



OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

Evaluation of the Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Programme

Final report

A team of external Consultants has prepared this report. The views expressed herein are those of the Consultants and therefore do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of OHCHR.

17 December 2020

Bjorn Pettersson and Françoise Roth

Composition of the Evaluation Team

Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team was composed of two external evaluators, with extensive experience in human rights and gender.

Bjorn Pettersson (Team Leader) has over 25 years of international human rights experience. He gained most of his skills and knowledge while working for OHCHR field presences in Colombia, Nepal and Sierra Leone. Bjorn also has broad human rights field experience from other UN agencies (UNHCR, UNDP, UNICEF and UN Women) and from international NGOs. Since 2013, he works as an independent evaluator and researcher for OHCHR and other international organisations. He recently helped the UN Team of Experts on the Rule of Law / Sexual Violence in Conflict to develop their monitoring and evaluation framework.

Françoise Roth (Team Member) is a French lawyer with post-graduate degrees in human rights (LL.M.) and criminal law. She devoted her career to human rights in different national settings, mostly in Latin America with regular professional activity in Africa. She has a long experience conducting evaluations for UN entities (including OHCHR), international cooperation agencies and non-governmental organizations. Since 2007, she has focused most of her efforts on women's rights and gender issues, in particular gender-based violence and access to justice. She has knowledge of OHCHR (including as former staff).

Evaluation Manager

Sabas Monroy, Evaluation Officer, OHCHR

Reference Group

For this evaluation, the Reference Group was composed of:

- Sabas Monroy, PPMES
- Cecilia Moller, PPMES
- Verónica Birga, WHRGS
- Beatriz Pérez Mena, WHRGS
- Nils Clotteau, DEXREL
- Mara Steccazzini, METS
- Arbena Kuriu, ERS
- Huma Khan, UNMISS
- Gloria Carrera, OHCHR member of the ToE

Table of contents

TABLE OF ACRONYMS	V
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	VII
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
PROGRAMME BACKGROUND	1
EVALUATION BACKGROUND	1
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	1
MAIN FINDINGS	2
LESSONS LEARNED	3
CONCLUSIONS	4
RECOMMENDATIONS	5
1 INTRODUCTION	6
1.1 PROGRAMME BACKGROUND	6
1.2 EVALUATION BACKGROUND	7
1.3 METHODOLOGY	8
2 MAIN FINDINGS PRESENTED ACCORDING TO EVALUATION CRITERIA	9
2.1 RELEVANCE	9
2.2 EFFECTIVENESS	14
2.3 EFFICIENCY	23
2.4 IMPACT ORIENTATION	25
2.5 SUSTAINABILITY	26
2.6 GENDER EQUALITY INTEGRATION	28
2.7 DISABILITY INCLUSION	28
2.8 IMPACT OF COVID-19	31
3 LESSONS LEARNED	32
4 EMERGING GOOD PRACTICES	32
5 CONCLUSIONS	33
6 RECOMMENDATIONS	35
7 APPENDICES (AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST)	41

- 7.1 ANNEX ONE: TERMS OF REFERENCE**
- 7.2 ANNEX TWO: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED**
- 7.3 ANNEX THREE: DATA COLLECTION TOOLS**
- 7.4 ANNEX FOUR: SGBV PROGRAMME PLANNING FRAMEWORK (AWP FROM JULY 2017 TO MARCH 31, 2021)**

Table of Acronyms

• AWP	Annual work plan
• CAR	Central African Republic
• COVID-19	Coronavirus disease
• Col	Commission of Inquiry
• CPWD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
• CRSV	Conflict-related sexual violence
• CSO	Civil Society Organizations
• DEXREL	Donor and External Relations Section
• DPA	Department of Political Affairs
• DPKO	Department of Peacekeeping Operations
• DPO	Department of Peace Operations
• DPPA	Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs
• DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
• EOY	End of the year report
• ERS	Emergency Response Section
• ESCR	Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
• FCO	Foreign and Commonwealth Office
• FFM	Fact Finding Mission
• FOTCD	Field Operations and Technical Cooperation Division
• GA	General Assembly
• GBV	Gender-based violence
• HC	UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
• HQ	OHCHR Headquarters
• HR	Human rights
• HRBA	Human Rights-Based Approach
• HRC	Human Rights Council
• HRO	Human rights officer
• ISU	Investigations Support Unit
• JHRO	Joint Human Rights Office
• JRR	Justice Rapid Response
• LGBTI	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex
• MARA	Monitoring, Analysis and Reporting Arrangements
• METS	Methodology, Education and Training Section
• MINSUMA	United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali
• MINUSCA	United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Central African Republic
• MONUSCO	United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo
• MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
• NGO	Non-governmental organization
• OEAP	Organizational Effectiveness Action Plans
• OHCHR	Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
• OMP	Office Management Plan
• OPT	Occupied Palestinian Territory

- OSRG-SVC Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary General on Sexual Violence in Conflict
- PBRB Programme and Budget Review Board
- PMS Performance Monitoring System
- PPMES Policy, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Service
- PSMS Programme Support and Management Services
- PwD Persons with Disabilities
- RoL Rule of Law
- SG Secretary General
- SGBV Sexual and Gender-based violence
- SPB Special Procedures Branch
- SWPA Senior Women Protection Adviser
- ToE Team of Experts on Rule of Law and Sexual Violence in Conflict
- ToR Terms of reference
- UK United Kingdom
- UN United Nations
- UNEG United Nations Evaluation Group
- UNMISS United Nations Mission in South Sudan
- UNSC United Nations Security Council
- UNSOM United Nations Assistance Mission in Somalia
- UN Women United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
- WHRGS Women Human Rights and Gender Section
- WPA Women Protection Adviser

Acknowledgements

The evaluation team would like to express its appreciation for the cooperation provided by the evaluation manager Sabas Monroy of OHCHR Policy, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Service (PPMES). Particular thanks are also owed to the Women Human Rights and Gender Section (WGHRG) staff, particularly the Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV) Team, for their collaboration and constant availability to answer to inquiries. The time and insights of staff from Field Presences and headquarters as well as from other SGBV Programme stakeholders were greatly appreciated.

Executive Summary

Programme Background

In April 2017, the United Kingdom (UK) Government and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) signed a funding agreement to support the implementation of a project on Sexual and Gender-Based violence, hereafter “the SGBV Programme”. The UK-funded programme runs from 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2021 and has a total budget of £2,130,000.00. The Programme has strengthened OHCHR’s efforts to document sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV), and to contribute to, complement and inform prevention and protection responses for SGBV by the UN system and beyond.

The SGBV Programme works towards the following four outcomes:

1. Quality investigations and reporting of sexual and gender-based violence produced by OHCHR field presences, including human rights components of peace operations, and international investigative bodies supported by OHCHR
2. Prevention and protection responses to conflict-related sexual violence are enhanced in all peace missions
3. Investigation findings on sexual and gender-based violence are better addressed in activities undertaken by OHCHR field presences and their partners
4. The United Nations (UN) system and other stakeholders are better able to promote access to justice for victims of SGBV in a coordinated, rights-based and effective manner.¹

Evaluation Background

After almost four years of financial support provided by the UK, it was considered relevant to assess the results achieved and extract lessons learned for the future of the Programme. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the SGBV Programme and produce recommendations in terms of these six evaluation criteria: (1) relevance; (2) effectiveness; (3) efficiency; (4) impact orientation; (5) sustainability; (6) gender and disability integration.

The evaluation was conducted by a two-person team of external consultants, both of them with extensive experience in human rights and evaluations. It was carried out between August and November 2020, and covers the implementation of the Programme since its beginning in July 2017.

Evaluation Methodology

As specified in the Terms of Reference (ToR), a mixed methodology was applied, allowing for appropriate triangulation of information. The following home-based methods were used: (1) **Desk reviews** of OHCHR’s and external documents such as policies, reports, handbooks, guidance materials, e-mail communications, etc.; (2) **Semi-structured interviews** with key stakeholders (conducted virtually due to the COVID-19 pandemic). In total, 46 persons were interviewed; (3) **Secondary data analysis** of existing data sets, particularly work plans

¹ Evaluation of the Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Programme Terms of Reference, p. 1 and 2.

contained in OHCHR's systems, produced documents and available in-country information, when relevant.

Main Findings

Relevance

The implementation of the SGBV Programme has evidenced the added value for OHCHR of a specialized and dedicated team to support and enhance its SGBV work and engagement within the UN. A wide variety of UN and non-UN entities are involved in SGBV issues, including in conflict-related sexual violence (CRSV). OHCHR's mandate and activities complement these initiatives by integrating a human rights-based approach. Over the last three years and a half, the SGBV Team has carried out many activities relevant for the Programme's purpose but not necessarily based on a consistent and well-organized result pathway.

Effectiveness

Overall, the evaluation team received information indicating that most of the Programme activities were reasonably effective. Clear achievements can be pointed to under each of the expected results. In particular, the SGBV Team has produced or actively participated in the drafting of useful tools on SGBV monitoring and reporting. The Programme has been credited for its advocacy efforts to include SGBV in the mandate of the UN-backed investigative bodies, and to ensure that specialized gender positions be included within the teams. Interviews with Senior Women Protection Advisers (SWPAs) and others also provided clear indication of the importance of the SGBV Programme's support to report writing in the field presences. The design and facilitation of specialized SGBV trainings and briefings has been one of the Programme's most appreciated components. An impressive total number of 25 trainings and briefings have been implemented. The SGBV Team effectively influenced and shaped both the UN Policy on CRSV and its Handbook for UN Field Mission on Preventing and Responding to CRSV in a very positive and (eventually) appreciated way. Finally, lessons-learned workshops and publications constitute important tools for UN and other stakeholders' promotion of SGBV victims' access to justice.

Efficiency

SGBV Programme staff have carried out their responsibilities efficiently. They have communicated, coordinated and efficiently worked together with relevant colleagues within OHCHR and in other UN agencies. However, the ambitious scope of the Programme in relation to available human resources, and a tendency to often "seize opportunities", seem to have spread efforts very thinly. This was not helped by the need to respond to a wide variety of *ad hoc* SGBV support requests from other OHCHR sections and field presences.

Impact orientation

It is maybe premature to assess the impact of the SGBV Programme, since it will take more than three years to see SGBV Programme's potentially transformative effects. However, some of its concrete interventions are geared towards long-term contribution to prevention and

responses to SGBV. In terms of normative changes, the SGBV Programme's substantive contribution to the UN Policy on Prevention and Response to Conflict-Related Sexual Violence by United Nations Field Missions is a key advancement towards a more systematic approach of the UN in that matter. The SGBV Team has obtained concrete results with UN-mandated investigative Col/FFMs. It developed an integrated strategy that has encompassed steps from the drafting of the mandates to the production of the reports. Other Programme activities were *per se* appreciated by interviewees but cannot be described as seeking broad and long-term impact.

Sustainability

Some of the Programme methods are geared towards sustainability of the results (training manuals, staff training, advocacy for UN action, etc.) but have not yet been able to ensure that durability. Several of the most important outputs of the Programme are likely to have a continued impact over the years, including the UN Policy and Handbook on CRSV as well as lessons-learned products and other tools produced by the Programme. Internally, among OHCHR staff and management, the SGBV Programme has developed increased awareness (as well as knowledge and skills) and a stronger commitment to a dedicated and permanent OHCHR capacity to address SGBV. Ownership of the Programme at the field level seems to be a challenge due to several factors.

Gender equality integration

The SGBV Programme is part of WHRGS and integrated into its annual work plans. The Programme is aimed at fostering preventive and protective responses to SGBV. As such, it obviously contributes to gender equality. Opinions are divided as to whether the SGBV Programme should limit its ambition to CRSV or broaden its engagement to all forms of SGBV. The answer to this issue will depend on the defined strategy and end-goal of the intervention. The SGBV Programme has expanded its consideration beyond the situation of women, to include a broader gender perspective, for example on violence against men, boys, lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans or intersex (LGBTI) persons.

