that did not allow these participants to constructively process new ideas and ultimately learn how these ideas could be adopted to the Cypriot context and case (INT_2). With so many years of frozen conflict, Cypriots have become cynical about the prospects for a solution, and as such some of the ideas were not well-received during the trip. On the other hand, as pointed out by the overall project coordinator from MRG in Turkey, there was a participant for example, who was very interested in the role of the EU and was sure that the EU had played an important role in resolving the Northern Ireland conflict, and seemed hopeful that the EU could play a positive role in resolving the Cyprus problem as well.

5. Recommendations

One of the key issues that came out of this evaluation is the importance of the project in its own right and the need for follow-up projects that can build on the success of this project and enlarge its potential impact. Therefore, in this sense and according to the interviews we conducted, this project constituted a good starting point for addressing the issue of minorities in relation to a potential solution to the Cyprus problem, and further actions should be taken in order to advance on this and not leave it at just that, a mere starting point (INT_2; INT_3; INT_4; INT_5; INT_6; INT_8; INT_10). The main recommendation of most of the participants that we interviewed was that they would have liked to attend more activities in the form of follow-up workshops. This recommendation from participants can be interpreted as a success of the project, since it indicates the need for such activities, such as the ones implemented in the project. It should be mentioned once again here, that it might be the case that under the specifications and requirements of this project, there was no provision for such follow-up

activities. For this reason, this is something to be considered when designing projects of this nature in the future.

With respect to evaluating whether the project's objectives have been met, a relevant recommendation that we have is the use of formative (continuous) evaluation techniques throughout the duration of the project from the part of the project partners or from the part of an external evaluator, in addition to a summative (final) evaluation, like the one that we are currently conducting. Many of the participants that we interviewed found it difficult to remember their experiences from the activity in which they had participated. Most of them had a general idea about the project, but the majority of them could not remember many details, especially those who had participated in the activities that took place early in the project (e.g. consultation research, capacity building workshop). Many of the interviewees commented on the fact that it had been a long time since the end of the activities and in fact some of them suggested that the whole process of evaluation should have taken place earlier (INT_4; INT_5). Our suggestion therefore, is for formative evaluation to take place throughout the course of the project, right after the completion of important activities or components of the project, in addition to a summative evaluation of the whole project after its completion. Thus, the evaluation of the project would be an ongoing process, which would reinforce the results collected through the evaluation at the end of it.

Another recommendation related to evaluating the outcomes of the project and whether its objectives have been met, relates to the indicators set for monitoring or evaluating a project from the part of the partners. The specific recommendation was derived through our efforts to use the indicators provided in the proposal of this project (DOC_1), in order to measure whether or not the project's objectives have been met. In our effort to integrate these indicators in our evaluation measures, we found it rather challenging to use them due to their nature. The indicators stated are of broad nature and they relate to meta-cognitive abilities of the participants that were never actually measured. For these indicators to be effective, data should have been collected after the completion of the project so as to measure the long-term effects of the project on the participants' skills and transfer of knowledge. Therefore, it is important to

set indicators that are more specific and measurable and that directly relate to data collected within the framework of the project, so that both project partners and an external evaluator can measure the progress and success of the project.

In summary, the key recommendations deriving from this evaluation are:

- The use of the minority rights framework is an important instrument for the prevention and resolution of conflict. Therefore, more projects like this are needed to contribute to this aim.

- Engaging multiple stakeholders is essential for the success of projects of this nature. This project engaged politicians, NGOs, activists, minority groups, and partners in the implementation of the project.

- Projects of this nature are complex and unpredictable. Therefore, it is important to allow for sufficient time for project activities to be implemented.

- The use of both formative (continuous) evaluation techniques throughout the course of the project, as well as summative (final) evaluation techniques in order to monitor its progress and evaluate its impact is an important practice.

Appendix 1

Data Coding

Data Source	Code
Project Documents	
Grant Application Form (Proposal)	DOC_1
Outline of the Project	DOC_2
Project Poster	DOC_3
Capacity Building Workshop – Programme	DOC_4
Capacity Building Workshop – Letter of Invitation	DOC_5
Capacity Building Workshop – List of Participants	DOC_6
Capacity Building Workshop – List of Trainers	DOC_7
Capacity Building Workshop – Evaluation Form	DOC_8
Capacity Building Workshop – Poster	DOC_9
Capacity Building Workshop – Report	DOC_11
Experience Exchange Trip - Programme	DOC_12
Experience Exchange Trip – List of Participants	DOC_13
Consultation Research - Questionnaire	DOC_14
Report "Minority rights: Solutions to the Cyprus conflict" (Greek)	DOC_15
Report "Minority rights: Solutions to the Cyprus conflict" (English)	DOC_16
Report "Minority rights: Solutions to the Cyprus conflict" (Turkish)	DOC_17
Media Campaign – Letter of Invitation	DOC_18
Media Campaign – Press Release on the Report	DOC_19
Media Campaign – List of Participants	DOC_20
Working Lunch – Letter of Invitation	DOC_21
Working Lunch – List of Participants	DOC_22
Civil Society Meeting – Letter of Invitation	DOC_23
Civil Society Meeting – List of Participants	DOC_24
Advocacy Meeting – Letter of Invitation	DOC_25
Advocacy Meeting – List of Participants and Schedule of Meetings	DOC_26
Draft of [Final] Narrative Report	DOC_27

