

Implementation of PANT principles as per HRBA and Gender Monitoring Checklist

The implementation of PANT principles in LIC during the day-to-day activities was reviewed in December 2016 using HRBA and Gender Monitoring Checklist which have a total of 19 indicators.

Overall assessment as per review Nov 2016: *Improvement are noted on several key aspects and issues relating to human rights and there are no red marks (un-satisfactory) aspects. In total 11 out of 19 indicators have moved in a positive direction.*

PANT Principles	Baseline ¹ February 2016			Progress by December 2016		
	No	Partly	Yes	No	Partly	Yes
Participation						
Are fair and effective platforms for public-private dialogue in place? <i>(linked to outcome viii in M&E results framework)²</i>	PPD part of Terms of Reference for LIC. They were generally NOT in place when LIC started, some progress have been made in year 1 and 2.			1. There is progress. To some extent it is “fair” and “effective”. Out of 71 resolutions made through PPD/DBC at least 41% actions taken at different levels of implementation (35% in Dodoma and 6% in Kigoma Region). 2. Domination of dialogue is one sided especially public actor’s representatives. 3. One sided agenda from private sectors only case study Kigoma. 4. A dialogue to have a form of complains platform instead of solution oriented interventions. ✓ But still there is a lot of best practices and improvement in relationships between private and public sectors. ✓ More capacity building to key public and private actors is needed for fair and effective participation		
➤ Do these platforms give space to representatives of informal actors to raise their voice?	As above, generally NOT in place when LIC started, some progress have been made in year 1 and 2.			1. Best example is Kongwa the way private actors representatives were selected from both formal and informal associations/ groups. 2. The issues for the agenda are collected from both informal and formal associations to DBC in case some of their agenda will not be taken into PPD/DBC they are using other existing structures through clusters and other business platforms.		

¹ The baseline from February 2016 has been updated based on further discussions with staff, stakeholders and decision makers during the review in November 2016. The original baseline was assessed to be slightly too optimistic for a few issues.

² Outcome viii in M&E results framework

		3. The issue is how their concerns effectively, fairly and timely taken consideration is.
➤ Are the views of women, children, elderly, persons with disabilities and minorities specifically probed and considered?	As above	1. Through cluster and informal groups. For instance in Kasulu District a former executive secretary of TCIA supported elderly persons to get areas for business in Sophia Market which was in conflict. 2. In some of the projects supported by SIFF most of the beneficiaries are women to some extent elderly persons, but not really people with disabilities.
➤ Have key stakeholders (including women, minorities etc.) been involved in SIFF project planning?	To some extent, not a high (sufficient) level. Included in SIFF assessment criteria (applicant is required to describe who & how).	Improvement noted. Women are involved in management team of several of the projects supported by SIFF for instance Kibaigwa market, Titye puddy projects and others. Also the process of getting the management team for the projects involved women.
➤ Have key stakeholders (including women, minorities etc.) been involved in SIFF project implementation?	To some extent, not a high (sufficient) level.	Yes, improvement noted, many women and other minority groups are involved in SIFF project implementation as sited above with example of Kibaigwa Market Project & Titye pudy project, women are among the active management team.
➤ Only as a “do-no-harm” approach?	To some extent, not a high (sufficient) level. Less than 60 % SIFF concept note frame work and Guideline for SIFF Management has component of human right ask: explain how the project will adhere to “do-no-harm” or <i>promote inclusion/ participation of groups which have been traditionally excluded from markets (e.g. persons with disabilities, minorities and women)?</i>	Improvement noted. 71 % of applicants use updated SIFF concept form to show their commitment on the “ do- no- harm” approach. 1. In most cases the nature of project supported includes a number of people who have with very low level of economic opportunities.
Accountability		
➤ Do LIC contribute to ensuring that public and private sector actors have systems in place to monitor and disclose social and environmental impacts according to national standards?		The SIFF Concept note (and guideline) include environmental issue (Specific eligibility criteria bullet 4 and Environmental concerns and opportunities). As examples, the projects of Titye puddy farming and Kibirizi have conducted EIA and adopted implementation operational guideline/standards.