Disability inclusion

The OHCHR SGBV Programme does not include activities, outputs or outcomes that are explicitly geared towards disability inclusion, but only marginally tackles the issue.

Lessons learned

The main lessons learned are:

1. Field activities need to be anchored thoroughly, not only with SWPAs and other focal points for SGBV but also with senior management of field presences to ensure full engagement by the field office, even when there is turn-over of staff.
2. OHCHR field presence staff (including SWPA) needs concrete and operational support from the SGBV Programme, such as the SGBV in investigations publication, training of staff and concrete assistance with analysis and drafting of SGBV sections in public reports.

3. Given the relatively high turn-over of staff in the field, trainings cannot be designed as a one-off but need to be repeated or designed as training of trainers.
4. OHCHR SGBV trainings or briefings with entire teams of Col/FFM is a crucial way to expand the Col/FFM's investigative priorities and inclusion of SGBV information in reports.

Conclusions

1. The two-person SGBV Team implementing the UK-funded Programme has made a huge difference to OHCHR's overall engagement and achievements on the issue of SGBV, including CRSV.
2. All stakeholders interviewed appreciated the SGBV Team's efforts but pointed to the need for a more robust OHCHR staff capacity on SGBV. In order to have a decisive impact in this field, OHCHR requires a specialized and dedicated resource, able to offer expert know-how on SGBV.
3. OHCHR has an essential role to play to include a human rights approach within UN-wide initiatives on SGBV, in particular on CRSV. OHCHR ensures that UN policies and practices are enshrined in international human rights law.
4. SGBV, including CRSV, is a very "crowded field", with many agencies and entities competing for resources and visibility. There is therefore a real need for OHCHR to reflect on its comparative advantages to contribute to concrete results in the area of SGBV and avoid duplication of efforts.
5. Within the framework of the "consolidation of protection process²," OHCHR has an important role to play in supporting the smooth absorption of the SWPAs and to ensure the high profile and priority of the CRSV issue on the agendas of Heads of Human Rights Components.
6. The ambitious scope of the SGBV Programme have at times led to the use of a fire-fighter modus operandi that seems to have stretched the Team too thin. A better planning effort is therefore required to define more coherently the strategic pathways and avoid the scattering of activities and resources.
7. The SGBV Team's highly appreciated work to strengthen SGBV investigations and reporting by Col/FFMs and OHCHR field presences is one of the most important achievements of the Programme. As a result, the SGBV thematic now occupies a more prominent role in Col/FFM investigations and reports.
8. Beneficiaries of the Team's field activities praise the quality of the content and communication but would have liked to see more comprehensiveness and follow up. It is however understandable that given the number of activities under the Programme, and the size of the Team, more coverage and follow up was impossible.
9. Many stakeholders appreciated OHCHR's broad approach (SGBV) and efforts to link CRSV to gender-based discrimination and inequality in general. The SGBV Programme

² See Report of the UN Secretary General: The future of the United Nations peace operations: implementation of the recommendations of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, A/70/357-S/2015/682, 2 September 2016, paragraph 66. The "consolidation of protection process" put into place by the UN Secretary General gives human rights components of peace missions a new and enhanced role with CRSV, which is not yet fully optimized. Heads of human rights components now have to ensure this issue is given enough attention internally in the missions and externally as a priority human rights issue to be monitored and reported on publicly, with the support of the Senior/Women Protection Advisers and CRSV Focal Points.

successfully advocated for the explicit inclusion of those links in the UN Policy on CRSV (2020).

Recommendations

1. As the current framework for OHCHR's SGBV activities comes to an end, there is a need to replace it with a new programmatic structure that can ensure focus and prioritization in the light of very limited staff and financial resources. Therefore, OHCHR should consider developing a formal SGBV Strategy that can be anchored within the whole organization (HQ and field) and provide that necessary framework that will ensure dedicated resources continue to be used efficiently and with effective impact.
2. Given the "crowdedness" of the SGBV field (including CRSV), it is important that a new OHCHR SGBV Strategy defines precisely where OHCHR's mandate and expertise have a comparative advantage over other actors and can clearly add value to the SGBV field. That assessment should include consideration of how to best link a new SGBV Strategy to:
 - a) The field presences with their monitoring mandate, case investigations and public reporting potential
 - b) OHCHR's mandated function and general involvement with CoI /FFM
 - c) OHCHR's unique support role in relation to the UN human rights mechanisms (UPR, Special Procedures and Treaty Bodies).
 - d) The public voice of the High Commissioner and other senior managers (Deputy High Commissioner and ASG)
3. OHCHR should continue to strategically engage in global SGBV inter-agency processes with a constant eye on the necessary resource investment vs. expected outcome balance. A renewed focus on SGBV activities closely linked to OHCHR's comparative advantages as an agency entails a commitment to strategically invest limited resources primarily in functions exclusively given to OHCHR (field monitoring and investigation, HC's public voice, support to human rights mechanisms etc.).
4. Efforts should be made to expand the number of staff on the SGBV Team, including through a targeted fundraising strategy that highlights OHCHR's unique contribution to global efforts to address SGBV. OHCHR's comparative advantages and unique mandate in comparison to the many other entities addressing SGBV should be clearly marketed. OHCHR should consider fundraising for its SGBV staff expertise rather than SGBV activities.
5. As important as the content of a new SGBV strategy or Programme is the need to create ownership of the strategy at the field level. This requires OHCHR field staff, including Heads of field presences, to be involved at a very early stage of the discussion and planning of future SGBV activities.
6. To avoid that the SGBV Team becomes overwhelmed by requests for support from colleagues in Geneva and NY (to the detriment of for example the Programme's planned field activities), the new strategy should be widely circulated and explained, to clarify what kind of support can and cannot be provided to units in HQ and in the field. Wider use of

existing guidance materials and trainings opportunities should also ensure that the SGBV Team does not get too absorbed by colleagues' day-to-day requests but can focus on implementing the broader programmatic activities of the strategy.

7. To ensure the smooth functioning of the Senior/Women Protection Advisers within human rights components of peace missions (“consolidation of protection process”), OHCHR FOTCD and WHRGS should pursue a dialogue with Heads of human rights components and SWPAs on how to best ensure high profile and priority of the CRSV issue on the agendas of Heads of Human Rights Components and their staff.
8. When defining the future SGBV strategy, and in the framework of OHCHR's increased engagement in humanitarian contexts and with humanitarian UN structures, OHCHR should consider establishing closer cooperation between SGBV focal points in its field presences and the GBV Sub-Cluster of the Protection Cluster at the local level in order to improve access to affected communities/individuals and ensure that the victim-centered approach is based on broadest possible understanding of the rights and needs of victims.

I Introduction

I.1 Programme Background

In April 2017, the United Kingdom (UK) Government and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) signed a funding agreement to support the implementation of a project on Sexual and Gender-Based violence (SGBV), hereafter “the SGBV Programme”, between 1 April 2017 and 31 March 2020 for a total of £1,630,000.00. In 2020, the donor decided to fund the SGBV Programme for an additional year from 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021. A new agreement was signed for a total amount of £500,000.

While OHCHR has long been engaged in addressing this issue, the SGBV Programme strengthens OHCHR's institutional capacity in line with OHCHR's Management Plan (OMP) by recruiting two full-time dedicated staff (SGBV Team) within OHCHR Women's Human Rights and Gender Section (WHRGS). Re-establishing a specialized function,³ the SGBV Programme supports and reinforces WHRGS' strategies and OHCHR's involvement in the area of SGBV. The Programme has strengthened OHCHR's efforts to document SGBV, and to contribute to, complement and inform prevention and protection responses for SGBV by the UN system and beyond. The SGBV Team works in close collaboration with relevant sections of OHCHR in Geneva and New York, as well as with geographic desks and field presences, including regional gender advisors and Women Protection Advisors (WPA) in consolidated human rights components of peace operations. Externally, the SGBV team has engaged with the major actors working at the global level on SGBV.

³ Until 2014, a human rights officer was in charge, within the WHRGS, of supporting the implementation of the Security Council's mandate on sexual violence. The position was discontinued in 2015 due to financial constraints. OHCHR, Proposal for a Three-Year Programme on Sexual and Gender-Based Violence.

The four-year SGBV Programme works towards the following four outcomes:

1. Quality investigations and reporting of sexual and gender-based violence produced by OHCHR field presences, including human rights components of peace operations, and international investigative bodies supported by OHCHR
2. Prevention and protection responses to conflict-related sexual violence are enhanced in all peace missions
3. Investigation findings on sexual and gender-based violence are better addressed in activities undertaken by OHCHR field presences and their partners
4. The UN system and other stakeholders are better able to promote access to justice for victims of SGBV in a coordinated, rights-based and effective manner

1.2 Evaluation Background

The Memorandum of Understanding between OHCHR and the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) does not specify an OHCHR obligation to conduct a final evaluation of the SGBV Programme. However, one of the UK FCO annual reviews stressed the importance for the SGBV team to conduct more monitoring and evaluation.⁴ Consequently, the SGBV team included an evaluation of the programme in the 2020-2021 workplan presented to the UK FCO.

According to OHCHR's evaluation policy, the subjects of evaluation within OHCHR are chosen using criteria such as its relevance to the OMP, strategic importance, and potential for generation of knowledge. The SGBV Programme fulfils these criteria and, after three years of financial support provided by the UK, it was considered relevant to assess the results achieved and extract lessons learned for the future of the Programme.

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the SGBV Programme and produce recommendations in terms of these six evaluation criteria:

- 1) **Relevance** – the extent to which the Programme is relevant to the prevalent situation of SGBV at the global and country levels, the mandate of OHCHR, its comparative advantage, and the needs of stakeholders (both duty bearers and right-holders);
- 2) **Efficiency** – the extent to which the Programme has economically converted resources into results in the course of its term;
- 3) **Effectiveness** – the degree to which the Programme's planned results and targets have been achieved, at outcome and output levels;
- 4) **Impact orientation** – the extent to which the strategic orientation of the Programme points toward making a significant contribution to broader, long-term, sustainable changes;
- 5) **Sustainability** – the degree to which changes achieved last in time;
- 6) **Gender and human rights integration** – the degree to which a gender and human rights perspective has been integrated in the Programme, and the degree to which the results obtained have contributed to gender and human rights principles of non-discrimination and equality, with emphasis on women rights and disability inclusion.

The objectives of the evaluation are:

⁴ See FY18/19 UK FCO Annual Review: "There is a requirement for stronger M&E and results framework with clearer indication of achievement of outputs and outcomes."

- **To identify areas of strength and areas of weakness** in the planning and achievement of results – including in the area of gender and human rights integration;
- **To produce useful lessons learned and good practices** that illustrate successful and unsuccessful strategies in the achievement of results;
- **To produce clear and actionable recommendations** identifying concrete actions and responsibilities for OHCHR to undertake towards these ends.

1.3 Methodology

The evaluation was carried out by two independent consultants between the months of August and November 2020.

The evaluation was guided by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) (2016) Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, the OHCHR (2013) Evaluation Policy, and the UNEG (2014) Handbook for Conducting Evaluations of Normative Work and (2014) Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality into Evaluations. These documents provided general background and direction concerning approach and a menu of methodologies from which to choose.

The evaluation took both a summative and a formative approach, in that it looked at results achieved or not achieved so far (summative) with a view to inform the SGBV programme and possibly other Programmes' work in the future (formative).

The evaluation team worked in closed collaboration with the Evaluation Manager and the SGBV Team to ascertain the adequacy of the methodology used. The openness, transparency and constant availability of the Team and of the WHRGS chief was greatly appreciated.

As specified in the Terms of Reference, a mixed methodology was applied, allowing for appropriate triangulation of information. The following home-based methods were used:

- **Desk Reviews** informal, for general background; and formal, of OHCHR's and external documents such as policies, reports, handbooks, guidance materials, e-mail communications etc.;
- **Semi-structured interviews** (conducted virtually) with key stakeholders in Geneva, NY and in some of the countries where the Programme operates. In total, the evaluation team interviewed 46 persons (see list of conducted interviews in Annex Two). Special focus was put on countries where the SGBV Programme has developed lessons learned activities: Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, South Sudan and Somalia. Information and experiences from other countries were also gathered.
- **Secondary data analysis** of existing data sets, particularly work plans contained in OHCHR's systems, produced documents and available in-country information, when relevant.

