Annex II: Achievement of targets for global expected accomplishments and lessons learned over 2014-2017

Introduction

Reporting at the end of a programme cycle is a crucial step in the programming framework of UN Human Rights as it enables the Office to critically assess its performance over the past four years. In particular, it provides insights into the progress made over time and the impact of its work. The OHCHR Management Plan (OMP) 2014-2017 defined the results that the Office planned to achieve by the end of 2017. Consequently, this final report focuses on the achievement of those results.

The assessment took into account each of the end of year progress reports from the reporting period as well as the end of programme cycle results from the country and subregional levels. This enabled UN Human Rights to present a reliable and evidence-based assessment of the degree to which its planned targets had been achieved in the course of this programming cycle, both at headquarters and in the field. This data has been instrumental in the decision-making processes related to the Office's planning for 2018-2021, including in the definition of new targets.

Targets and achievements

In the 2014-2017 OMP, UN Human Rights presented global targets that it wanted to achieve over a four-year period. To do so, it proposed that 37 indicators would be used to measure the achievement of 11 global expected accomplishments. The majority of these targets were specific targets that were formulated at the national level in countries of engagement.[7]

As this was the Office's first attempt at setting targets for a four-year programming cycle, it was acknowledged that some targets may have been too ambitious and others may have been too modest. In addition, factors beyond the Office's control impacted the achievement of the targets, such as the global context and significant socio-political changes that took place on the ground. Moreover, as a result of OHCHR's financial situation at the beginning of the programming cycle, a number of adjustments were made to its programme of work. Several targets were therefore adjusted during the mid-term review in 2015.

---

[7] Countries of engagement are those countries in which the Office has undertaken a set of activities towards a planned result. It is not limited to countries where UN Human Rights has maintained a presence.

The following chart outlines the 11 global expected accomplishments, the global indicators that were used to measure their achievement, the targets that were set for the end of the programme cycle and an indication of their achivement.

	Global Expected Accomplishments		Global Indicators	Targets 2017[8]	2014-2017 Achievements
National protection systems	EA 1: Increased compliance of national legislation, policies, programmes and institutions, including the judiciary and national human rights institutions, with international human rights standards	1.1	No. of countries of engagement where **NHRIs** have been established or improved their compliance with international standards (Paris Principles).	51	50
		1.2	No. of countries of engagement where the level of **compliance of legislation/policy** with international human rights standards in selected human rights areas has significantly improved.	54	39
		1.3	No. of countries of engagement where the level of **compliance of selected State institutions and programmes** with international human rights standards has significantly improved.	29	18
		1.4	No. of countries of engagement where **human rights trainings** have been institutionalized in one or more selected human rights areas.	27	24
		1.5	No. of countries of engagement where the **use of international human rights law** in court proceedings and decisions has increased to a significant extent.	18	13
	EA 2: Increased ratification of international and regional human rights treaties and review of reservations of international human rights treaties	2.1	Total no. of international **human rights treaties ratified**. Baseline: 2,041 outstanding ratifications to reach universality.	200	192
		2.2	Total no. of **reservations** withdrawn from international human rights treaties.	20	10 withdrawals; 2 partial withdrawals
	EA 3: Establishment and/ or functioning of protection systems and accountability mechanisms in compliance with international human rights standards to monitor, investigate and redress the full range of human rights violations	3.1	No. of countries of engagement where **oversight, accountability or protection mechanisms** have been established or improved compliance with international human rights standards.	40	33
		3.2	No. of countries of engagement where **transitional justice mechanisms** which conform to international human rights standards have been established or improved compliance with international human rights standards.	22	15
		3.3	No. of countries of engagement where **systems/procedures put in place by UN Human Rights** at the national level have contributed to protection from human rights violations.	5	4
		3.4	No. of countries of engagement where the number of **human rights violations' cases** raised by UN Human Rights positively addressed by governments has significantly increased.	13	10
	EA 4: Increased compliance of national legislation, policies, programmes and institutions with international human rights standards to combat discrimination, particularly against women	4.1	No. of countries of engagement where the level of compliance with international human rights standards of l**egislation and policies to combat discrimination** has significantly improved.	40	34
		4.2	No. of countries of engagement where selected **State institutions and programmes combating discrimination** have significantly improved their compliance with international human rights standards.	16	8
	EA 5: Increased use of existing national protection systems and participation in public processes by rights-holders, especially women and discriminated groups	5.1	No. of countries of engagement demonstrating significant improvement in the **level of meaningful participation** in selected public processes.	38	37
		5.2	No. of countries of engagement where the **use of national protection systems** has increased significantly.	15	11
International protection systems	EA 6: Increased compliance and engagement by States with UN human rights mechanisms and bodies	6.1	No. of countries of engagement where **mechanisms for integrated reporting** and/or implementation of outstanding treaty bodies, special procedures or Human Rights Council recommendations are in place or have improved functioning.	57	49
		6.2	Percentage of countries that submit **treaty body reports on time**. Baseline: 33 per cent	40%	32%
		6.3	No. of countries of engagement with an improvement in the proportion of **reports submitted** to the treaty bodies/UPR that substantially or fully **conform to reporting guidelines**.	23	21
		6.4	No. of countries which have issued a **standing invitation to special procedures** mandate-holders. Baseline: 108	123	118 plus 1 non-Member Observer State
		6.5	No. of countries for which **requests for visits of thematic special procedures** have resulted in at least one visit.	62	Visits to 121 countries
		6.6	Rate of responses from governments to special procedures **communications**. Baseline: 40 per cent	50%	58%

