

ASSESSING THE WORK OF THE CENTRE FOR CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS 2008-2014

Evaluation report

Commissioned by the Centre for Civil and Political Rights

*Written by Dodo Karsay
February 2015*

Acknowledgements

This evaluation report relies primarily on the contributions of the Members and Secretariat of the UN Human Rights Committee and of the CCPR-Centre's NGO partners, who kindly dedicated their time and energy to participate in the project. Their support was and continues to be highly appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. OVERVIEW	1
1.1 METHODOLOGY	1
1.2 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF RESPONDENTS	2
1.3 OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS	2
1.4 ABBREVIATIONS	5
2. ASSESSING THE CENTRE'S WORK: EVALUATION OBJECTIVES	6
2.1 RELEVANCE	6
2.2 IMPACT	10
2.3 EFFECTIVENESS	13
2.4 SUSTAINABILITY	20
2.5 EFFICIENCY	22
2.6 HUMAN RIGHTS BASED APPROACH	24
3. INTERNAL ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS	25
4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	28
5. CASE STUDIES	31
5.1 BOLIVIA	31
5.2 DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO	32
5.3 MOZAMBIQUE	34
5.4 INDONESIA	36
ANNEXES	38
ANNEX I: STAFF, BOARD MEMBERS, INTERNS 2008-2014	38
ANNEX II: DONORS 2008-2014	40
ANNEX III: KEY COUNTRIES 2008-2014	41
ANNEX IV: SURVEY QUESTIONS	42
ANNEX V: TERMS OF REFERENCE	48

1. OVERVIEW

This evaluation report assesses the work of the Centre for Civil and Political Rights (CCPR-Centre) since its inception in 2008 up to the end of 2014. The evaluation is the first of its kind in the Centre's history. It looks at the Centre's work through the lens of six evaluation objectives: *relevance, impact, effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency, and human rights based approach*. It also discusses internal organizational matters and lastly, it looks more closely at the Centre's work through 4 country case studies.

The evaluation aims to support the successful implementation of the Centre's Strategic Plan for the period of 2015-2017.

1.1 METHODOLOGY

The evaluation consisted of four key phases.

First, an in-depth **documentation review** was carried out that included the Centre's Annual Reports, Statute, project reports, minutes of Board and Bureau meetings, and Strategic Plan for the period of 2015-2017.

Second, the author of this report attended part of the 112th session of the Human Rights Committee to **observe** the running of some of the Centre's activities, including formal and informal briefings.

Third, a detailed **online evaluation survey** was disseminated among key partners identified by the Centre. The survey was to gain feedback from the Secretariat and Members of the Committee, representatives of national and international NGOs, and other partners who have cooperated with the Centre over the years. Respondents had to answer slightly different questions depending on whether they were NGO partners or a member of the Secretariat or the Committee (the survey questions can be found in Annex IV). The survey was sent to a total of 88 people out of whom 57 filled it in (65% response rate).

Fourth, **interviews** were conducted with a total of 30 people. Interviewees included:

- 6 CCPR-Centre staff members (current and former)
- 3 Board members
- 4 Members of the Human Rights Committee (current and former) and Secretariat
- 16 NGO and UN Field Office partners (*Africa: 7, Latin America: 2, Asia-Pacific: 3, Europe: 1; international: 3*)
- 1 funder.

In October-November (2014) interviews were conducted with all current staff members. In the period of December-January (2014-2015) external partners were interviewed. These interviewees were selected from a list of key partners provided by the Centre and included

people who marked in their survey responses that they volunteer to be interviewed. When selecting interviewees, the priority was to gather input from a diverse group that represented different regions and various forms of cooperation with the Centre. The response rate was slightly lower than hoped among candidates from the Latin America and Asia-Pacific regions. Different interview guides were developed for staff, Board members, Members and Secretariat of the Committee, and NGO or other partners.

The report does not attribute quotes to interviewees and the list of interviewees is confidential.