Interviews	
Interview with Project Coordinator in Cyprus from KISA	INT_1
Interview with Overall Project Coordinator from MRG in Turkey	INT_2
Interview with Participant in Capacity Building Workshop (female, Southern part)	INT_3
Interview with Participant in Capacity Building Workshop (female, Southern part)	INT_4
Interview with Participant in Consultation Research, Capacity Building Workshop, and Civil Society Meeting (female, Southern part)	INT_5
Interview with Participant in Working Lunch (female, Northern part)	INT_6
Interview with Participant in Media Campaign (female, Southern part)	INT_7
Interview with Expert in Reconciliation and Social Justice Pedagogies, who Read the Report (male, Southern part)	INT_8
Interview with Participant in National Report Advocacy Meeting (male, Southern part)	INT_9
Interview with Participant in Experience Exchange Trip and Working Lunch (female, Southern part)	INT_10

Note: The project documents were numbered based on the file numbering that partners used while saving the files before giving them to us. For reasons of consistency we followed that sequence. It should be noted that there was no document numbered 10, for which reason the code DOC_10 does not appear on this list.

Appendix 2

Interview Guide for Interviews with Partners

1. What was your role in this project?

2. Can you briefly talk about the project / the history behind the project and how your organisation decided to undertake this project?

3. Can you briefly describe the main activities of the project?

4. Did you come across any difficulties/challenges during the implementation of the project and its activities?

5. What would you consider to be successful with respect to the project's activities?

6. Which activities worked well and what were the elements that could be improved?

7. One of the project's main activities involved an exchange trip to Northern Ireland. What was the aim of this trip?

8. Was the selection of Northern Ireland as the trip's destination successful?

9. Could you please comment on the MRG's proposal for the researcher of the consultation research? What was the reason behind the MRG's suggestion (non-Cypriot researcher)? KISA had a different opinion on the issue (a team of Greek-Cypriots or Turkish-Cypriots researchers). Could you please comment on that?

10. In your opinion, has the consultation research increased awareness of and attention to the situation of minorities on the island? Could you please provide us with some type of evidence on that?

11. How would you define 'minorities' within the framework of this project?

12. KISA believes that the addition of a small section/part on the report regarding the situation of migration in Cyprus would have been useful due to the character of this project. Nevertheless, this addition was never made. Could you please comment on that? What is the MRG's point of view on this issue?

13. Can you briefly talk about the gender aspect of this project and whether or not this goal was achieved? How did the MRG and KISA approach gender in the project and what suggestions can be made as to how this could be improved (if needed)?

14. Do you think that the objectives of this project based on the estimated

results have been achieved? If yes, to what degree? Could you please provide us with any evidence on that?

15. What is your opinion regarding the indicators that the MRG and KISA used in order to evaluate the extent to which the project's objectives were met? Do you have any evidence to support whether these indicators were fulfilled or not?

16. Were the advocacy meetings (in Cyprus & abroad) successful or not?

17. Is the MRG satisfied with the media coverage of the project?

18. Are there any other dissemination activities that in your opinion could have contributed to the project's success?

19. As an overall evaluation of the project from your part, could you please identify the main successes and the main challenges/weaknesses of this project?

20. One of the requirements of this evaluation is to conduct interviews with 'independent sources'. What does this mean? Does it include project participants?

21. Could you please provide us with the names and contact details of potential interviewees?

22. Is there anything else that you would like to add, which was not discussed during the interview?

Appendix 3

Email Request for Interview with Independent Sources

Dear Mr. / Ms. …,

We are contacting you on behalf of CARDET, an NGO based in Cyprus. CARDET has undertaken the external evaluation of the project "Minority Rights: A Contribution to the Cyprus Problem", which was completed by *Minority Rights Group (MRG)* and *KISA* in April 2011. The overall objective of this project was to contribute to reconciliation amongst all communities (including minorities) and to a sustainable solution to the Cyprus problem, in full respect of human rights and gender equality. The main activities of the project included research on the contribution of a minority-rights approach to a peaceful settlement of the Cyprus problem, organisation of a capacity building workshop for Cypriot Civil Society Organisations, an experience exchange trip, and publication of a final report with outcomes and recommendations.

Within the framework of the evaluation that we are carrying out, it is essential to interview a number of independent sources regarding their opinion on the effectiveness of the project. MRG and KISA provided us with your contact information indicating you as a potential interviewee. Thus, we were wondering whether you would be willing to participate in a phone or face-to-face or Skype interview, preferably this week, and if so, what days and times would be most convenient for you. The interview is expected to last 15-20 minutes. If you prefer to discuss any clarification or arrangement over the phone, please feel free to call us at +357-22-795013.