	Global Expected Accomplishments		Global Indicators	Targets 2017[8]	2014-2017 Achievements
International protection systems	EA 7: Increased no. and diversity of rights-holders and other stakeholders making use of UN human rights mechanisms	7.1	No. of countries of engagement with a significant number of **substantive submissions** or submitting actors to UN human rights mechanisms.	58	65
		7.2	Total no. of **substantive submissions** from NHRIs, civil society organizations, UN entities and individuals to UN human rights mechanisms.	13,000	More than 15,000
	EA 8: Progressive development and strengthening of international and regional human rights institutions, laws and standards	8.1	No. of **regional human rights institutions** strengthened or established in compliance with international human rights standards.	2	2
		8.2	No. of thematic areas where **international and/or regional human rights law** or standards have been developed or strengthened.	12	21
	EA 9: Enhanced coherence of UN human rights mechanisms and bodies	9.1	Percentage of treaty bodies and special procedures **recommendations taken up** by the Human Rights Council in the context of the UPR.	50%	n/a[9]
		9.2	No. of countries which have submitted or updated **common core documents**.	56	64
		9.3	Degree of progress made in improving the **harmonization of the work of the treaty bodies**.	Medium	Medium
		9.4	Degree of **coordination among the special procedures**.	High	Substantive
Involvement of other actors	EA 10: International community increasingly responsive to critical human rights situations and issues	10.1	Percentage of critical **human rights issues/situations** raised by UN Human Rights which have been **taken up in international fora** in a timely manner.	60%	n/a[10]
		10.2	No. of countries of engagement where the **international community has objectively engaged** on specific issues raised by UN Human Rights.	18	13
		10.3	No. of **international and regional fora which have included human rights issues** and/or established standing mechanisms/ procedures to address human rights situations on an ongoing basis.	10	11 mechanisms
	EA 11: A human rights-based approach, including gender equality and the right to development, increasingly integrated into UN policies and programmes	11.1	No. of countries of engagement with **UN peace missions** which have integrated international human rights standards and principles, as well as the recommendations of the human rights mechanisms, into their work to a significant extent.	15	14
		11.2	No. of countries of engagement with **humanitarian operations** which have integrated international human rights standards and principles, as well as the recommendations of the human rights mechanisms, into their work to a significant extent.	19	20
		11.3	No. of countries of engagement where **UN guidelines incorporating a human rights-based approach** have been applied to a significant extent by a number of UN entity programmes.	31	32
		11.4	No. of countries of engagement where **UN common country programmes** (i.e., UNDAFs) have satisfactorily integrated international human rights standards and principles, as well as the recommendations of the human rights mechanisms.	47	53
		11.5	No. of **UN policies and programmes at the global level** which integrate a human rights-based approach to a significant extent.	10	26

[8] Targets were revised in the context of the mid-term review of the OHCHR Management Plan 2014-2017 that was conducted in 2015. These numbers only apply to the current cycle and should not be understood as the baseline for upcoming programming cycles.

[9] The indicator is not measurable as available data does not allow for a calculation of the percentage. Treaty body recommendations and special procedures recommendations have been taken up by the Human Rights Council in the context of the UPR to a significant extent.