The Methodological Framework used for this evaluation (see Annex Three: Data Collection Tools) is based on the five standard OECD/DAC (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development Assistance/Development Assistance Committee) evaluation criteria referred to in the ToR, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact orientation and sustainability. It also considered the integration of gender, by looking at how specific SGBV affected populations were taken into account in the Programme (mainly SGBV violence against lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and intersex (LGBTI) persons, and against men or boys), as well as the inclusion of persons with disabilities. For each evaluation question, various performance indicators were developed and the data sources as well as the methods used for collecting the data were identified.

Beside limitations imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic, the evaluation was carried out without major difficulties (apart from the fact that some interlocutors did not respond to the evaluation team's requests for interviews, and others were not available at the agreed meeting time). It has to be considered as a home-based evaluation since none of the countries where the SGBV Programme has engaged could be visited by the Evaluation Team. In other conditions, other methodologies could have been envisioned, such as direct observation of project activities, focus group discussions, direct interaction with stakeholders. However, for the purpose of this evaluation, the adopted methodology turned out to suffice for its purpose.

2 Main Findings presented according to evaluation criteria

2.1 Relevance

The implementation of the SGBV Programme has evidenced the added value for OHCHR of a specialized and dedicated team to support and enhance its SGBV work and engagement within the UN. A wide variety of UN and non-UN entities are involved in SGBV issues, including CRSV. OHCHR's mandate and activities complement these initiatives by integrating a human rights approach. Over the last three and a half years, the SGBV Team has carried out many activities relevant for the Programme's purpose but not necessarily based on a consistent and well-organized result pathway.

What is the added value of the Programme for OHCHR OMP 2018-2021

The SGBV Programme supports OHCHR's work towards several OMP results. Programmatically, its activities fit within the OHCHR Management Plan for 2018-2021, which states that women, young people and people with disabilities will be spotlighted. As an WHRGS focus area, the SGBV Programme contributes to OMP results under its pillars on "prevention of violation and strengthening of human rights, including in situations of conflict and insecurity", and under "strengthening the rule of law and accountability for human rights."

Outcome 2 of the SGBV Programme is included under the Early Warning pillar through activities aimed at enhancing the capacity of UN field missions (in particular peace missions) to prevent and respond to CRSV. Under "Strengthening rule of law and accountability for human rights violation", the SGBV Programme contributes to OHCHR OMP A3 ("Justice

systems investigate and prosecute gender-related crimes more effectively”) through the following activities:

- Support to quality investigations and reporting on GBV by OHCHR field presences and international investigative bodies (publication of guidance on documentation and analysis of sexual violence, training and mentoring to WPAs and field presences, support to Col and FFM)
- Support to strategic litigation by civil society organizations of cases of gender-related crimes before national and regional courts (Walikale case in DRC⁵)
- Strengthening States capacity to put into place gender sensitive procedures to enhance participation of victims of gender-related crimes in justice process (establishment of shelter/safe house, and of a protection network for victims of sexual violence in CAR)
- Reinforcing knowledge by national, regional and international justice systems of international standards on gender-related crimes (lessons learned publications on victims’ protection as well as on strategic SGBV litigation).

The SGBV Programme also contributed to the Organizational Effectiveness Action Plans (OEAP) on Gender and Diversity, in particular through its work with the Gender Accreditation Programme, which aims at strengthening capacities to integrate gender equality and women's rights into country offices’ substantive work, composition, culture and processes. For example, the SGBV team provided trainings for staff of the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT) Office to enhance capacities to integrate a gender perspective into its monitoring work, with a specific focus on SGBV (e.g., so called “honour” killings). It also supported the OHCHR country office in Cambodia by providing SGBV monitoring capacity building to local civil society organizations. The team also engaged with OHCHR country presence in Ukraine in relation to its work with women human rights defenders.

Operationally, it was possible for the WHRGS to advocate for the inclusion of SGBV in several OMPs because of its strengthened capacity to ensure substantive SGBV backstopping with specialized knowledge and guidance. Even though these types of activities were previously carried out by WHRGS, the securing of a specialized and dedicated team contributed to a greater uptake of work in these areas, through outreach and dissemination of tools, support to the implementation of activities and systematization of lessons learned.

As shown below under effectiveness, the existence of a specialized and dedicated team has contributed to greater OHCHR institutional engagement on the subject with other UN agencies. It had also had a clear impact on OHCHR and UN public reporting on the issue. Similarly, with the support of the SGBV Team, OHCHR field presences’ commitment to SGBV issues has grown. To illustrate this point, in 2020, 36 entities selected at least one of the four

⁵ The Walikale case (also called “Sheka case”) is one of the “priority cases” identified by the military justice system in the North Kivu province of the DRC and endorsed by the national government in 2016. It relates to a series of attacks carried out in the Walikale territory from 30 July to 2 August 2010 by the armed group Mayi Mayi Sheka, along with other armed groups, to punish local populations accused of collaborating with Congolese government forces. In the course of these attacks, more than two hundred women and girls were sexually abused, children were raped and abducted, subjected to forced labour and to cruel, inhumane or degrading treatment (SGBV Programme, Sixth progress and final report, 30 April 2020).

gender-specific results. Sixteen entities (11 field presences and 5 HQ units) selected thematic result A3. The majority pursued activities related to the prosecution of gender-based crimes, and the development of legal and policy frameworks to promote women's rights and protect them from GBV. The majority of these field presences reported good progress in their end of the year reports.

What is the added value of the Programme for UN strategies dealing with SGBV?

A wide variety of UN and non-UN entities work on SGBV issues, including CRSV. OHCHR's mandate and activities complement these initiatives. The availability of SGBV dedicated staff within OHCHR has fostered its contribution and engagement. Evidence collected by the evaluation team from inside and outside of the UN systematically pointed to the important added value of the SGBV Programme for UN strategies and policy development, especially on CRSV. A particular close and fruitful collaboration has developed with the Team of Experts on CRSV, where OHCHR has a representative who has ensured consistent and productive cooperation.

OHCHR is the only UN agency with a mandate to monitor and carry out case-based investigations of SGBV and other violations. OHCHR investigative know-how and extensive field experience allow the SGBV team to advance practical methodologies to monitor SGBV within the UN. The Team elaborated specific tools (such as the document *Integrating a Gender Perspective into Human Rights Investigations: Guidance and Practice*) and actively participated in the drafting of others, such as the UN Policy on CRSV, the Handbook for United Nations Field Missions on Preventing and Responding to Conflict-Related Sexual Violence, and several METS tools. These tools are instrumental to ensure consistency in approach throughout UN or UN-mandated investigative bodies. Furthermore, the SGBV Team's expertise in SGBV monitoring and reporting, derived from OHCHR's direct engagement with SGBV cases and victims, have brought an added value to CoI and FFMs. Further, the SGBV Team has taken advantage of OHCHR's broad mandate to expand its work beyond CRSV, and complement the work of other UN entities with more restrictive mandates (such as the ToE).

OHCHR brings a human rights lens that other UN entities working on SGBV do not necessarily have. Concretely, during inter-agency discussions, the SGBV Team brought human rights perspectives and analysis that were seen as important added value to other agencies' mandates and experiences (sometimes more focused on provision of services, gender awareness-raising, women empowerment or anti-discrimination activities).

Further, OHCHR secretariat role for the Human Rights Council (HRC), Special Procedures and Treaty Bodies also ensures that UN initiatives are in tune with the latest developments of international human rights law. Stakeholders argued that the SGBV team ensures "the law in the making," and makes sure that the legal understanding of the phenomenon is constantly updated. The SGBV Team's expert knowledge of international human rights law has complemented the contributions of the other agencies. For example, several respondents pointed out that the SGBV Team contributed to clarify the language used in documents, refine

key concepts, and give them concrete meaning. Examples were given of concepts such as “victims-centered,” “reparations,” or “protection,” words that were not necessarily translated into real practice. Stakeholders also voiced that, in the Monitoring, Analysis and Reporting Arrangements (MARA) framework, the SGBV Team’s intervention led to a more nuanced text and more detailed understanding of the notion of “monitoring.” The SGBV Team was even referred to as “the locus of substantive knowledge.”

The SGBV Programme also contributes to global public awareness on SGBV through its consistent support of public statements by the High Commissioner (HC). The evaluation concluded that the public voice of the HC is an extremely useful advocacy tool for the entire UN system. The SGBV Team worked with Desk Officers, colleagues in the field presences and others to ensure that the HC’s statements during missions and on other occasions drew attention to SGBV situations of particular concern to the UN, including on situations in Guatemala, Somalia and, more recently, on the issue of draconian punishments for rape in Nigeria and Bangladesh (15 October 2020).

The SGBV Programme’s consistent work has substantially strengthened UN (HRC, UN General Assembly, Secretary General - SG) mandated Col /FFM. Clear contributions include:

- ensuring that Col/FFMs’ mandates include SGBV issues;
- promoting the inclusion of gender advisors in the Col/FFMs;
- shaping the terms of reference for the gender advisors, and making sure they are tailored to the country context;
- supporting Gender Advisers/SGBV investigators once deployed through constant advice;
- providing guidance materials, training and inputs to draft reports.

The Programme has witnessed and is to some degree, facilitating the implementation of the SG’s “consolidation of protection functions” into Human Rights components of UN Field Missions. Several current and former SWPAs interviewed by the evaluation team expressed their concerns about CRSV losing priority in the new institutional setting (SWPAs now lead a CRSV unit within human rights components and report to the Head of that component, rather than directly to the Mission leadership). However, they saw the SGBV Team as an important ally inside OHCHR, which helped them keep the necessary focus on CRSV in the new context of competing human rights priorities within the human rights components.

Were the relevant global and local stakeholders, strategies and policy frameworks consulted during the planning process?

Interviews with the SGBV Team confirm that it is very familiar with other stakeholders’ SGBV strategies as well as the global policy frameworks on SGBV and CRSV, and that these frameworks were considered when designing and updating the OHCHR SGBV Programme plans.

In order to ensure coordination, avoid duplication of tasks, identify gaps and complementarities, the SGBV team initiated its tasks in July 2017 by organizing extensive consultation with a wide variety of stakeholders, within and outside the UN.⁶ According to the SGBV Programme's first progress report, during a first round of consultations, the Team turned to colleagues in OHCHR Geneva, New York and in the field, including Peace Missions Support, Rule of Law, Methodology, Education and Training, Emergency Response, geographic desks, human rights components of peace operations. The team also consulted the Department of Peace Operations (DPO), the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict, the Team of Experts on the Rule of Law/Sexual Violence in Conflict (OSRG-SVC) and UN Action. A special effort was made to reach out to Women Protection Advisors (WPAs), and conflict-related sexual violence focal points within human rights components of peace operations as well as to gender advisors of Col/FFM, including the ones for Burundi, Myanmar and Syria. The few persons the evaluation team could find who are still in the entities consulted testified to the efforts made to consult with relevant stakeholders.

In addition, all along the development of the SGBV Programme, the team has maintained a constant dialogue with key UN and non-UN partners to ensure the adequacy of its strategies and to tailor it to new realities. At the local level, the Team relies on information provided by OHCHR field presences. In some cases, the SGBV team visited key countries to conduct first-hand consultation. For example, a visit to CAR allowed for contact with local stakeholders and ensured coordination between the Human Rights Division and the SWPA.

In order for OHCHR's efforts to clearly add value to on-going UN (and non-UN) SGBV efforts, how relevant were the selection of Programme results and activities?

Over the last three and a half years, the SGBV Programme has carried out many activities relevant for its purpose but not necessarily based on a consistent and well-organized result pathway. The initial planning document was formulated based on WHRGS' previous work and a realistic view of the kind of SGBV activities two staff could carry out.⁷ Then, when the team was in place, from July 2017, the first annual work plan was quickly produced, at the same time as the first activities were executed. It seems that very little time was left to conduct strategic planning, examine options and strategize around the Programme as such, including conducting a thorough analysis of the contexts, drivers and opportunities for change.