Thank you in advance,

Kind Regards,

Charalambos Vrasidas, Ph.D.
Executive Director, CARDET
&
Katerina Theodoridou, Ph.D.
Senior Researcher, CARDET

Appendix 4

Interview Guide for Interviews with Independent Sources

CARDET has undertaken the external evaluation of the project "Minority Rights: A Contribution to the Cyprus Problem", which was completed by *Minority Rights Group* and *KISA* in April 2011. Within the framework of the evaluation that we are carrying out, it is essential to interview a number of independent sources regarding their opinion on the effectiveness of the project. MRG and KISA provided us with your contact information indicating you as a potential interviewee. Before we start, I would like to thank you for your willingness to participate in this evaluation and for your time.

1. What do you know about this project?

2. What was your involvement in this project?

3. Which of the project's activities have you attended or are you aware of?

4. Specific questions about the project's activities, based on the interviewee's involvement/awareness:

   Activity A: Community Consultation Research
   - What is your opinion on the community consultation research?
   - Would you consider this activity successful?
   - In your opinion, has the consultation research increased awareness of and attention to the situation of minorities on the island? Could you please provide some type of evidence on that?
   - What were the challenges/weaknesses of this activity?
   - What elements related to this activity could be improved?

   Activity B: Leadership and Capacity Building Workshop
   - What is your opinion on the leadership and capacity building workshop?
   - Do you think that all the main communities that reside in Cyprus were represented in the workshop?
   - Did you find it helpful?
   - How would you characterise this event? Successful or not?
   - What were the challenges/weaknesses of this workshop?
   - Do you think that the aim of this workshop (to strengthen the capacity of participants to represent the interests of their own community) was achieved?
   - What could be improved with respect to this workshop?
   - What is your opinion on the follow-up meetings that took place?
   - Were the meetings well-attended?
   - Did you consider these meetings to be successful? If not, what could be improved?

Activity C: Experience Exchange Trip
- What is your opinion on the experience exchange trip to Northern Ireland?
- Did you find it helpful?
- Do you think it was successful?
- What were the challenges/weaknesses of the trip?
- What could be improved?
- What is your opinion on the follow-up meetings that took place?
- Were the meetings well-attended?
- Did you consider these meetings to be successful? If not, what could be improved?

Activity D: Publication of the Report
- What is your opinion on the report that was prepared proposing a framework for a country where all communities have their rights respected and can express their voice?
- Have you read the report? If yes, did you find it useful?
- What were the strengths of this report?
- What were the weaknesses of this report?
- What could be improved?

Activity E: Report Advocacy Meetings (national and international)
- What is your opinion on the report advocacy meetings?
- Did you receive the report in advance in order to study it?
- Do you think that an equal participation of all communities was maintained during the report advocacy meetings?
- Did you find the meetings helpful?
- Was/were the meeting/s that you attended successful? In what sense?
- Did you face any challenges? If yes, could you please elaborate?
- What could be improved?

Activity F: Media Campaign
- What is your opinion on the media campaign that was organised in order to disseminate the results of the project?
- In your opinion, was it successful? In what sense?
- Were there any challenges/weaknesses related to the media campaign? If yes, could you please elaborate?
- What could be improved?
- Are there any other dissemination activities that in your opinion could have contributed to the project's success?

5. Do you believe that the activity/activities in which you participated increased your understanding of the problems that prevent trust among communities and the settlement of the Cyprus problem as well as of the possible strategies to address them?

6. Do you believe that the activity/activities in which you participated strengthened the capacities of civil society (including women organisations and women CSO representatives) to contribute to the debate on a sustainable settlement, promoting the rights of all communities living in Cyprus?

7. Do you believe that the activity/activities in which you participated contributed to the increased use of the minority rights framework as a relevant tool for conflict prevention and resolution, which promotes reconciliation, gender equality, and respect for the rights of all the communities?

8. Do you think that the project's goals have been achieved? If yes, to what extent?
   [Goals: a) Increase understanding of the problems which prevent trust among communities and the settlement of the Cyprus problem and of the possible strategies to address them; b) Strengthen capacities of civil society, including women organisations and representatives, to contribute to the debate on a sustainable settlement, promoting the rights of all communities living in Cyprus; c) Increase use of the minority rights framework as a relevant tool for conflict prevention and resolution, which promotes reconciliation, gender equality, and respect of rights of all the communities.]

9. From your experience as a participant in this project, what is your overall evaluation of it? What aspects would you consider successful and what aspects do you feel could be improved?

10. In your opinion, what is the impact/contribution of this project?

11. What potential do you see for this project nationally and internationally both in the short-term and in the long-term? Do you consider projects of this nature to be significant?

12. Is there anything else that you would like to add, which was not discussed during this interview?

Contact information

This report was prepared by the CARDET team. For more information or clarifications, contact us at info@cardet.org