[10] The indicator is not measurable as available data does not allow for a calculation of the percentage. Critical human rights issues/situations raised by UN Human Rights have increasingly been taken up in international fora as indicated in UN Human Rights reports.

Analysis of the assessments of the indicators

During the reporting cycle, UN Human Rights has made significant progress as a results-based organization. In widely varied contexts, plans were consistently implemented and reports were drafted in relation to almost all of the planned results, regardless of the extent to which they were achieved. In cases where targets were not achieved, explanations were provided to ensure that lessons were identified to inform future decision-making about the planning of results, target setting and the selection of strategies.

Of the above-mentioned targets, UN Human Rights achieved or exceeded targets for 23 of the 33 assessed global targets. In relation to nine of the targets, the level of achievement ranged between 70 and 80 per cent. Finally, the percentage of achievement in relation to four targets was between 50 per cent and 70 per cent.

The countries of engagement are not limited to countries where UN Human Rights has a presence. However, a reduction in the number and size of field presences unquestionably impacted the achievement of targets at the national level. Specifically, several field presences were closed or reduced in size, i.e. Bolivia, Côte d'Ivoire and Togo. Furthermore, as noted above, adjustments were made to programme implementation plans in some countries in order to reflect implementation challenges or the development of new trends/situations. This was the case in countries/regions where events of a considerable magnitude took place that largely rendered the original results frameworks irrelevant (i.e., Bahrain, Burundi, Egypt, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Libya, Mauritania, Myanmar, South Sudan, Sudan (Darfur), Yemen). The impact on the achievement of targets of all indicators was particularly evident in terms of increased compliance of national legislation, policies, programmes and institutions with international human rights standards (EA 1 and EA 4). In response, UN Human Rights successfully focused its programme on strategies to increase the responsiveness of the international community (EA 10), the functioning of protection mechanisms (EA 3) and the mainstreaming of human rights into UN policies and programmes (EA 11).

The OMP 2014-2017 emphasized a strengthening of the international protection system by improving the engagement of Member States, civil society and the larger UN family with the international human rights mechanisms. This is an area where all targets were met and exceeded. In the case of the Universal Periodic Review, the engagement of Member States was 100 per cent during the second cycle and the number of submissions made by the UN and civil society increased. Also, more Heads of States and ministers attended the UPR consultations and sessions of the Human Rights Council. With regard to the treaty bodies, the strengthening process provided funding for additional meeting hours, which resulted in the review of more country reports. There was an increase in the number of submitted initial and long overdue reports, which in turn enabled civil society groups to engage with the treaty bodies through their submission of alternative reports. Moreover, rights-holders made more submissions to the mechanisms in relation to individual cases. Finally, although Member State engagement with the special procedures is not yet universal, there was a clear improvement. For instance, more standing invitations were issued, thematic procedures visited more countries and more positive responses were received from governments in response to individual complaints.

Another area of focus in the OMP 2014-2017 was the increased integration of human rights into UN policies and programmes. All of the set targets were achieved. On the other hand, not all global targets that measured the increased compliance of national legislation policies, programmes and institutions with international human rights standards were achieved. One exception was in relation to the institutionalization of human rights training. Specifically, engagement with national institutions to develop curricula/modules that would integrate human rights into mandatory training for the judiciary, police or army or in the curricula of formal education led to the institutionalization of human rights training in 24 countries. With regard to the compliance of legislation and policies with international human rights standards, a significant improvement in one or more areas was achieved in 39 countries of engagement. The established target was 54 countries. The progress achieved in the remaining countries of engagement varied to a considerable extent. No progress was reported in those cases where the deteriorating human rights situation did not allow for further engagement on these issues. In several countries of engagement, draft legislation or policies in compliance with international human rights standards have been presented to their respective legislative bodies and are pending approval. Finally, in many cases, the assessment showed that working to achieve legislative changes encouraged the development of a strong constituency where government institutions, civil society organizations and the general public could exchange views on these issues.

Overall, ensuring the compliance of institutions with international human rights standards, withdrawing

reservations to treaties and establishing human rights-compliant transitional justice mechanisms have been identified as areas where results fell short of the targets set at the national level.

Lessons learned from the implementation of the OMP 2014-2017

UN Human Rights has used results-based management (RBM) as the foundation for its management strategy for the past four years. RBM fosters a results-oriented culture that focuses on the achievement of a set of goals and the use of feedback and accountability to develop, implement, evaluate and report on operational activities.