1.2 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF RESPONDENTS

Of the 57 survey respondents:

- 35% worked globally, 26% in Africa, 23% in Europe, 14% in Latin America, 11% in Asia-Pacific, 5% in North America and 7% in other regions
- 61% were male and 42% female; 2 people marked both female and male as their gender
- 17 were former or current members of the Secretariat or the Committee
- 20 were staff of national NGOs, 17 of international NGOs, 3 people marked 'other'
- 81% worked on civil and political rights in general and respondents were most commonly (also) working on torture (39%), women's rights (39%), child rights (33%) or freedom of assembly/ association/ expression (32%).

Of the 40 respondents who are NGO partners roughly half have participated in the Centre's in-country workshops, NGO submissions, formal and informal briefings and more than one-third have also taken part in its follow-up missions.

Of the 25 interviewees (excluding staff) 15 were male and 10 female. Of the 16 NGO members interviewed, 7 worked in Africa, 3 in Asia-Pacific, 2 in Latin America, 1 in Europe. 3 people worked globally.

1.3 OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

At the time of its inception the Centre identified gaps in NGO engagement with the Committee and the implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). The Centre is seen as having found a niche where it has successfully built its expertise in the past years and has been able to fill these gaps very effectively.

Its partners and beneficiaries find the Centre's work extremely **relevant** for their needs. For NGOs and the Committee alike, the lack of funding is their most pressing concern in their work. NGOs also need support in building their knowledge and skills to engage with the Committee and to follow up on its concluding observations (cobs). The Committee faces additional difficulties in its cooperation with States and the implementation of its cobs.

The Centre's activities on capacity building, promoting engagement and follow-up have been most relevant for both NGOs and the Committee. Both groups have suggested that the Centre maintain and strengthen its core activities, i.e. capacity building and promoting engagement, and also boost its work on follow-up. In the next 3 years, both NGOs and the Committee will continue to seek the Centre's support primarily in these three areas. Its partners recommended that the Centre pursue any additional work on top of these areas, should its funding make that possible.

The Centre is seen across the board as having made tremendous **impact** on civil society engagement with the Committee. It has sparked interest among local NGOs and increased their skills and knowledge to engage with the Committee's various mechanisms. It has also supported local human rights organizations in forming or strengthening coalitions on the ground. The Centre has carved out formal space for NGOs at Committee sessions and coordinated that space very effectively. Before each State review, NGOs now have the opportunity to present their concerns during formal and informal briefings. This has made the flow of information between civil society and the Committee more stable than ever before. Their cooperation with the Centre has increased the profile of domestic NGOs before the Committee and also at national levels.

The Centre has enhanced the visibility of the Committee's work by putting in place webcasting. It has also increased the awareness of its concluding observations among civil society and key decision makers on the ground. It has contributed to setting up a grading system now applied by the Committee that assesses the level of implementation of concluding observations.

The Centre has developed a great number of resources and activities to **effectively** fulfill its mandate. Overall, most resources have been very useful for its partners. The Centre uses in-country workshops to increase the capacity of local NGOs in making submissions to the Committee. Partners see these events indispensable and a truly effective way to boost their skills and knowledge. Their practical nature and tangible outputs are much appreciated. A key tool in capacity building is the Centre's NGO Guidelines, which partners have considered a crucial resource they can turn to.

The Centre supports direct engagement between NGOs and the Committee by funding 2 advocates from its key countries to attend their State's review. Given that most NGO partners lack resources to travel to UN events, this has been a truly important form of support and an effective way to increase partners' skills and knowledge. To facilitate engagement the Centre also coordinates the formal and informal briefings during Committee sessions. Partners recognize and appreciate the Centre's effective leadership in this area.

To enhance the implementation of concluding observations the Centre has developed several resources, including the grading system and its assessment notes. It has also increasingly focused on creating synergies with other UN mechanisms, including the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) and the Committee Against Torture (CAT). As a unique and extremely effective contribution, it conducts follow-up missions in selected States reviewed and does this with the

participation of Committee Members. These missions have opened doors and sparked dialogue between civil society, Members of the Committee and authorities.

The Centre's work on individual communications has focused on increasing NGO capacity to engage with Optional Protocol 1 of the Covenant (OP1), directly supporting litigation, and developing resources on the Committee's jurisprudence, including through a case law database. These activities and resources are less known among partners, but highly appreciated by those who have used them.