The main stakeholders are identified from the beginning: Department of Peace Operations (DPO), Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (DPPA), OSRG-SVC (considered partners); in the field: WPAs and human rights components of Peace Missions, ColS and FFM's and OHCHR field presences (as beneficiaries/field partners). The evaluation team was however surprised to not find a reference to, or obvious point of cooperation with, the SGBV Sub-Clusters of the Protection Clusters of UN Humanitarian Country Teams. At the global

⁶ See SGBV Programme First Progress report (July – October 2017), p. 3.

⁷ See annex to the April 2017 MoU with the UK FCO

level, the Programme interacted with the humanitarian agencies in the framework of UN Action.

As stated before, the core of its activities (production of methodological material, training, legal analysis, participation in advocacy efforts within the UN, backstopping of field presences, report reviewing) is relevant to achieve the defined outcomes. However, the systematic reading of the initial and subsequent planning documents leads to the following observations:

- The Programme could only be properly understood if not considered as a stand-alone strategy, but as an initiative enshrined within WRHGS overarching work plan. The overarching goals of the Programme are difficult to precisely apprehend. There seem to be a disconnect between the theory of change presented in the Three Years Strategy and the actual Programme activities. In fact, the theory of change concentrates its analysis on national legal frameworks and responses by national justice systems. It also focuses on transitional justice processes. However, the Programme outcomes do largely not address these aspects, and therefore do not respond coherently to the theory of change analysis.
- The constant changes in the planning denotes hesitations as to the preferred intervention pathway. Annex Four summarizes the four work plans established since July 2017. It underlines (in yellow) areas where changes occurred over time. The only outcome (also referred to as “Priorities” in the Work Plans and “Objectives” in the Programme Proposal) that did not change is outcome 4. The ever evolving wording of the outcomes is also reflected in how they are referred to in reports, especially in the final report of the Programme’s first phase.

The SGBV team reports that the implementation of the Programme “required constant assessment, flexibility and redesign of planned activities while keeping the Programme’s priorities unchanged and aligned with OHCHR’s overall goals and thematic priorities.”⁸ It is true that, over its implementation, the contours of SGBV Programme have become more precise. The SGBV team has acquired a better understanding of OHCHR’s added value, and how it could intervene more effectively. Therefore, the first years of the intervention could be seen as an inception phase. The assertion that priorities remain the same all along is more debatable. It seems for example that Outcomes 2 and 3 have seen substantive changes, not only in terms of wording but in terms of strategy.

2.2 Effectiveness

Overall, the evaluation team received information indicating that most of the Programme activities were reasonably effective. Clear achievements can be pointed to under each of the expected results, as discussed below. This was possible despite the reliance on only two staff, and thanks to the widely recognized expertise of the Team and its clear commitment to the issue and the Programme.

⁸ SGBV Programme, Sixth progress and final report, 30 April 2020, p.6.

What clear indication of positive results obtained by the Programme can be found? To what extent were planned results under the four priorities of the Programme's strategy actually achieved?

As discussed in the relevance section, Outcomes 2, 3 and 4 are broadly drafted and the first two have been modified during the Programme period. Furthermore, the defined results should be a reflection of what a two-person team could realistically achieve in three years. A clear example is Outcome 2: "prevention and protection responses to conflict-related sexual violence are enhanced in all peace missions". Its unspecific wording renders it challenging to fully understand what exactly the Programme intends to achieve and how. The same could be said for Outcome 3 and 4. Their unrealistic ambitions (reflected in wordings such as "in all peace missions", "by OHCHR field presences and their partners" "the UN system and other stakeholders") provide an unrealistic framework against which to evaluate the results.

It is therefore difficult to categorically conclude that the four outcomes were completely achieved or not achieved. To assess effectiveness towards the originally planned results, the Evaluation Team has tried to make use of the Programme indicators. However, the indicators relate to the activities and outputs, more than to the results, and have been continuously modified from one work plan to another. The Programme regularly reports to the UK on the results of the activities, but falls short in its analysis of progress towards the outcomes.

This "flexibility" of the Programme, its activities and indicators, can of course be seen as an operational strength, but it makes it difficult to categorically respond to the evaluation question above. Rather, the evaluation team can conclude that it has received clear indications that significant activities have been successfully implemented under each of the four Outcomes.⁹ This finding will be further developed and evidenced below, using examples of effective activities.

Result No 1: Quality investigations and reporting of sexual and gender-based violence produced by OHCHR field presences, including human rights components of peace operations, and international investigative bodies supported by OHCHR

Production of tools and guidance materials

As a way to promote "coherent and consistent monitoring and investigation methodologies across UN Missions,"¹⁰ the SGBV Team has produced or actively participated in the drafting of useful tools on SGBV monitoring and reporting.

One of the Programme's strategic achievements is the production of practical materials for field presence staff. The SGBV Team produced a document entitled "*Integrating a Gender*

⁹ In the effectiveness analysis, the evaluation team is using the four Outcomes as phrased and listed in the evaluation ToR and in the original Programme Proposal.

¹⁰ SGBV Programme AWP, Output I.a.

Perspective into Human Rights Investigations: Guidance and Practice”, which they refer to as their “flagship tool”. The document, translated into French, Spanish and Arabic, has been appraised very positively by partners: one of the respondents described it as a “fantastic publication.” Others cited it as one of the SGBV Programme’s significant results. SGBV stakeholders also found it useful for their own work. The Guidance is aimed at filling methodological gaps, unifying procedures and approaches, and ensuring stronger gender integration and focus on SGBV. Reshaped into training modules, it has served as the basis for the training sessions the SGBV Team has conducted in the field. Even if it is always risky to link a document to concrete changes, it seems clear that the Guidance is a useful tool to improve gender integration and SGBV incorporation into human rights monitoring and reporting.

The Team also actively participated in the drafting of the **“Handbook for United Nations Field Missions on Preventing and Responding to Conflict-Related Sexual Violence.”** According to respondents, the SGBV Team contributed very positively to the process by drafting texts (for example on definitions, guiding principles related to CRSV or the MARA) and carefully reviewing other’s drafts. “They brought substance and expertise,” testified a respondent directly involved in the drafting process. That was only possibly because of the dedicated SGBV capacity OHCHR now has, according to the same informant.

Since 2017, the SGBV Team is working on the production of a toolkit on sexual and gender-based violence. The toolkit will be divided into three parts: (1) documentation, analysis and reporting on sexual violence; (2) protection of victims of sexual and gender-based violence; and (3) strategic litigation of sexual and gender-based violence crimes. According to the Programme’s last report, the first component is in its last phase, while the Team is finalizing the draft of the other two parts.¹¹

The production of practical guidance, toolkits and lessons learned documents on SGBV monitoring, reporting or litigation are very useful for OHCHR and other UN field staff. These documents undoubtedly fill a methodological gap within the UN. Therefore, they are rightly placed at the core of the SGBV Programme. The production of the Guidance offers an example of the concrete contribution such materials have in the field. However, there are two main challenges that should be kept in mind: (1) the writing of such material is time- and resource-consuming (as the long process of the toolkit drafting demonstrates); (2) they are only useful if a strategy is put into place to ensure that staff know and apply them.

Support to investigative SGBV capacity in Col/FFMs

To identify evidence of the Programme’s effectiveness in relation to Col/FFMs, the Evaluation Team talked to several stakeholders from different involved organizations and OHCHR units, as well as current and former Col/FFMs Gender Advisers. They unanimously confirmed the positive impact of the Programme’s involvement in efforts to provide experienced and skilled Gender Advisers to Col/FFMs.

¹¹ SGBV Programme, First Progress Report, 1 April 2020 – 16 October 2020, p.6.

The Programme has been credited for its advocacy efforts to include SGBV in the mandate of the UN-backed investigative entities, and to ensure that specialized gender positions be included within the teams. The Programme also joined on-going recruitment efforts conducted by Justice Rapid Response (JRR) and UN Women and was able to add thematic expertise to the process by contributing to the standard start-up workshops designed to develop the investigation plan for each Col/FFM, a critical moment to ensure sufficient attention to SGBV in the investigations. In addition, the SGBV Team has been engaging the recruited Gender Advisers and often the entire Secretariat of a given Col/FFM in training on SGBV investigations. For this purpose, the Programme's flag-ship publication was used: "Integrating a Gender Perspective into Human Rights Investigations".

OHCHR's immediate counterparts in this process credit the SGBV Programme with the establishment of a "Community of Practice" made up of the deployed Gender Advisers/SGBV investigators. This Community was brought together to a round-table organized by the Programme, but mostly meets through webinars every 4-5 months. The most recent webinar disseminated and discussed the findings of FFM Myanmar's thematic SGBV report. The Programme stays in touch with the Gender Advisers through-out the mandate of the Col/FFM and the individual Advisers are strengthened in their SGBV capacity through the trainings and the systematization of best practices pursued by the Programme. This is how one Gender Adviser interviewed by the evaluation team summarized her positive experience with the SGBV Programme: "Don't think I could have done the job without the SGBV Team. Their contribution has been essential, absolutely crucial".¹²

SGBV Programme's qualitative and quantitative impact on the SGBV content in Col/FMM and OHCHR field presence reports

The evaluation team has reviewed a number of Col/FFM reports to assess the SGBV content. It effectively found important SGBV content in many of them (e.g. Myanmar, Yemen, South Sudan and Burundi). It also identified thematic SGBV reports from Col/FFM and field presences that have received input from Programme-trained Gender Advisers, or directly from the SGBV Team.

It is always difficult to prove causality between activities and outputs, but the evaluation team feels fairly confident that for example the reports produced by the Col on Syria have benefitted from the guidance and training of the SGBV Team. In May 2019, the SGBV Team facilitated a 1 1/2 day training on gender integration for the Secretariat staff of the Col on Syria. One of the main arguments made at the training was that the integration of a gender perspective does not only mean reporting on sexual violence. The SGBV Team used as an example an earlier Col report on the siege of Ghouta, where the Col only addressed women's roles as mothers, to illustrate the multiple gender dimensions of the conflict. The training and the ongoing support provided to the gender adviser, contributed to the inclusion of a new section in sub-sequent Col Syria reports called "gendered impact".¹³ The first one was published just months after the training. This inclusion of gender and SGBV has continued.

¹² Interview with a Col Gender Adviser.

¹³ See for example A/HRC/44/61 from 2 July 2020

The Col Syria's latest report from 14 August 2020 contains a section on SGBV and a separate SGBV recommendation.

Interviews with SWPAs and others also provided clear indication of the importance of the SGBV Programme support to report writing in the field presences. For example, a recent report on Access to Health for Survivors of Conflict-Related Sexual Violence in South Sudan (2020) went back and forth between the SGBV Team in Geneva and the Human Rights Division in Juba 4 or 5 times before taking its final shape. Also, field staff in Juba praised the SGBV Team's efforts to connect them to entities working on reproductive health at the global level and with follow-up to implementation of the report recommendations.

In another example, colleagues in Iraq responsible for the gathering of information for the SG's annual report on CRSV received useful advice from the SGBV Team on how to conceptually link "survival sex" to the conflict and include it in the inputs to the SG's report.

Result No 2: Prevention and protection responses to conflict-related sexual violence are enhanced in all peace missions

Specialized training of SWPA/WPAs

The design and facilitation of specialized SGBV trainings and briefings has been one of the Programme's most appreciated components. An impressive total number of 25 trainings and briefings have been implemented. The specialized trainings for SWPA/WPAs/field presences often filled a gap in their professional experience as several of them do not come from a traditional human rights background and did not have extensive monitoring and reporting experience.

