MONITORING AND EVALUATION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROTECTION OF WOMEN FROM DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ACT 2005

Paroma Ray

Lawyers Collective Women's Rights Initiative

NEED FOR M&E

Success of any law depends on its implementation

The M&E process is akin to the concept of social audit wherein people work with the government to monitor and evaluate the planning and implementation of a scheme / programme / policy / law.

Process helps in:

- Demystification of law
- Dissemination of relevant information

OVERARCHING OBJECTIVE OF THE M & E (2007 - 2011)

- □ To examine whether infrastructure under the PWDVA is adequate in meeting the objective of the law, namely, realizing a woman's right to live in a violence free home.
- □ To map the implementation of the PWDVA on the ground, analyze emerging trends, collate best practices and identify infrastructural needs.
- □ Trace the developing jurisprudence under this law.
- □ Identify best practices, shortcomings and suggest remedial measures / amendments required in law.

M&E: GENERAL METHODOLOGY

- Questionnaire administered to the nodal departments for data on infrastructure
- Meeting with NGO representatives
- ☐ State visits undertaken for in depth interviews with stakeholders using questionnaires developed in house

M&E: GENERAL METHODOLOGY

- □ Surveys with select stakeholders in states
- □ Surveys with women who have used the law
- Order analysis
- □ Analysis of judgments delivered by the higher judiciary

METHODOLOGY FOR ORDER ANALYSIS

- □ Three steps are involved:
 - Develop matrix of indicators to identify good practices based upon socio cultural context, specific substantive and procedural issues that require clarification and to evaluate trends

Transfer information from orders to this matrix

Analyse emerging trends

METHODOLOGY FOR BUDGET INFORMATION

- □ Questionnaires developed and filed under Right to Information Act in each state
- □ Response received from state government
- □ Analysis

M&E: PARTNERSHIPS (2007-2011)

- □ Ministry of Women and Child
- □ National Commission for Women
- □ Office of the Hon'ble Chief Justice of India
- □ Partners working in a regional and national level

M&E: PARTNERSHIPS (2009-2011)

- □ Collaboration with International Center for Research on Women
 - 3 year partnership
 - □ Baseline: 2009
 - □ Midline: 2010
 - □ Endline: 2011
- Collaboration with Center for Budget and Governance Accountability
 - Responsible for budget analysis under the PWDVA

Partnership with ICRW

- Developed pre and post training questionnaires
- □ Tools used-
 - Anonymous surveys with stakeholders
 - Focus group discussions
 - Key informant interviews
 - In-depth interviews

M&E 2010: MAIN FINDINGS

- □ Inadequate data from nodal agencies and lack of uniformity in reporting system
- □ Lack of support services for POs
- Lack of uniform protocols among stakeholders for procedural issues
- □ Low awareness among health professionals and lack of visibility
- □ Poor functioning of the multi agency coordination committees
- □ No impact assessment for trainings and awareness programmes

 Lawyers Collective Women's Rights Initiative

M&E 2010: MAIN FINDINGS

- □ Courts are taking purposive approach while interpreting the law
- ☐ High number of compromise cases among the orders analyzed
- Compensation orders increased

MAIN FINDINGS FROM BUDGET ANALYSIS 2010

- □ Only 14 out of 28 states had provided separate budget for implementation of PWDVA
- □ States without separate allocation are meeting expenses under PWDVA through existing schemes of women welfare
- ☐ Most states devised state plan schemes for implementation. E.g.- Haryana
- □ Wide variation in amount allocated:
 - Highest- INR 7,22,23,000 (Karnataka)
 - Lowest- INR 2,30,000 (Meghalaya)

MAIN FINDINGS FROM BUDGET ANALYSIS: 2010

- □ Expenditure vis-à-vis allocation:
 - Near complete expenditure: HR, AP, Assam, WB
 - Poor utilization: MP
 - No expenditure vis-à-vis allocation: Punjab
- □ Broad heads of allocation:
 - POs
 - Computers, training, salaries, support staff / contractual services
 - Publicity and workshops

MAIN FINDINGS FROM BUDGET ANALYSIS: 2010

- Neglected issues:
 - Support for SPs
 - Limited information shared regarding budgetary allocation: no transparency

LIMITATIONS FOR METHODOLOGY FOLLOWED: 2007-2010

- □ Infrastructure:
 - Poor response from states
 - Incomplete data
- □ State visits, surveys
 - Problems with securing permissions:
 - □ No permission to interview magistrates
 - □ Police personnel are deployed in several other duties and hence difficult to get permissions
- Order analysis
 - Not all states send orders

- □ No uniformity in record keeping
 - Appropriate authorities should issue practice directions. E.g. MOHFW to issue practice directions to all notified MFs to maintain records for all victims of domestic violence and action taken etc
- □ Continued lack of clarity around role of police
 - Practice directions should be issued in each state
 - Good practice: AP model where detailed directions were issued by with eller of the Rights Initiative

- □ Lack of adequate funds
 - Adequate budgetary support should be given by the central government to supplement funds provided by states
 - Needs of each state must be assessed and allocations made accordingly
 - Heads of allocation must include appropriate budget for M&E of the law

- No tracking system for judicial orders
 - Uniform tracking system should be developed
 - Orders should be digitized and made available on website
- ☐ Guidelines to be issued by the Supreme Court to clarify procedural issues
 - Incorporate mechanisms within orders to enforce them
 - Open mandatory opening of banks within court premises to facilitate orders of maintainance

- □ Amendments required to the Act
 - DIR should not be mandatory
 - Act to include breach of all orders
 - A provision for M&E of the law must be incorporated
 - ☐ Central registry of all orders passed under the Act
 - Annual M&E to be conducted and report to be published and given wide publicity
 - Appeal from maintenance orders should be prohibited
 Lawyers Collective Women's Rights Initiative

Thank you