In accordance with RBM, UN Human Rights has successfully institutionalized an evaluation function and culture founded on a systematic, methodological approach. Office-wide evaluations have been instrumental in determining how to make the UN Human Rights programme more relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable.

During the reporting period, UN Human Rights carried out an unprecedented number of strategic/cross-cutting evaluations of a wide variety of activities, including support that was provided to national human rights institutions (NHRIs) and in relation to the alignment of national legislation with international human rights standards (from 2017). Evaluations were also undertaken of the regional gender advisers structure and of the programmes that were supported by human rights advisers.

Moreover, a number of de-centralized evaluations of field presences programmes and projects were conducted regarding: the programme of the Regional Office for Central Asia; the internal reviews for Honduras, Mexico and Uganda; the Maya Programme for the Full Exercise of Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Guatemala; the projects on "Combating Discrimination in the Republic of Moldova" and "Building Capacities for Human Rights Monitoring Protection and Advocacy in Tajikistan;" The Impact of Technical Assistance and Capacity-Building on the Human Rights Situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (as requested by the Human Rights Council); the review of the UN Network on Racial Discrimination and Protection of Minorities as well as two lessons learned exercises from the projects "Human Rights Protection in the South of

Kyrgyzstan" and "Human Rights Protection for Stability in Central Asia."

In addition, UN Human Rights supported external evaluation processes regarding: an evaluation of UN Human Rights by the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), which emphasized the work of the field presences; another OIOS evaluation, conducted in 2017, which focused on human rights protection in peacekeeping operations; and an assessment undertaken by the Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network of UN Human Rights, which began in 2017 and will continue in 2018.

As a standard practice, action plans for the implementation of evaluation recommendations are submitted to the Office's Programme Budget Review Board for their review and endorsement. The implementation of the action plans is monitored every six months.

Furthermore, a meta-analysis of the results of the evaluations and audits conducted during the programming cycle 2014-2017 was undertaken, which included the assessment of 12 external and internal evaluations, 10 audits and two lessons learned exercises. The conclusions of the evaluations, good practices, lessons learned and recommendations were categorized and analysed according to thematic areas and geographic scope. The results of the meta-analysis provided inputs for the development of the OHCHR Management Plan (OMP) 2018-2021.

The following lessons learned were extracted from the meta-analysis of the results of evaluations conducted in UN Human Rights during the programming cycle 2014-2017, as well as those from monitoring reports.

Lessons learned related to thematic issues

Compliance of national laws policies and institutions

UN Human Rights uses several types of strategic interventions to achieve its intended results. For instance, the Office provides institutionalized training of judges and prosecutors on the application of international human rights law, encourages the judicial and quasi-judicial pursuit of emblematic cases and monitors trials in order to facilitate changes in national judicial systems, strengthen the rule of law and ensure compliance with international human rights standards. Specific achievements in these areas were identified in the evaluations of the projects "Combating Discrimination in the Republic of Moldova" and the "Maya Programme for the Full Exercise of Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Guatemala."

Technical support for capacity-building is also another strategy that the Office employs to increase the compliance of NHRIs and governments with international human rights standards. As identified during the evaluation of the support that UN Human Rights provided to NHRIs, technical support includes the use of tools and methodologies developed by the Office, especially human rights indicators. The information collected by UN Human Rights in the course of its human rights monitoring activities is also used to support advocacy efforts and needs assessments that in turn enable the development of appropriate capacity-building initiatives for local stakeholders.

Protections systems and accountability mechanisms

UN Human Rights seeks to ensure the functioning and compliance with international human rights standards of protection systems and accountability mechanisms that monitor, investigate and redress human rights violations. Field presences are key to ensuring that UN Human Rights is able to contribute to the establishment and operation of these systems and mechanisms at the national level. The evaluations of regional and country programmes that were conducted during the cycle indicated that mapping processes and a clear understanding of the unique needs on the ground are essential for building the capacity of local stakeholders to effectively engage with the international human rights mechanisms.

The same evaluations further noted that close cooperation with local governments, NHRIs, civil society organizations and other stakeholders through advocacy, capacity-building and technical advice improves the effectiveness of field work and contributes to the national ownership and sustainability of human rights protection systems and accountability mechanisms.