Training participants who the evaluation team spoke to particularly appreciated how the trainings were tailored to the local context and the needs of the trainees. One SWPA expressed how the training "made a huge difference in the way she conducted monitoring". In general, stakeholders praised the quality of the trainings, both the preparation of the trainers and the design of the sessions, as well as the useful materials distributed. Based on the interviews and the review of the materials, the evaluation team has received a clear indication that this activity had a very positive effect on its intended beneficiaries, including in South Sudan and DRC.

Development of new UN policy on CRSV

The SGBV Team led OHCHR's involvement in the drafting of the new UN Policy on CRSV and dedicated substantial time to this important task during several years. It was finally signed by the heads of DPO, Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (DPPA), the SRSG-SVC and the High Commissioner for Human Rights at the end of 2019. The Policy was followed by the development of the "Handbook for UN Field Missions on Preventing and Responding to CRSV" (2020), which provides guidance on the highly complex implementation of the Policy.

The evaluation team interviewed staff from different agencies involved in the Policy and the Handbook and reviewed both documents in order to assess the Programme's contribution. It is clear from the progress reports and the interviews that substantial Programme resources were invested in these drafting processes. Also, initial resistance (unspoken) from other agencies to active and assertive OHCHR involvement in the processes reportedly had to be overcome.

From the mentioned sources, the evaluation team has received clear indication that the SGBV Team effectively influenced and shaped both the Policy and the Handbook in a very positive and (eventually) appreciated way. All UN staff have an obligation to promote and mainstream human rights into their work, but without the OHCHR SGBV Team's participation in these processes the human rights perspective could easily have been lost. As one strategically placed interviewee said: "The human rights aspects of CRSV may not have come across so well, it would have been considered only as gender issue, or peace and security issue."

For example, the SGBV Team brought a broader understanding of the causes of gender-based violence in general and made the links between gender equality, women's empowerment and sustainable efforts to prevent and respond to CRSV.¹⁴ It further promoted the victim-centered approach through-out the documents and ensured that international human rights law was appropriately included and used. In addition to multiple strategic written inputs, it drafted the chapters in the Handbook devoted to unpacking the guiding principles for the implementation of the Security Council mandate, including a victim/survivor-centered approach, confidentiality, informed consent, gender perspective, as well as those related to monitoring and reporting on CRSV.

Result No 3: SGBV and a gender perspective are better integrated in activities undertaken by OHCHR field presences

Working through implementing partners in CAR and DRC

The UK FCO was reportedly keen to see the inclusion of activities with concrete and tangible outcomes, such as the shelter for SGBV victims in Bangui, Central African Republic (CAR), and the support to the prosecution of SGBV perpetrators in Goma, in the North Kivu region of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Both these activities seem to have had positive outcomes.

However, based on interviews with UN staff on the ground, it is less obvious that they "clearly add value to on-going UN (and non-UN) SGBV efforts" (Evaluation Question). It was pointed out that with such large peace missions in place in DRC and CAR, the very limited amounts transferred from the Programme to implementing partners in DRC (USD 60.000) and CAR (USD 40.000) might not have had a huge added value while potentially constituting an administrative distraction for the Programme in Geneva, particularly as United Nations Organizations Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUSCO) Justice Support Section was already involved in support to the prosecution process in Goma.

¹⁴ See for example par.13 of the UN Policy on CRSV (*United Nations Field Missions: Preventing and responding to Conflict-Related Sexual Violence*, 1 January 2020)

Also, in the Walikale case, in addition to the three SGBV Programme funded lawyers (through TRIAL), the American Bar Association and Avocats Sans Frontières funded five lawyers, making up a team of eight lawyers representing the victims.

The evaluation team was not able to assess the full impact of these initiatives. However, reactions from some respondents make it worth reflecting on the merits of funding small SGBV activities directly from Geneva when large UN peace mission and international NGOs are present and active on the ground.

SGBV training in the Gender Accreditation Programme¹⁵

The Gender Accreditation Programme was designed, piloted and rolled-out by the WHRGS cluster on gender integration and it relies on the SGBV Programme for support to the SGBV part of the accreditation process. External SGBV consultants have also been used, but they are not WHRGS' preferred option as they are not necessarily familiar with human rights monitoring and reporting methodologies. The cooperation started in 2019 when the programme launched the pilot phase. The SGBV team supported the OHCHR country office in Cambodia (focus on judicial stereotypes and SGBV in monitoring work) and OHCHR OPT (focus on integrating gender in monitoring, GBV in private sphere and gender-related killings).

The evaluation team spoke to OHCHR staff involved in the Gender Accreditation Programme, both in Geneva and in a participating field office. They expressed great appreciation for the high quality of the trainings delivered. The training conducted with staff in the OPT Office this year had to be delivered on-line, but evidence collected do not point to lowered effectiveness of the activity due to the on-line modality. A survey of participants showed though that they would have liked even further use of case scenarios.

The Gender Accreditation Programme is part of OHCHR's Organisational Effectiveness Action Plan on Diversity and Gender, and as such, an important priority for the OMP, with on-going interest from senior management. Given the important contribution of the SGBV Programme to the Gender Accreditation Programme, it is fair to say that in this respect the SGBV Programme constitutes a substantial added value to the OMP.

Backstopping field presences and other SGBV desk functions

So called "backstopping" of field offices is included under several results in the Programme work plans. It is referred to as the provision of specialized SGBV and gender expertise, as well as support to implementation of SGBV projects and initiatives by OHCHR field presences (stand-alone OHCHR offices or components of peace operations, i.e. Result No 2 and 3).

Closely related to this, the Programme initiated what members of the team referred to as the "SGBV Desk Function" (i.e. SGBV Team members responding to a wide variety of ad hoc SGBV support requests from other sections and field presences, a function previously *de facto* divided among several clusters in WHRGS). They described how it developed as a result of the Team holding a number of meetings with other OHCHR Geneva sections to introduce

¹⁵ The Gender Accreditation Programme is part of the new OHCHR Organization Effectiveness Action Plan on Diversity and Gender 2018-21 (OEAP DG), and also one of the commitments of High Commissioner Bachelet as International Geneva Champion.

the Programme and invite colleagues to engage with them on SGBV issues. This generated a substantial demand for SGBV support from field and HQ colleagues, and an increase of the internal day-to-day requests on everything from classification of SGBV crimes to report drafting support, some relevant to Programme activities, others not. Soon, team members spent more than 20% of their time on the desk function and they had to become more restrictive with what kind of requests they could respond to as their response-capacity was getting overwhelmed.¹⁶

As the SGBV Team often puts it in the progress reports: they were “victims of their own success” and subject to “a reality that the team cannot control.”¹⁷ It is true that if the SGBV activities should be considered a permanent thematic function within WHRGS, then staff have to try to respond as best as they can to all requests from field and HQ units. However, as a time and resource-limited programme, it would have been acceptable (even recommendable) to set limits, as part of the planning process, to for example how many Col/FFMs, field presences or Gender Accreditation processes could realistically be supported.

Result No 4: The UN system and other stakeholders are better able to promote access to justice for victims of SGBV in a coordinated, rights-based and effective manner

Lessons-learned workshops and publications

After reviewing the reports and speaking to participants and organizers of the two workshops on “Protection of victims of sexual violence” and “Strategic litigation for sexual and gender-based violence,” the evaluation team could better appreciate how these workshops and lessons-learned documents could actually facilitate access to justice for victims of SGBV. Stakeholders pointed out that they were not ordinary workshops, but meticulously planned and prepared activities with clear outputs.

Most importantly, substantial preparatory work was invested in desk research and phone interviews with practitioners from civil society and from within the UN system at headquarters and in the field. For the workshop on Protection of victims of sexual violence, over 40 civil society representatives and UN experts in the fields of accountability, protection of victims and witnesses of sexual violence were interviewed by email and phone. Through a preliminary mapping of the different field level interventions, the SGBV Team selected 25 participants for that workshop from a variety of institutional and regional backgrounds, with direct experience in the protection of victims of sexual violence, specifically in conflict and post-conflict contexts. Experience from countries such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guatemala, Kosovo, Libya, Mali, Uganda, Ukraine, Somalia, South Sudan and Sri Lanka enriched the discussion and the workshop outcome document.

The workshop on Strategic litigation for sexual and gender-based violence included similar preparatory work and brought together 29 participants from a variety of institutional and

¹⁶ Interviews with SGBV Team members.

¹⁷ See for example SGBV Programme Progress Report p.6, 30 April 2020

regional backgrounds, with direct experience in designing and implementing strategic SGBV litigation, specifically in conflict and post-conflict contexts.

The evaluation team therefore finds that both workshop outputs, captured in the workshop reports and forthcoming lessons-learned documents, constitute important tools for UN and other stakeholders' promotion of SGBV victims' access to justice.

Where positive (expected or unexpected) results of the Programme were found, what were the enabling factors and processes? What lessons have been learned?

The many positive results identified by the evaluation team can often be linked to a qualitative approach rather than a quantitative one. The scope of the Programme activities are not always extensive, but the thematic expertise offered seems to be a factor commonly highlighted by stakeholders as a key to success. This applies, for example, to the contributions to the UN Policy on CRSV, the Handbook and other publications, the SGBV trainings and the input to draft reports.

Secondly, the evidence collected testify to the SGBV Team's professionalism in its interaction with beneficiaries of the Programme. This took different expressions, including a general openness and listening capacity that allowed for tailoring of the activities to different contexts, but also an appreciated availability to promptly respond to requests, despite the limited staff capacity.

From this we can learn that thematic expertise and professionalism in the interaction with counterparts go a long way towards successful implementation of activities.

In case some planned results haven't been accomplished, what prevented the Programme from achieving them? What lessons can be drawn?

A very small number of activities do not seem to have been fully accomplished for different reasons. Programme staff and other interviewees have explained the sometimes complex reasons that prevented them from achieving planned results. As mentioned in the periodic Programme reports, the planned activities on reparations for SGBV victims in Sri Lanka and the project on contextualization of early-warning indicators in Somalia were not completed. It is likely that several factors influenced the lack of complete results, but based on detailed interviews with the stakeholders, the evaluation team has received clear indication that insufficient ownership of these activities on behalf of key field colleagues is at least partially to blame.

Lessons can be learned from that experience, including the need to anchor the activities repeatedly and comprehensively with all field colleagues involved (or to become involved). Additionally, activities and expected results should also be fully supported by Heads of field presences, who can then be expected to follow up and move things forward when there is turn-over of staff or lack of interest from new staff.

2.3 Efficiency

Based on feedback from counterparts and beneficiaries, the evaluation team has the impression Programme staff have carried out their responsibilities efficiently. They have communicated, coordinated and efficiently worked together with relevant colleagues within OHCHR and in other UN agencies. However, the ambitious scope of the Programme in relation to available human resources, and a tendency to often “seize opportunities”, seem to have spread efforts very thinly. This was not helped by the need to respond to a wide variety of ad hoc SGBV support requests from other OHCHR sections and field presences.

Have the organizational and management arrangements used for the Programme efficiently serviced the achievement of planned results and activities?

Thanks to the UK funded SGBV Programme, the dedicated capacity of WHRGS to work on SGBV went from zero to two staff positions, which substantially raised the ambition level for this area of work. However, many informants, including the SGBV Team, describe how despite the increase, the new staff capacity did not match the ambitious Programme. At times, this led to what one source referred to as a “fire-fighter modus operandi”. It has been suggested that a better balance was needed between seizing opportunities to make a difference and strategically prioritizing activities within available staff resources.

The “SGBV Desk Function” established by the SGBV Team has been very well received by OHCHR colleagues, but is not an organizational arrangement contemplated by the Programme Proposal. As this function came to occupy more than 20% of the SGBV Team’s time¹⁸, and is not exclusively directed at meeting the four results, it could be argued that efficiency towards the Programme results was not served by this arrangement. However, those ad hoc support activities might have been crucial for advancing the SGBV agenda in other OHCHR sections and field presences, which can explain why a member of the SGBV Team points to the “Desk Function” as the second most important result of the Programme.¹⁹

How has been the communication and coordination among the SGBV team, the country/regional offices, and other units within OHCHR headquarters in terms of programmatic, financial and administrative issues?