To ensure that there is permanent space provided for NGO participation, the Centre has also participated in discussions around the treaty body reform process in the UN. Occasionally the Centre participates in thematic events at the UN that relate to civil and political rights.

Over the years the Centre has managed to achieve a number of truly **sustainable** results. It has created formal space for NGO engagement, which is now regulated by a policy adopted by the Committee. Although this makes NGO engagement ongoing, the Centre's continued support in capacity building, promoting engagement, and coordination is much needed. The Centre has helped put in place the grading system of implementation and increased the Committee's presence on the ground by establishing follow-up missions. Given the Committee's scarce resources and the unique profile of these missions, they will also continue to be needed in the near future. The Centre's webcasting could entirely be taken over by the Committee if it had the necessary resources. This however is not the case today.

The Centre has faced difficulties in creating sustainable results in terms of increasing NGO capacity to engage with the Committee. The changing contexts in the UN and at national levels, fluctuation of staff, and the one-off nature of capacity-building events have made it hard to achieve long-term impact. The Centre's more ongoing engagement with its partners might improve this situation.

The Centre has gone through remarkable expansion of its financial and human resources since its inception. It is seen by partners and funders alike as having done a great job in **efficiently** allocating these resources to fulfill its mandate. It has kept its costs low throughout the years, including through keeping travel costs reasonable or using free communication tools in its daily operations. It has also been careful in ensuring that despite the expansion of its thematic scope, its core activities are promptly delivered. The difficulty of securing core funding and increasingly relying on project-based financial support may pose barriers in maintaining this balance.

The hiring of the two regional Coordinators in 2013 is seen across the board as further enhancing the Centre's efficiency. Hiring more Coordinators in the MENA, East Africa, Central Asia, and Latin America regions is among the Centre's future plans. To do this, it would be essential that the Centre first strengthens its stability as an ever-growing organization and puts in place a number of procedures and guidelines to help make its work more consistent, coherent, transparent, and sustainable. The Strategic Plan for 2015-2017 is a positive development in this direction that will further help consolidate the Centre's work.

The Centre's partners consider that to increase its efficiency, the Centre should have more continuous engagement with its local partners. Although this may require additional resources at first, it could have the potential of achieving more sustainable results on the ground on the long run.

Regarding the Centre's **human rights based approach**, its staff members have been fully committed to fulfilling the organization's mandate: the full and universal realization of rights enshrined in the Covenant. The Centre maintains a work environment that is based on mutual trust and respect and where staff input is welcome and encouraged. There is close cooperation between individual staff members. Some concerns include the inconsistencies in decision making, gender balance among staff, and the gender and relative regional equity in salaries. The Centre is met with a high level of respect and trust by the Committee and its NGO partners. NGOs have appreciated that the Centre acknowledges their expertise on human rights violations on the ground and stays in the background during meetings and briefings. The Centre has made efforts to ensure it is not seen as imposing an external agenda on local actors.

1.4 ABBREVIATIONS

CAT: UN Committee Against Torture

Cobs: Concluding observations

HRCtte: UN Human Rights Committee

ICCPR: International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

NGO: Non-governmental organization

NHRI: National Human Rights Institution

OP: Optional Protocol

OPCAT: Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture

UPR: Universal Periodic Review

2. ASSESSING THE CENTRE'S WORK: EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

2.1 RELEVANCE

Was the Centre mandate suitably designed to address the problems identified? Was it relevant to the needs of its target group and beneficiaries?

In 2008 the Centre responded to a gap in the operation of the Human Rights Committee, namely that there was no structure in place with a specific mandate to assist, coordinate and support NGO engagement with the Committee. This led to insufficient NGO participation in the reporting process. The Centre was established to fill this gap by facilitating NGOs' access to the Committee, to ensure their effective participation in the State reporting process, and ultimately to ensure better monitoring of the implementation of the Covenant.

There is consensus among NGO partners, Members and the Secretariat of the Committee that the Centre's work has been well designed to fulfill these functions. The Centre is seen as having found a niche where it is operating very effectively. Partners also see the Centre's work as extremely relevant for their needs. The Centre has met some needs States, international NGOs, and UN Offices may have had, although they are not primary beneficiaries.