<p>➤ Do the state (district and municipalities) have monitoring capacity to ensure compliance with human rights principles when sub-contracting external actors in SIFF projects?</p>	<p>Not a direct LIC task, and not high on the agenda</p>	<p>For the Titye Irrigation project and the UWAZAMAM grape juice making industries the government provided guideline on environmental conservation to reduce harm to other people and advised on how to adhere on healthy practices principles to protect consumers. But still a number of gaps exist like workers have no contract, no protective facilities, etc.</p>
<p>➤ Does the applicant describe how (s) he will be accountable to the constituency / community?</p>	<p>Included in SIFF assessment criteria. Achieved to a satisfactory extent.</p>	<p>This has been included in SIFF assessment criteria. Achieved to a satisfactory extent.</p>
<p>➤ Is it implemented?</p>	<p>At least 75 %</p>	<p>Yes, to a high extent</p>
<p>➤ Does the applicant describe mechanisms through which stakeholders in the SIFF project may challenge decisions or actions that affect them negatively?</p>	<p>To some extent</p>	<p>Among the SIFF assessment criteria an applicant is to have such mechanisms: <i>“Describe mechanisms through which stakeholders in the project may challenge decisions or actions that affect them negatively”</i> Challenge is that private sectors is still weak to question public actors, especially on the issues of revenue versus expenditures e.g. In Kibaigwa market project business people said they do not know how much revenue is collected per month and its expenditure.</p>
<p>Non-discrimination</p>		
<p>➤ Have options to provide targeted support to specific, excluded groups of people been considered in LIC?</p>	<p>To a reasonable extent, but improvement can be made.</p>	<p>Improvement noted. SIFF grants has supported some projects which enable minority groups to access business opportunities. Examples are land in Mango project Chamwino District, market place in Kibaigwa Kongwa District whereby most of small business people were conducting their activities outside at the sun but now most of them are accommodated in the newly constructed market.</p>
<p>➤ Does the applicant describe how the SIFF project will have a “do-no-harm approach” to groups which have been traditionally excluded from markets (e.g. persons with disabilities, minorities and women)? Or promote those groups?</p>	<p>Achieved to some extent. Included in SIFF assessment criteria. With the help of M4P approach</p>	<p>It is among the SIFF assessment criteria and in most cases it is applied. We have assessed that quite a number of minority group business women and small farmers have been included in SIFF projects. No documentation or evidence that the beneficiaries have been excluded due to their socio-economic or physical status.</p>
<p>➤ Is it implemented?</p>	<p>30 %</p>	<p>Implementation is in place. However, more analysis is needed to assess to which extent.</p>

		More capacity at the implementation level is need to enable them to understand the concept and its validity.
Transparency		
➤ Do LIC have effective communication strategies, which specifically consider accessibility of information for poor and marginalised groups (being sensitive to gender, age, level of education, disability and local languages)?	Yes.	Several ways and strategies of communication like Website, Media, formal and informal meetings, brochures and site visit.
➤ Do SIFF grantees have effective communication strategies, which specifically consider accessibility of information for poor and marginalised groups (being sensitive to gender, age, level of education, disability and local languages)?	65 %	Improvement noted. Among the assessment criteria for SIFF fund the applicant is to explain the communicating strategies to be employed. The most popular strategies are formal and informal meetings i.e. with clusters, site visit, and notice board. This is applied to all SIFF grantees.
➤ Are SIFF grants made public on LIC website in terms of size of funding, main focus area (not the full contract)?		It is in Guideline for SIFF Management. Some information is made available, improvement still required.
➤ Are SIFF grants made public on LIC website in terms of their commitments towards / benefits of the population (not the full contract)?		It is in Guideline for SIFF Management. Some information is made available, improvement still required.
➤ Do LIC consider to enhance openness and transparency by providing support to local monitoring mechanisms, like civil society monitoring or public information, e.g. of PPD minutes?	Reasonable level of compliance, improvement can be made.	Improvement noted. LIC is providing technical support, advise and mentorships to local monitoring mechanisms and public information through formal and informal business association/ groups meetings like DBC/PPD