In interviews with evaluation informants, the SGBV Team has been systematically praised for its communication and coordination efforts with other units and offices. The members of the Team, despite their limited capacity, have been pro-actively reaching out to colleagues and counterparts and have been very responsive to requests, according to interviewees. At an early point, the SGBV Team reviewed field presences’ annual work plans for SGBV relevant activities and contacted offices where Programme activities could be required and/or suggested.

¹⁸ Interviews with SGBV Team members.

¹⁹ Interviews with SGBV Team members.

For example, the SGBV Programme's engagement with the field presence in South Sudan was highly praised, both in terms of its substantial content and the communication process. SGBV Team members were seen as responsive to requests and suggestions from the field.

Unfortunately, this does not seem to apply to the financial and administrative issues. Interviewees from the South Sudan field presence appreciated the SGBV Team's offer to pay for trainings and even a local CRSV consultant/mentor to be embedded in the army, but the OHCHR Geneva's financial and administrative hurdles were too cumbersome for the Human rights Division of United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) to accept the funding.

Similarly, a USD 20.000 project to develop early warning indicators in Somalia was approved in Geneva but the transfer of the funds from Geneva to Somalia became a huge administrative problem that delayed the one-year project by 4-5 months, according to field staff in the United Nations Assistance Mission in Somalia (UNSOM). In Sri Lanka, the SGBV Programme wanted to fund a national survey of SGBV victims/survivors' expectation on reparations but, in the end, it became too complicated administratively so the funding was taken from the Peace Building Fund.²⁰ It goes beyond the scope of this evaluation to research and identify the precise administrative and financial stumbling blocks encountered by the Programme and its counterparts in the field. Suffice to convey the above challenges reported from Sri Lanka, South Sudan and Somalia.

What have been the roles of stakeholders, partners or other UN agencies in the achievement of results? What has been the strategy and methodology used to work together, communicate and disseminate results among them?

Several of the Programme activities were carried out jointly with other agencies, particularly the drafting of the UN Policy on CRSV and the Handbook on CRSV. OHCHR was not the lead agency in neither of those two processes but the SGBV Programme contributed substantially, particularly by ensuring that the Policy and the Handbook are based on a human rights and victim-centered approach.

The SGBV Team also co-facilitated training for S/WPAs together with DPO, DPPA, O/SRSG-SVC and ToE, during which OHCHR's unique expertise on methodologies for documenting and analyzing CRSV contributed substantially. Other joint activities with the mentioned counterparts include thematic discussions with S/WPAs on how to best mainstream CRSV across peace operations (September 2020).

OHCHR also played an important role by summarizing and disseminating SGBV reports produced by Col/FFMs and field presences through media statements on its website, including on Myanmar and South Sudan.

A few activities were carried out by implementing partners of the SGBV Programme, including national and international NGOs operating locally in CAR and in DRC.

²⁰ Interview with OHCHR staff.

2.4 Impact Orientation

To what extent is the Programme making a significant contribution to broader and long-term prevention and responses to SGBV? Or, how likely is it that it will eventually make this contribution? Is the Programme's strategy and management steering towards impact?

It is maybe too premature to assess the impact of the SGBV Programme, if impact is understood as “higher-order effects and broader changes to which an intervention may be contributing to.”²¹ It will take more than three years to see SGBV Programme's potentially transformative effects. However, some of its concrete interventions are geared towards long-term contribution to prevention and responses to SGBV.

In terms of normative changes, the SGBV Programme's substantive contribution to the UN Policy is a key advancement towards a more systematic approach of the UN in that matter. It will clearly have a long-term impact on the UN's efforts to address the SGBV for many years to come. In this regard, the Programme has contributed to broader and long-term prevention and responses to SGBV. The extent of OHCHR's participation in its implementation and monitoring will determine the impact of its intervention. However, it is noteworthy that the work on the policy was not part of the early planning, but was included thanks to what the SGBV Team refers to as the “flexibility of the Programme”.

The SGBV Team has obtained concrete results with UN-mandated investigative Col/FFMs. It developed an integrated strategy that has encompassed steps from the drafting of the mandates to the production of the reports. The SGBV Team has worked to ensure that their mandates systematically include SGBV issues, has participated in the selection of their gender experts, has trained their secretariat staff on SGBV monitoring and reporting, and has worked closely with the gender experts in the drafting of the reports. As the result of this integrated strategy, Cols and FFMs report more systematically on SGBV, and thematic reports have been produced on SGBV. All these activities have created a precedent around the mandate, design, composition and reporting by Col/FFMs that is likely to have a long-term impact on how Col/FFMs include a gender perspective and address SGBV. Further, the elaboration of training materials and tools, the sharing of good practices and experiences with practitioners are also interesting strategies for longer-term impact.

Other Programme activities were *per se* appreciated by interviewees but cannot be described as seeking broad and long-term impact. These activities include e.g. the support to a shelter for SGBV victims in CAR. It was unclear to stakeholders why OHCHR Geneva would have a comparative advantage to support the remodeling and operation of a shelter for a very limited number of SGBV victims in Bangui, an activity that might be more appropriate for an operational international NGO present on the ground.²² On the other hand, some respondents found the initiative strategic, although limited in time and scope, as a showcase

²¹ OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation, Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use, 2019, p.9.

²² The SGBV Programme progress reports cite a shelter capacity of 15 victims/survivors. The one-year shelter project had a USD40.000 budget.

of what is required to enhance access to justice for victims of sexual violence. They were confident that other donors would follow the example.

In another example, the conceptual idea of working on early-warning indicators is welcome by stakeholders but the scope of the activity is rather unambitious: only one peace operation was selected. It does not help that this particular activity (Somalia) was never completed. Similarly, under Result 3, the Programme commits to work with “at least one OHCHR Field Presence,” which might be an ambition level that falls short of impact, given that OHCHR has a total of 66 field presences.

These are not marginal activities of the Programme. Under Result 2 (“Prevention and protection responses to CRSV are enhanced in all peace missions”) the intention to adapt early warning indicators to local contexts is one output out of only three identified under that result. Similarly, the support to a shelter for 15 victims/survivors in Bangui is reported under “Key Achievements and Impact” in the Programme’s final report.

The analysis of the overall impact orientation of the Programme therefore renders a mixed result: some important activities clearly aim towards long-term impact while others might be less ambitiously designed.

It is fundamental that, if the SGBV Programme wants to achieve long-term results, it focuses its strategy differently, and envisions activities that could guarantee transformative effects. For example, training exercises are definitely useful and required. However, a two-person team cannot obtain long-term results conducting a few training sessions per year. Other methods should be explored with a longer-term result spectrum.

2.5 Sustainability

Several of the most important outputs of the Programme are likely to have a continued impact over the years, including the UN Policy and Handbook on SGBV as well as lessons-learned products and other tools produced by the Programme. Internally, among OHCHR staff and management, the SGBV Programme has developed increased awareness (as well as knowledge and skills) and a stronger commitment to a dedicated and permanent OHCHR capacity to address SGBV.

Are the results, achievements and benefits of the Programme likely to be durable?

Some of the Programme methods are geared towards sustainability of the results (training manuals, staff training, advocacy for UN action, etc.) but has not yet been able to ensure that durability. The sustainability of the achievements will vary from one activity to another. For example, many interlocutors argued that the publications produced by the Programme will effectively guide practitioners for a long time to come. This was particularly the judgment made regarding the guide on “Integrating a Gender Perspective into Human Rights Investigations” and the two lessons-learned products under Result No 4. Further, the now approved and signed UN Policy on CRSV which the Programme contributed substantially to

is seen by most interviewees as a framework that will guide UN action in this area for the foreseeable future.

Are the stakeholders willing and committed to continue working on the SGBV issues addressed by the Programme? How effectively has the Programme built ownership?

Ownership of the Programme at the field level seems to be a challenge due to several factors. While several of the SWPAs contacted by the evaluation team were very appreciative of the Programme activities and will continue to pursue similar activities in the framework of their own work plans, they did not necessarily commit to continue the activities (such as the Shelter in Bangui or the support to prosecutions in DRC) with their own resources. Sustainability might therefore depend on the availability of continued funding from OHCHR Geneva.

As mentioned in the Programme progress reports, some activities were discontinued because of reduced ownership in a given field location. This might happen because of a change of staff, particularly turn-over of management or SGBV focal points. One OHCHR field staff strongly argued that the Programme needs to be more present in the field, visit more often. The respondent pointed to the fact that she had already received four visits from CRSV staff in New York. The need for, and also the intention of the Programme, was to spend more time in the field, which would likely have had several positive effects, including stronger field ownership of the Programme. Such increased field presence should probably be initiated already during the assessment and planning phase of future Programmes.

Other sustainability issues might be beyond the control of the Programme. For example, the deployment of Gender Advisers/SGBV investigators to Col/FFMs requires external funding, currently covered by UN Women. The evaluation team was told this funding is far from guaranteed and that alternative sources are being explored to ensure sustainability. Positive steps in that direction have been taken by OHCHR through the successful extension of funding for the Gender Advisers in the Col/FFM for Yemen, Venezuela and Burundi through their inclusion in the new PBIs (Programme Budget Implications).²³

Within OHCHR, representatives of the different divisions and sections closely collaborating with the SGBV Programme (FOTCD, Rule of Law, METS, Investigations Support Unit, etc.) express strong support for the Programme in interviews with the evaluation team. They expressed sentiments of ownership in terms of the need for the SGBV Programme, but it is unclear how much of the Programme's work has been/can be incorporated into the standard activities of these units. It is not surprising that Desk Officers for countries highly affected by SGBV see the need for the Programme activities, and support them, but the evaluation concludes that additional training and awareness building might still be necessary for them to fully internalize the issues and further incorporate SGBV in the vital back-stopping they are providing to field presences.

²³ Interview with OHCHR Geneva staff.

At the OHCHR institutional level, senior management, through the Programme and Budget Review Board (PBRB), is sending an important “ownership signal” by deciding that the SGBV activities will from now on fall under the “minimum requirement” budget, in other words, OHCHR will make an effort to possibly continue the SGBV Programme in one form or another.²⁴

2.6 Gender equality integration

Did the Programme plan results that contributed to gender equality (including LGBTI issues)? Were results in the areas of gender equality and women’s rights achieved?

The SGBV Programme is part of WHRGS and integrated into its annual work plans. The Programme is aimed at fostering preventive and protective responses to SGBV. As such, it obviously contributes to gender equality. However, two points should be considered here.

First, opinions are divided as to whether the SGBV Programme should limit its ambition to CRSV or broaden its engagement to all forms of SGBV. Although, the language of the Programme documents appears to encompass SGBV broadly (but with an emphasis on CRSV), a certain disconnect is perceptible between the UK and the WHRGS in this respect. The donor would rather see the Programme focus on CRSV while the SGBV Programme activities are clearly going beyond CRSV. Some respondents agree that SGBV limited resources should concentrate on CRSV, and that concentration would enable to refine the analyses (necessary to be able to sustain a certain level of interlocution) and avoid it to be diluted with other issues. In contrast, others argue that, by doing so, SGBV Programme would overlook serious issues related to SGBV. The answer to this question will depend on the defined strategy and end-goal of the intervention.

Second, the SGBV Programme has expanded its consideration beyond the situation of women, to include a broader gender perspective. Violence against men, boys and LGBTI persons was systematically incorporated in the SGBV Programme publication *Integrating a Gender Perspective into Human Rights: Guidance and Practice* and is being incorporated in the trainings. According to the SGBV team, they have increased their efforts to systematically explore issues related to LGBTI persons and, together with WHRGS LGBTI cluster, carefully examine the language when reviewing field presences, Col or FFM reports. The reports on Myanmar, Venezuela and Yemen include interesting analysis on violence against the LGBTI community.