During its organizational development since 2008, the Centre has placed increasing emphasis on activities beyond its core mandate. These include follow-up to concluding observations, engagement with the individual complaints procedure, strengthening the ratification of the ICCPR and its two Optional Protocols, or creating synergies with other UN mechanisms.

Virtually all of the Centre's partners view the Centre's core activities, i.e. capacity building and promoting engagement, as extremely relevant and suggest that they are continued and strengthened. There seems to be consensus that follow-up activities are also extremely relevant, but should not be strengthened at the expense of the core mandate. The same opinion prevails about the Centre's other areas of work:

"If they were to gain a doubling or tripling of their resources, of course I think they should start moving into other areas but at the moment I would really concentrate on what they do best, which is promoting NGO engagement with the Committee and capacity building and legal support" (Member of the Secretariat of the Committee)

The Centre's relevance for domestic NGOs

The lack of financial and human resources are by far the greatest barriers for NGOs in engaging with the Committee. In numerous States reviewed by the Committee, civil society also lacks the knowledge and skills to effectively participate in the reporting process. The Centre has addressed these gaps by bringing its expertise to its partners and holding workshops on the ground.

The level of previous exposure to the Committee varied among NGO partners. Most people had known about the Committee before participating in the Centre's workshop, but were not familiar with the nuances of its work or the tools for effective NGO engagement:

"This training was very useful because I personally [knew] about the Human Rights

Committee [...] but not concretely on what they do, how to interact with them. I never tried to know how we can do it [...] When we [had] the training, we [knew] what the Committee is [...] how we can interact with it and its Members [...] and how useful it is” (NGO representative from the West-Africa region)

“There is so much information coming from [our country] from different bloggers and activists, but there is such a lack of reporting. How to write in a proper way [...] It is good information, but it would be never accepted [...] people just do not know how to submit it” (NGO representative from the Central Asia region)

Some NGOs had thought national or regional mechanisms were more useful and had chosen to prioritize those over international bodies.

Particularly in larger and poorer countries, civil society had had little opportunity to come together before the Centre’s workshop to discuss and document human rights violations in their various contexts:

“In [country] we normally do not have such an opportunity of having a consolidated report on human rights. It is very difficult for organizations to come together and write a report. Some of the organizations lack capacity, it requires a lot of professional skill” (NGO representative from the West-Africa region)

Lacking resources, most NGO partners were not in a position to attend sessions before and directly engage with Committee Members:

“For me it was the first experience and opportunity to be present at the UN in Geneva. For me it was never ever possible to participate in this process [...] This was a new experience to make a report and to present it in the UN” (NGO representative from the Central-Africa region)

All of the Centre’s partners thought that its support on the follow-up to concluding observations has been very relevant for their work. NGOs commonly lack the knowledge and skills to effectively follow-up to the Committee’s recommendations. Those working in particularly difficult political contexts also face barriers in engaging with local decision makers. In some cases, the Centre has facilitated their access to these authorities.

When asked about how the Centre could make its work more relevant for NGOs, most interviewees recommended that the Centre should simply do more of what it is doing already. A small number of interviewees suggested that the Centre should inform NGOs of upcoming advocacy opportunities with other UN mechanisms, financially support such engagement, or help with fundraising. These activities currently fall outside the Centre’s mandate.

The Centre’s relevance for the Committee

The Committee and its Secretariat see the Centre’s work as indispensable for their operation. Most of them consider the Committee’s most pressing need to be the lack of financial resources. The Committee operates with a very limited budget and is not able to carry out some basic functions that could greatly enhance its impact. One such example is webcasting the sessions, which the Centre is performing now:

“Before we had webcasts, it was difficult for the outside world to know what was going on [...] So the webcast we cannot do without [...] I think everybody acknowledges that that should be done by the UN, but we simply do not have the money to do it [...] The Centre does it and it does a very good job within the limits of their own resources” (Member of the Secretariat of the Committee)

Should the Centre not fulfill this role, webcasts would simply not take place. This would greatly diminish the visibility of the Committee’s work and its usefulness for local actors.