Participation

UN Human Rights assists rights-holders to claim their rights by supporting their use of national protection systems and participation in public processes. The evaluations of the support provided by the Office to NHRIs and of various regional and country programmes underlined the importance of the technical advice and capacity-building assistance that UN Human Rights offers to local stakeholders. This takes the form of elaborating human rights tools and methodologies, teaching skills for human rights monitoring, protection and advocacy, and establishing networks of victims, beneficiaries and other rights-holders.

Engagement of Member States with international human rights mechanisms

At the international level, UN Human Rights seeks to ensure that duty-bearers uphold their human rights obligations by supporting the engagement of States with international human rights mechanisms. As highlighted in the OIOS evaluation of UN Human Rights and the internal evaluations of field presences, the engagement of Member States with international human rights mechanisms enables UN Human Rights to better support countries in fulfilling their commitments and strengthening their accountability. The evaluations of regional and country programmes concluded that a crucial element of this support is the identification of strategies that will ensure that follow-up to these commitments is integrated into the Office's country or regional work plans.

Engagement by the international community

UN Human Rights promotes the active involvement of international actors in human rights activities by encouraging their increased responsiveness to critical human rights situations and issues. As noted in the study conducted in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, a large field presence and the ongoing outreach activities of the human rights components in United Nations peacekeeping operations provide multiple opportunities for human rights staff to play a critical role in early warning initiatives and interventions for the protection of civilians. These efforts can be significantly strengthened through the use of human rights-related data that they have collected.

Human rights integrated into UN policies and programmes

The evaluation of programmes supported by human rights advisers and others that were based in field presences noted that engagement with UN entities and United Nations Country Teams, including through the sharing of information and strengthened communication and coordination, significantly increased their knowledge about international human rights standards and mechanisms. This engagement during the reporting period ensured that the staff of UN agencies had the capacity to fully implement a human rights-based approach and the Human Rights up Front Initiative.

Lessons learned related to management issues

Strategic decisions

UN Human Rights aims to promote improved understanding among staff and senior management about RBM principles and the importance of "managing for results." Every organizational unit and field office in UN Human Rights plans, monitors and reports through an IT-based Performance Monitoring System that is based on a common results framework that uses RBM methodologies and principles.

The Joint Inspection Unit undertook an evaluation of RBM in the UN System, in 2017, and highlighted that results-based management practices at the entity level, such as use of the UN Human Rights Performance Monitoring System, can contribute to the alignment of programme planning, programme aspects of the budget, monitoring implementation and methods of evaluation and related tools that are managed at the United Nations Secretariat level.

In addition, project evaluations conducted at the field level concluded that a long-term investment of time and trust is needed to positively impact on the enjoyment of human rights. As a result, medium- or long-term planning is crucial to the development of strategic decision-making. This is particularly important for short-term projects or programmes where setting overly ambitious goals may cause undue stress for the implementing staff regarding their delivery.

Field operations

Increasing efficiency in supporting field operations is crucial as the Office enhances its field engagement. Several regional and country programmes and projects were evaluated during the programming cycle. This enabled the Office to identify the following important lessons that were learned and should be taken into account in future interventions.

Guidelines and review mechanisms can assist field presences to establish appropriate organizational structures and clarify strategies to narrow down the scope of activities in accordance with needs on the ground and the comparative advantages of UN Human Rights.

Limited access to financial, administrative and human resources, including for staff members that are living in difficult conditions in the field, restricts their potential to have a substantive impact on human rights issues on the ground. To offset these limitations, there is a need for the streamlining and expediting of internal administrative and financial procedures for field presences, especially the deployment of staff, which can increase the effectiveness of field operations, particularly those that are affected by high turnover.

Finally, evaluations that assessed the effectiveness of organizational arrangements at the field level indicated that field presences are better at understanding the complex environment in which they operate and at implementing the Office's mandate whenever they are composed of a diversified workforce, both in terms of gender diversity and professional backgrounds. They also indicated that field presences need to focus on the key human rights issues in their respective countries or regions, identified through systematic needs assessments, to which UN Human Rights can contribute added value.

Staff training

The knowledge and expertise of its staff are one of UN Human Rights' comparative advantages. As the project and programme evaluations at the field level concluded, the effective implementation of the UN Human Rights programme requires regular staff capacity needs assessments, development of training plans for all staff and access for all staff to relevant training programmes. These capacity-building efforts are particularly useful in areas such as: project management, RBM systems, resource mobilization and financial reporting. When the mandate of a field presence involves special themes that require particular knowledge or skills, focused assessments of capacity needs should be taken into account to develop appropriate training plans.