2.7 Disability inclusion

The OHCHR SGBV Programme does not include activities, outputs or outcomes that are explicitly geared towards disability inclusion, but only marginally tackles the issue. Its guidance (“Integrating a Gender Perspective into Human Rights Investigations”) considers it as a form of discrimination that should be taken into account while analyzing the context of violence

²⁴ Interview with OHCHR Geneva staff.

and gathering information. It also underlines that in conflict or crisis contexts, GBV may result in disabilities.²⁵

Studies however indicate that women with disabilities are sexually assaulted at a rate at least twice that of the general population of women.²⁶ Therefore, a future SGBV Strategy/Programme needs to more systematically incorporate specific and targeted activities aimed at disability inclusion in all areas of operation.

What Programme results could be planned to contribute to disability inclusion?

Future programme results need to address and ensure disability inclusion from two perspectives. Firstly, taking into consideration that disability increases vulnerability to SGBV, and secondly, addressing the special needs of disabled persons that are SGBV victims/survivors:

1) Disability as an increased vulnerability to SGBV

Around 15 percent of any community may constitute persons with disabilities.²⁷ That figure is likely to be higher in communities that have fled conflict or disaster. They may have difficulty accessing State services due to a variety of societal, environmental and communication barriers that increase their protection risks, including to SGBV. For women and girls with disabilities, the intersection of gender inequality and disability makes them especially vulnerable to SGBV. SGBV preventive and protective measures need to fully take into account the increased vulnerability to SGBV of disabled persons.

2) Disabled persons rights and needs as victims/survivors of SGBV

The SGBV Programme should take into account the rights of persons with disabilities when formulating programme results. It should also incorporate results that include needs and rights of persons with disabilities who are victims/survivors of SGBV, in relation to e.g. protection from further harm, access to services, justice and reparation. Taking into account OHCHR's added value, it should consider developing specific work on access to justice. Many barriers prevent persons with disabilities from accessing justice on an equal basis with others, including restrictions on the exercise of legal capacity; lack of physical access to justice facilities; lack of accessible transportation to and from these facilities; obstacles in accessing legal assistance and representation; lack of information in accessible formats; and lack of training for professionals working in the field of justice.²⁸

In a future OHCHR SGBV Strategy/Programme, the following suggested results could contribute to disability inclusion:

²⁵ The increased vulnerability to CRSV of persons with disabilities is also mentioned in the UN Handbook for United Nations Field Missions on Preventing and Responding to Conflict-Related Sexual Violence, which underlines the need for "extra care" while interviewing them. See Handbook, p.119.

²⁶ The Roeher Institute. 2004. "Violence against Women with Disabilities." Ottawa, Public Health Agency of Canada

²⁷ Handbook for parliamentarians on the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. <http://www.un.org/disabilities/default>.

²⁸ International Principles and Guidelines on Access to Justice for Persons with Disabilities, p.6 https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Disability/SR_Disability/GoodPractices/Access-to-Justice-EN.pdf

- Field staff with specific SGBV responsibilities (including Gender Advisers, SWPA, WPA and SGBV focal points) ensures disability inclusion when conducting their monitoring, investigation and reporting activities, and promote the rights of persons with disabilities as victims/survivors of SGBV.
- Through enhanced partnership with organizations of persons with disabilities and other specialized stakeholders, OHCHR increases its knowledge of “barriers to rights” faced by persons with disabilities who are victims/survivors of SGBV.
- OHCHR successfully advocates within the UN for better inclusion of disability rights and needs in policies, programmes and practices to prevent and protect against SGBV.

What strategies relevant to the integration of disability inclusion should be adopted by the Programme?

The main strategy to integrate disability inclusion in the SGBV Programme should consist of further capacity building and awareness raising of OHCHR field staff in coordination with thematic OHCHR Geneva experts. OHCHR staff needs to systematically include disaggregation questions while conducting human rights monitoring. Until recently, systematic collection and analysis of disability statistics has been largely overlooked, despite the data collection requirements called for in the above mentioned guidance, based on the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals.

Today, several useful tools and guidelines relevant to SGBV and disability are available. Many are developed by humanitarian SGBV practitioners, but are often useful also in the human rights field.²⁹ Others have been developed with a clear human rights lens, such as the International Principles and Guidelines on Access to Justice for Persons with Disabilities³⁰ or the OHCHR-endorsed Washington Group Short Set of Questions on Disability, which are designed to identify persons with disabilities and could be incorporated into monitoring methodologies. The SGBV Programme could use them/adapt them in their training materials and sessions. A specific guidance note could also be envisioned to enhance field staff’s understanding and response capacity.

A second strategy could build on an enhanced partnership with organizations of persons with disabilities (OPDs) and other specialized stakeholders. Such partnerships could facilitate OHCHR’s better understanding of the barriers faced by disabled persons, particularly those victims of SGBV (see above). Such enhanced partnerships could also enable further inclusion of disability in OHCHR’s field monitoring, by providing access to important disability networks at the very local level.

²⁹ See for example: The Charter on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action (launched at the World Humanitarian Summit); The GBV and Disability Toolkit (Women’s Refugee Commission and International Rescue Committee)

³⁰ An OHCHR-endorsed practical tool to support States in designing and implementing justice systems that provide equal access to justice for persons with disabilities, in line with international human rights standards. The guidelines are a result of consultations and collaboration with disability rights experts, organizations of people with disabilities, States, academics, and other practitioners.

2.8 Impact of Covid-19

What measures was put in place to overcome the challenges created by Covid-19 for the Programme?

According to the SGBV Team, the implementation of the Programme continued despite the challenges and constraints created by the COVID-19 pandemic. The Team had to adjust its work methods and reshape its training material and methodologies to online sessions, using tools available online to develop interactive sessions. Doing so, it was able to deliver training sessions on CRSV and gender-related killings to South Sudan and OPT field presences. Virtual meetings (through webinars) were organized instead of in-person events, which required adjustments to their formats (for example, the regional lessons learned exercise on SGBV strategic litigation in Latin America).

Due to the impact of the pandemic on GBV, on top of its planned activities, the SGBV Team had to respond to a growing number of requests for substantive support from OHCHR units and field presences, and for collaboration in UN initiatives. For example, the Team participated in the drafting of documents on the impact of the COVID-19 on women's rights, as well as in inter-agency advocacy and policy initiatives to address GBV in the context of COVID-19. It continued also to provide substantive support on gender integration and SGBV to field presences, adapting it to the context. For example, in Mali, it contributed, together with DPO and OSRSG-SVC, to the development of an analytical note on SGBV in the context of COVID-19.

What lessons have been learned from the Covid-19 pandemic that could be useful for the Programme?

Two main lessons emerging from the context of the COVID-19 could eventually be used by the SGBV Team.

First, the virtual format of the training courses that was developed for the exercises in South Sudan and OPT could probably serve as a basis to develop online capacity-building materials to be used for ToT training.

Second, the challenges that the SGBV Team faced to respond to increased requests (from the field presences, from OHCHR Geneva/NY and from other UN agencies) indicate the need for SGBV specialized and dedicated positions within OHCHR. At the same time, they impose on the SGBV Team the need to better define its priorities and strategic lines of action.

3 Lessons Learned

The implementation of the Programme during the last three years has allowed for important lessons regarding what has or has not worked well in the implementation of the SGBV Programme:

1. WHRGS does not have the capacity to “do the SGBV work” for other sections and field presences, but can only build capacity, guide and advice.
2. SGBV support to field presences is an on-going need, which can be difficult to satisfactorily meet with time-limited Programme efforts and resources.
3. Field activities need to be anchored thoroughly not only with SWPAs and other focal points for SGBV but also with senior management of field presences to ensure full engagement, even when there is turn-over of staff.
4. OHCHR field presence staff needs concrete and operational support, such as the SGBV in investigations publication, training of staff and concrete assistance with analysis and drafting of SGBV sections in public reports.
5. Given the relatively high turn-over of staff in the field, trainings cannot be designed as a one-off but need to be repeated or designed as ToTs with the necessary commitment by the field presences.
6. SWPAs constitute a mixed group of gender professionals with different backgrounds, several of them without traditional human rights experience. Their successful merge into human rights components therefore needs support from OHCHR SGBV colleagues at HQ as well as that of the Heads of field presences.
7. OHCHR SGBV trainings or briefings with entire teams of Col/FFM do not only impart knowledge and raise awareness but it also a crucial way to expand the space for the Gender Adviser/SGBV investigator in terms of the Col/FFM’s investigative priorities and inclusion of SGBV information in reports. It’s also an opportunity to make all team members reflect on how to include SGBV considerations in their respective work.

4 Emerging Good Practices

Expert/practitioner workshops with a clear output

International workshops have almost become stigmatized as a waste of money, sometimes seen as more of a social event, including by donors. The SGBV Programme effectively changed that perception by re-defining and substantially upgrading and expanding the traditional workshop methodology. International workshops with practitioners organized by the SGBV Programme (March 2018, June 2019 and October 2020) included preparatory desk research and phone interviews with over 40 diverse and representative civil society organizations and UN experts before the careful selection of participants was made. Materials were sent in from

absent experts. A consultant was hired to prepare the workshop and capture all its findings in a lessons-learned document that will be published as part of OHCHR's SGBV Toolkit.

Community of practice of Gender Advisers/SGBV investigators in Col/FFMs

In September 2018, the SGBV Team, together with UN Women and JRR, brought together the Gender Advisers/SGBV investigators for a 2-day stock-taking/lessons-learned exercise. This was an opportunity to analyze progress and achievements, to discuss and develop methodologies/strategies and to learn from each other. The event broke the isolation of some Gender Advisers and was so well received by participants that the SGBV Team has since continued the "community of practice" through periodic webinars, jointly with UN Women and JRR.

Connecting SWPAs to key UN human rights mechanisms

Many SWPAs do not have a traditional human rights background and are not always sufficiently connected to, or even familiar with, some of the key UN human rights mechanisms that are potential partners or important references in the area of SGBV. Therefore, the SGBV Team facilitated an informal briefing between the SWPA in South Sudan and the Secretariat of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). As a result, the main concerns in the UNMISS report on SGBV victims/survivors' access to health were included in the CEDAW's preliminary examination of the situation of women in South Sudan.

5 Conclusions

1. After years of very limited resources exclusively dedicated to SGBV, the two-person SGBV Team implementing the UK-funded Programme has made a huge difference to OHCHR's overall engagement and achievements on the issue of SGBV, in particular CRSV. The evaluation team has received consistent praise for the Team's technical knowledge and skills, as well as its commitment and responsiveness to the needs and requests of counterparts at HQ and in the field.
2. All stakeholders interviewed appreciated the SGBV Team's efforts but pointed to the need for a more robust OHCHR staff capacity on SGBV. Many expressed surprise that the Team was only made up of two staff, both with a disproportionate workload. Therefore, in order to have a decisive impact in this field, OHCHR requires a specialized and dedicated resource, able to offer expert know-how on SGBV.
3. The ambitious scope of the SGBV Programme, and the additional demands put on the team from OHCHR HQ and field colleagues, as well as global CRSV policy processes, have at times led to the use of a fire-fighter modus operandi that seems to have stretched the Team too thin, particularly in relation to the activities in the field. A better planning effort is therefore required to define more coherently the strategic pathways (activities and outputs leading to results) and avoid the scattering of activities and resources.

4. The SGBV Team’s highly appreciated work to strengthen SGBV investigations and reporting by Col/FFMs and OHCHR field presences is one of the most important achievements of the Programme. Gender Advisers/SGBV investigators and field presence staff received concrete and effective support in the form of capacity building and support to drafting of SGBV content in public reports. As a result, the SGBV thematic now occupies a more prominent role in Col/FFM investigations and reports.
5. Beneficiaries of the Team’s field activities praise the quality of the content and communication but would have liked to see more comprehensiveness and follow up. It is however understandable that given the number of activities under the Programme, and the size of the Team, more coverage and follow up was impossible.
6. Within the framework of the “consolidation of protection process,”³¹ OHCHR FOTCD and the WHRGS have an important role to play in supporting the smooth absorption of the SWPAs and to ensure the high profile and priority of the CRSV issue on the agendas of Heads of Human Rights Components.
7. The SGBV Team and most HQ-based interviewees coincide in their view of the CRSV area as a very “crowded field”, with many agencies and entities competing for resources and visibility. Suffice to mention some of the most important actors: Office of the SRSG-CRSV, the Team of Experts on CRSV, DPO-CRSV Office, UN Action and UN Women. There is therefore a real need for OHCHR to reflect on its comparative advantages to contribute to concrete results, particularly in the area of CRSV, and avoid duplication of efforts.
8. OHCHR has an essential role to play to include a human rights approach within UN-wide initiatives on SGBV, in particular on CRSV. Other UN entities bring other useful approaches on the thematic, while OHCHR ensures that UN policies and practices are enshrined in international human rights law.
9. Many stakeholders appreciated OHCHR’s broad approach (SGBV) and efforts to link CRSV to gender-based discrimination and inequality in general. Counterparts focusing on the UN CRSV mandate understand and support OHCHR’s broader mandate. The SGBV Programme successfully advocated for the explicit inclusion of those links in the UN Policy on CRSV (2020).