At least two-thirds of Committee respondents thought that the lack of effective follow-up to concluding observations and the lack of cooperation with States Parties were great challenges for the Committee. The Centre’s follow-up missions in countries reviewed, usually joined by a Committee Member, are seen as fulfilling a crucial role in overcoming these challenges:

“The biggest gap I think is the monitoring of the follow-up. [We are] completely dependent upon the cooperation of the relevant States Parties and there is nothing we can do, there is no budget for Members of the Committee to travel to the countries that we have examined [...] I think the Centre has filled that particular gap to some extent”. (Member of the Committee)

States Parties that have never submitted a report pose particular difficulties for the Committee. The Centre has made efforts to urge these States to cooperate, support civil society to pursue advocacy, and find other avenues for engagement on civil and political rights, including through the UPR or the CAT. The Centre is commended for these efforts.

The Committee also considers the Centre’s work on building the capacity of NGOs very relevant for its operation. Before the Centre’s inception it often happened that there was a complete lack of NGO submissions on a country. Today, this is the exception rather than the rule. Thanks to the Centre’s involvement, the quantity and quality of submissions have both greatly increased:

“In several countries you find that NGOs are totally oblivious to the fact that there is something even called as the Human Rights Committee. So the involvement of the Centre has brought the work of the Committee to the center” (Member of the Committee)

The Centre’s role of coordinating NGO inputs and organizing formal and informal briefings is also great support for the Committee. There is awareness that these would not be happening without the Centre’s involvement. Interestingly, the Committee often finds itself in two extremes. They either receive too many or too few submissions. In both cases, the Centre’s role is seen as indispensable:

“Maybe [from] a smaller country with a less sophisticated NGO network, you may get one report or sometimes none. Sometimes we have NGO briefings that we have to cancel last minute, because we do not actually have any NGOs coming. For us it is extremely important to have NGOs be there, particularly for smaller countries” (Member of the Secretariat of the Committee)

“I think the Centre plays a fantastic role by urging all those [...] NGOs to come together, to sit together, to organize themselves well. Indonesia is [an] example, where quite a lot of NGOs were present fortunately, and the Centre [...] has been

very instrumental in coordinating and stimulating coordination of the work of the various NGOs” (Member of the Committee)

The Committee sees Africa, Latin America and Asia-Pacific, as regions the Centre should continue to prioritize. However, the lack of engagement from countries like Malta or Montenegro shows that the Centre’s support is need in the European region as well.

Committee Members feel that the Centre’s work matches their needs and it should be continued the way it is. Some Members made proposals for activities that would be additionally relevant. These included giving regular feedback to the Committee about its work and making recommendations for improvement.

The Centre’s relevance for others: States, UN Offices, and international NGOs

The Centre’s follow-up missions have been extremely relevant in raising the awareness of **States** of the Committee’s concluding observations and their respective obligations. An interviewee who works in a **UN Field Office** saw the Centre’s relevance in bringing Committee Members to countries reviewed, as their Office does not have the funds to do this. **International NGOs** have found the Centre’s online resources, its coordination work during sessions and its webcasts particularly relevant for their work:

“Even for an organization like [ours] that has considerably more resources than many NGOs, it is really not feasible to think about having somebody in the room for the entirety of a session of the Committee. So the webcasting I think has been a really valuable tool that the NGOs have, particularly around things like the public discussion around the development of General Comments [...] We just couldn’t afford to send somebody to sit in Geneva for the duration of those sessions, so we did all of our monitoring work pretty much by watching the webcast”

Needs assessment

Currently the Centre does not have any formal needs assessment procedure in place to capture the nuances of its partners’ needs. Individual staff members do conduct varying degrees of assessment prior to events, but these initiatives are informal and inconsistent. A Board member was concerned that this may give the impression that the Centre is paternalistic with domestic NGOs:

“You really have to assess first before you do a training on the ground, because assessment is needed in order to avoid any allegation or impression that can come up that this international NGO is trying to patronize us on the national level”

Needs assessment would be particularly important in advance of follow-up missions where it is essential that the Centre understand the complexity of the political situation and power dynamics. Several NGO partners and Board members suggested that the Centre do a more in-depth analysis of the local context before these visits to ensure they are relevant.