³¹ See Report of the UN Secretary General: *The future of the United Nations peace operations: implementation of the recommendations of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations*, A/70/357-S/2015/682, 2 September 2016, paragraph 66. The “consolidation of protection process” put into place by the UN Secretary General gives human rights components of peace missions a new and enhanced role with CRSV, which is not yet fully optimized. Heads of human rights components now have to ensure this issue is given enough attention internally in the missions and externally as a priority human rights issue to be monitored and reported on publicly, with the support of the Senior/Women Protection Advisers and CRSV Focal Points.

10. Interviewees reported insufficient communication and collaboration between the efforts to address SGBV in the framework of the UN CRSV mandate/OHCHR SGBV efforts and on the other hand the numerous SGBV activities pursued by the humanitarian community, coordinated in each humanitarian setting by the GBV Sub-Cluster of the Protection Cluster. Effectively, the evaluation team has not come across any OHCHR SGBV Programme activities linked to the often closely deep field-connected humanitarian responses to SGBV, or close collaboration with the GBV Sub-Cluster. This indicates that despite substantial OHCHR progress on enhanced engagement with the UN humanitarian agencies, particularly through the OHCHR Emergency Response Section and its Human Rights in Humanitarian Action Unit, there is room for closer SGBV collaboration with humanitarian agencies, particularly to strengthen the victim-centered approach.

6 Recommendations

1. As the current framework for OHCHR's SGBV activities (the SGBV Programme supported by the UK) comes to an end, there is a need to replace it with a new programmatic structure that can ensure focus and prioritization in the light of very limited staff and financial resources. Therefore, OHCHR should consider developing a formal SGBV Strategy that can be anchored within the whole organization (HQ and field) and provide that necessary framework that will ensure dedicated resources continue to be used efficiently and with effective impact.
2. Given the "crowdedness" of the SGBV field, it is important that a new OHCHR SGBV Strategy defines precisely where OHCHR's mandate and expertise have a comparative advantage over other actors and can clearly add value to the SGBV field. That assessment should include consideration of how to best link a new SGBV Strategy to:
 - a. The field presences with their monitoring mandate, case investigations and public reporting potential
 - b. OHCHR's mandated function and general involvement with CoI /FFM
 - c. OHCHR's unique support role in relation to the UN human rights mechanisms (UPR, Special Procedures and Treaty Bodies).
 - d. The public voice of the HC and other senior managers (DHC and ASG)
3. OHCHR should continue to strategically engage in global SGBV inter-agency processes with a constant eye on the necessary resource investment vs. expected outcome balance. A renewed focus on SGBV activities closely linked to OHCHR's comparative advantages as an agency does not mean a total disconnect from global SGBV processes, rather a commitment to strategically invest limited resources primarily in functions exclusively given to OHCHR (field monitoring and investigation, HC's public voice, support to human rights mechanisms etc.).
4. Efforts should be made to expand the number of staff on the SGBV Team, including through a targeted fundraising strategy that highlights OHCHR's unique contribution to

global efforts to address SGBV. OHCHR's comparative advantages and unique mandate in comparison to the many other entities addressing SGBV should be clearly marketed. OHCHR should consider fundraising for its SGBV staff expertise rather than SGBV activities.

5. As important as the content of a new SGBV strategy or Programme is the need to create ownership of the strategy at the field level. This requires OHCHR field staff, including Heads of field presences, to be involved at a very early stage of the discussion and planning of future SGBV activities.
6. To avoid that the SGBV Team becomes overwhelmed by requests for support from colleagues in Geneva and NY (to the detriment of for example the Programme's planned field activities), the new strategy should be widely circulated and explained, to clarify what kind of support can and cannot be provided to units in HQ and in the field. Wider use of existing guidance materials and trainings opportunities should also ensure that the SGBV Team does not get too absorbed by colleagues' day-to-day requests but can focus on implementing the broader programmatic activities of the strategy.
7. To ensure the smooth functioning of the Senior/Women Protection Advisers within human rights components of peace missions ("consolidation of protection process"), OHCHR FOTCD and WHRGS should pursue a dialogue with Heads of human rights components and SWPAs on how to best ensure high profile and priority of the CRSV issue on the agendas of Heads of Human Rights Components and their staff.
8. When defining the future SGBV strategy, and in the framework of OHCHR's increased engagement in humanitarian contexts and with humanitarian UN structures, OHCHR should consider establishing closer cooperation between SGBV focal points in its field presences and the GBV Sub-Cluster of the Protection Cluster at the local level in order to improve access to affected communities/individuals and ensure that the victim-centered approach is based on broadest possible understanding of the rights and needs of victims.

Management response to the recommendations

Evaluation of the Sexual and Gender-based Violence Programme

Recommendation 1: As the current framework for OHCHR’s SGBV activities comes to an end, there is a need to replace it with a new programmatic structure that can ensure focus and prioritization in the light of very limited staff and financial resources. Therefore, OHCHR should consider developing a formal SGBV Strategy that can be anchored within the whole organization (HQ and field) and provide that necessary framework that will ensure dedicated resources continue to be used efficiently and with effective impact.

Management position on recommendation: accepted

Key Action(s)	Responsibility	Timeframe
1. Develop a SGBV strategy with the goal of integrating it in the next OMP and, based on it revise SGBV priorities in workplans for WHRGS and field to ensure efficient use of dedicated resource and impact.	WHRGS with support from PPMES and in consultation with FOTCD and key field presences	Q3/Q4 2022
2. See action 1 under recommendation 4.	N/A	N/A

Recommendation 2: Given the “crowdedness” of the SGBV field (including CRSV), it is important that a new OHCHR SGBV Strategy defines precisely where OHCHR’s mandate and expertise have a comparative advantage over other actors and can clearly add value to the SGBV field. That assessment should include consideration of how to best link a new SGBV Strategy to:

- a) The field presences with their monitoring mandate, case investigations and public reporting potential
- b) OHCHR’s mandated function and general involvement with CoI /FFM
- c) OHCHR’s unique support role in relation to the UN human rights mechanisms (UPR, Special Procedures and Treaty Bodies).
- d) The public voice of the High Commissioner and other senior managers (Deputy High Commissioner and ASG)

Management position on recommendation: accepted

Key Action(s)	Responsibility	Timeframe
1. Hold consultations with key field presences and relevant sections at HQ and partners, such as the ToE/RoL-SVC with the aim to identify OHCHR added value and	WHRGS in consultation with FOTCD, key field	Q1/Q2 2022

comparative advantage on SGBV and better link the SGBV strategy to a, b, c and d mentioned in the recommendation.	presences, METS, HRTB, SPB, etc	
2. Ensure that action 1 under recommendation 2 feeds into action 1 under recommendation 1.	N/A	N/A
<p>Recommendation 3: OHCHR should continue to strategically engage in global SGBV inter-agency processes with a constant eye on the necessary resource investment vs. expected outcome balance. A renewed focus on SGBV activities closely linked to OHCHR’s comparative advantages as an agency entails a commitment to strategically invest limited resources primarily in functions exclusively given to OHCHR (field monitoring and investigation, HC’s public voice, support to human rights mechanisms etc.).</p>		
<p>Management position on recommendation: accepted</p>		
Key Action(s)	Responsibility	Timeframe
1. Continue to strategically engage in global SGBV inter-agency processes, which are most relevant for the work of OHCHR (e.g. UN Action network), in line with OHCHR comparative advantages, mandate and strategic prioritisation.	WHRGS	ongoing
2. Ensure coherence and consistency with actions under recommendations 1 and 2.	N/A	N/A
<p>Recommendation 4: Efforts should be made to expand the number of staff on the SGBV Team, including through a targeted fundraising strategy that highlights OHCHR’s unique contribution to global efforts to address SGBV. OHCHR’s comparative advantages and unique mandate in comparison to the many other entities addressing SGBV should be clearly marketed. OHCHR should consider fundraising for its SGBV staff expertise rather than SGBV activities.</p>		
<p>Management position on recommendation: accepted</p>		
Key Action(s)	Responsibility	Timeframe
1. WHRGS to submit proposals and fundraising plans to strengthen staffing working on SGBV for consideration by the PBRB.	WHRGS and DEXREL, PPMES, and PSMS	Q2 2022
<p>Recommendation 5: As important as the content of a new SGBV strategy or Programme is the need to create ownership of the strategy at the field level. This requires OHCHR field staff, including Heads of field presences, to be involved at a very early stage of the discussion and planning of future SGBV activities.</p>		

Management position on recommendation: accepted		
Key Action(s)	Responsibility	Timeframe
1. See action 1 under recommendation 1 and actions 1 and 2 under recommendation 2	N/A	N/A
<p>Recommendation 6: To avoid that the SGBV Team becomes overwhelmed by requests for support from colleagues in Geneva and NY (to the detriment of for example the Programme’s planned field activities), the new strategy should be widely circulated and explained, to clarify what kind of support can and cannot be provided to units in HQ and in the field. Wider use of existing guidance materials and trainings opportunities should also ensure that the SGBV Team does not get too absorbed by colleagues’ day-to-day requests but can focus on implementing the broader programmatic activities of the strategy.</p>		
Management position on recommendation: accepted		
Key Action(s)	Responsibility	Timeframe
1. Disseminate the SGBV strategy, including through briefings to colleagues and clarifying the type of support expected to be provided by the WHRGS	WHRGS	Q4 2022
2. Mapping and compilation of existing guidance and materials on SGBV available to field colleagues and encourage its use	WHRGS	Q3 2022
<p>Recommendation 7: To ensure the smooth functioning of the Senior/Women Protection Advisers within human rights components of peace missions (“consolidation of protection process”), OHCHR FOTCD and WHRGS should pursue a dialogue with Heads of human rights components and SWPAs on how to best ensure high profile and priority of the CRSV issue on the agendas of Heads of Human Rights Components and their staff.</p>		
Management position on recommendation: accepted		
Key Action(s)	Responsibility	Timeframe
1. WRHGS and FOTCD to consult on ways to have a dialogue with heads of human rights components and senior women protection advisors on how to continue ensuring the implementation of the UN CRSV policy.	WHRGS and FOTCD, in particular PMSS	Q1/Q2 2022
<p>Recommendation 8: When defining the future SGBV strategy, and in the framework of OHCHR’s increased engagement in humanitarian contexts and with humanitarian UN structures, OHCHR should consider establishing closer cooperation between SGBV focal points in its field presences and</p>		

the GBV Sub-Cluster of the Protection Cluster at the local level in order to improve access to affected communities/individuals and ensure that the victim-centered approach is based on broadest possible understanding of the rights and needs of victims.

Management position on recommendation: accepted

Key Action(s)	Responsibility	Timeframe
1. Ensure coherence and consistency with action 1 under recommendation 3. See as well action 1 under recommendation 1, actions 1 and 2 under recommendation 2.	N/A	N/A

7 Appendices

- 7.1 Annex One: Terms of Reference
- 7.2 Annex Two: List of Stakeholders Interviewed
- 7.3 Annex Three: Data Collection Tools
- 7.4 Annex Four: SGBV Programme planning framework (AWP from July 2017 to March 31, 2021)