Committee Members and Secretariat both feel that they are regularly consulted about their needs and are quite happy with the Centre’s flexibility in meeting these. These consultations are also mostly informal. Some Members recommended that more formal and regular consultations on needs could be put in place.

2.2 IMPACT

What contribution did we make to the change we wanted to see? What were the final results of our activities during the initial five years?

The Centre is seen across the board as having made tremendous impact on boosting civil society engagement and supporting implementation. Respondents were asked to assess the Centre's overall impact on engagement on a scale of 1 to 10. Over half of the respondents marked the maximum score, 10 as their response. The rating average was 9.

There is more interest, knowledge, and capacity among civil society to use the Committee and other international mechanisms in their work. The Centre has sparked interest among domestic NGOs to use international instruments in their work and has given them the necessary tools and knowledge to do so. There has been tremendous increase in partners' knowledge on the Covenant and its Optional Protocols, on how and when NGOs can engage with the Committee, and how they can prepare effective NGO reports. Engagement with the Committee has become part of the routine for many NGOs who were previously not submitting information or participating in follow-up:

“Now whatever report we do in human rights regarding civil and political rights, we always cite the ICCPR [...] If I go to the court when I have a case, I do not forget international human rights instruments, including the ICCPR” (NGO representative from the East-Africa region)

“The engagement of civil society has been strengthened in the last five years. That is something you cannot deny and that is the achievement of the Centre” (NGO representative from the Asia-Pacific region)

Through its various targeted projects, the Centre has also increased the capacity of a number of NGOs to engage with the UPR or the CAT and use these mechanisms to support their work on civil and political rights.

NGO coalitions have been formed and strengthened. The Centre's in-country workshops have created or strengthened NGO coalitions. The workshops enabled NGO partners to exchange information about their diverse realities on the ground. They have also generally strengthened the voice of local civil society:

“The workshop was one way of mobilizing civil society to have a stronger voice” (NGO representative from the East-Africa region)

There is a steady flow of good quality information between civil society and the Committee. The Centre has helped establish formal space for NGOs to engage with the Committee. Through what were initially informal discussions with the Committee and its Secretariat, the Centre helped realize the adoption of the Committee's policy on NGO

engagement.¹ This was later used as a skeleton for a similar policy on the cooperation with NHRIs. As a consequence, NGOs now have 30 minutes per country to present their issues during *formal briefings* at Committee sessions. They can additionally answer any questions Committee Members may have during *informal briefings* that are held in lunch breaks. The Centre's coordination of these briefings has further enhanced their impact:

“My personal experience over the last years as a Member of the Committee, I could see the increasing role of the Centre coordinating and organizing the presence and participation of NGOs before the Committee. I think that is very important. Before the Centre existed [...] the participation of NGOs was very disorganized. So in that sense the impact has been very important” (Member of the Committee)

“The advice the Centre had on how to present our oral testimony to the Committee was extremely helpful. The advice being: “you do not need to repeat what is in the briefing, focus on things that have changed”. Because the Committee will come back with in-depth questions, they have done their homework. I think if we had not been given that advice, we may have wanted to deliver quite a different statement” (representative of an international NGO)

The Centre has also contributed to improving the quantity and the quality of NGO submissions:

“Both the number and quality of NGO reports have increased quite dramatically since the activities of the CCPR-Centre [...] [The Centre's] contributions have been tremendous” (Secretariat of the Committee)

NGOs are more familiar with how Committee sessions are run and how to engage with Committee Members and diplomats. The Centre's work on promoting direct engagement during sessions in Geneva and New York has allowed local activists to gain first-hand experience presenting their key concerns to UN representatives and diplomats:

“I really benefited from the support of the Centre and it was my first time to participate in meetings with diplomats. It prepared me to work with decision makers during an advocacy process. It was very, very useful for me” (NGO representative from the Central-Africa region)

The profile of the Centre's partners has been raised before the Committee and at the national levels. Through increasing NGO engagement, the Centre has made civil society input an inherent part of the State review process. In doing so, it has contributed to a change in perspective among Committee Members who are now more and more convinced of the importance of civil society input:

¹ The relationship of the Human Rights Committee with non-governmental organizations. CCPR/C/104/3. 4 June 2012. <http://bit.ly/1yxq4EY> Last accessed: 20 January 2015.

“Before [the Centre] there was very little space for the Committee and NGOs to interact [...] Committee Members thought that the examination of the country reports was a matter between themselves [...] and the State Party. But of course this has changed over the years and I think the Centre has really facilitated that change. And now many more Members are convinced of the usefulness of NGO contributions” (formal Member of the Committee)

The profile of NGOs has also increased at the national level as a consequence of their participation in the review process:

“The impact is also [that] the profile and respect of the organizations who have participated at the UN increases. The government is now able to realize the important role of civil society organizations in terms of protecting human rights [...] It has repositioned the organizations” (NGO representative from the East-Africa region)

Some raised concern that this may have had a negative impact on NGOs that were not part of the coalitions facilitated by the Centre but are just as capable and professional.

There is more awareness of concluding observations at the domestic level. Building on or complementing the work of national, regional, and other international NGOs, the Centre has contributed to the wider dissemination of the cobs in countries reviewed. It has increased their visibility among key national authorities during its follow-up missions. It has stimulated dialogue among UN Offices, NGOs, and decision makers. One Committee Member considered that the key impact of the Centre’s follow-up work lies in initiating discussion in difficult political contexts, in a way that formal UN missions could not:

“If we go for a formal visit, they close the doors. There is no possibility to discuss in an open way the fulfillment of the recommendations, because they [the State] are defensive. [When we went with the Centre], we talked about the key recommendations and how they [authorities] can make the best efforts to make the fulfillment. If [they] have doubts about the recommendations, [they] can get more information behind the scenes. I can explain what they involve”

There is more systematic assessment of implementation of concluding observations. Through close consultations with the Committee and its Secretariat, the Centre was able to support the Committee to adopt a system that assesses the level of implementation of its concluding observations. The Centre’s grading system is one of the most important examples of long-lasting impact that the organization has made to date. The system has also been used by other NGOs when submitting information to the Committee.

NGOs are better prepared to follow up on the Committee’s concluding observations. Partner NGOs who have participated in the Centre’s workshops have more in-depth knowledge about the Committee’s follow-up procedure. During its follow-up missions the Centre has co-organized advocacy events with local NGOs and where applicable UN Offices and universities,

which have facilitated the follow-up process. Some of these missions encouraged civil society to start using the cobs in domestic advocacy. Others complemented and strengthened ongoing civil society efforts:

“We were able to meet with some government officials, civil society organizations, and the National Human Rights Institution. Some of the key people who are supposed to implement the recommendations. And that was also an opportunity for me to know how to do lobbying at the level of my country” (NGO representative from the Central-Africa region)

NGOs have a better understanding of the individual complaints procedure. Although the Centre has done relatively less work on Optional Protocol 1, as compared to its other work areas, its training events have definitely increased NGOs’ knowledge base. In some instances the Centre supported NGOs to bring cases to the Committee. Through its case law database the Centre has made it easier for NGOs to find cases that may be useful for their advocacy work.

There is now a go-to organization for NGOs for matters related to the Committee. The Centre has carried out its mandate very effectively and in doing so established a brand that is now widely known among civil society. There is now an organization that NGOs can turn to and great resources they can reach through the Centre’s website:

“I met an NGO yesterday seeking advice about working with the Human Rights Committee and it was great to be able to say: “well actually, you should go to the Centre, they are the people that can really help you”. They have become these experts in this area” (a representative from an international NGO)

2.3 EFFECTIVENESS

How far have we delivered on our intended outputs and results?

The Centre has been relying on annual work plans before adopting its 3-year Strategic Plan for the period of 2015-2017. The articulation of its missions, goals and objectives has been somewhat inconsistent over the years. Although this is part of its natural development as a young organization, it has made the analysis of intended outputs and results slightly difficult.

Members of the Committee have found the Centre’s activities and resources increasingly effective over the years. Some thought that in addition to its expertise and experience, the Centre’s effectiveness was in part due to the staff’s great interpersonal skills and open communication. They have also commended the Centre for its flexibility in responding to the Committee’s emerging needs. NGO partners also agreed that the individual activities and resources of the Centre have been extremely effective in improving their engagement.

The majority of respondents thought that in order to increase its overall effectiveness, the Centre should do a better job at reaching out to **media, National Human Rights Institutions, and regional human rights bodies**. Many noted about NHRIs that they are well placed to act as a link between civil society and the government, but often lack awareness of international mechanisms, which the Centre could improve. In many countries NHRIs have better access to State officials than NGOs do. Creating synergies between regional mechanisms and the UN is also seen as an effective way to enhance the implementation of a country's human rights obligations. Most local NGOs have considerable experience working with regional human rights bodies and the Centre could build on this.

Ensuring that each NGO interacting with the HR Committee is in a position to submit adequate information so that their concerns are taken into account in the review process²

The Centre fulfills this goal primarily by delivering in-country workshops to local NGOs. These events build partners' knowledge and skills on engagement with the Committee and also support them in coalition building. The Centre's most tangible output in this area is that its NGO partners make List of Issues submissions and compile alternative reports to the Committee.

The Centre makes good use of its **NGO Guidelines** during its workshops. This resource is seen by NGO partners as one of the most effective tools to strengthen capacities:

"They are very clear, very well written. I think for NGOs that are trying to access the system for the first time, the Guidelines are extremely helpful. Also because the Committee, like the other treaty bodies does make adjustments to its working methods. And for people who are operating outside of the system, they would not necessarily appreciate some of the nuances that happen with the changes in the working methods. So I think that's a really critical resource" (representative of an international NGO)

Each and every survey respondent who has participated in the Centre's **in-country workshops** thought that they were effective in increasing their knowledge and skills. Several interviewees spoke positively about the workshops being very practical and resulting in tangible results, such as the final coalition reports. For others the most useful part of a workshop was bringing various advocates together from the different regions and thematic areas. NGOs commonly appreciated that the Centre used regional examples during the workshops. One person from the Central-Africa region suggested it would be greatly beneficial to also have a fellow advocate present from the same region, who may have gone through the cycle of the review process already.

NGO partners are often chosen on the basis of existing personal relationships with the Centre and it has only happened in a few instances that a public call was announced for interested partners. Some believed that partners could be recruited in a more transparent and objective manner. It is acknowledged however that this can also have its challenges.

² The following goals were identified in the Centre's annual work plans for the years 2012-2014.

When it comes to workshop participants, some thought there could be a better inclusion of local NGOs who are based outside the capitals and whose participation has not been secured in all instances. One person was worried that the selection of NGOs is not always done in a transparent and objective way. Some NGOs, whose participation may be a source of conflict, might be excluded. The particular example of LGBTQI organizations was mentioned.

Others were concerned that language barriers remain a big issue at these events and resources have been insufficient to provide quality interpretation on the spot. In some cases translations of workshop materials were not provided ahead of time.

Provide full technical and legal support to NGOs in each State reviewed throughout the reporting process

The Centre provides regular updates to its partners about key events and deadlines through its **mailings about upcoming sessions**. NGO partners across the board greatly appreciate these alerts and have found them effective in preparing them for engagement.

To support its partners in its key countries, the Centre funds the participation of 2 local advocates to take part in **Committee sessions in Geneva or New York**. Those NGO representatives who have participated in these sessions unequivocally thought that the trip was an extremely effective way for them to learn about how to present their information to the Committee. An NGO partner thought the Guidelines could include a more detailed section on how briefings can be done effectively, sharing the Centre's vast experience in this area.

Many felt that thanks to their participation at the session, the Committee issued observations that really echoed NGOs' concerns on the ground:

"The training and traveling to Geneva actually added a lot of value to our work. It ensured that some of the concern we had, which we would normally put into a report and send to stakeholders, was actually discussed. Because in Geneva I had the opportunity to also have closed-door and informal sessions where specific questions were asked [about our human rights issues] and I could give information about what really is happening" (NGO representative from the West-Africa region)

"We had very good opportunity [during the session] on how to speak to the Committee members. We had different kinds of meetings and [...] they [the Centre] helped us how to actively engage the Members. It was an extremely useful experience for us" (NGO representative from the Central Asia region)

In more general terms participants also learned about how sessions are run and what happens to NGO information once submitted. Several partners recommended that the trips could be slightly extended, so that there is more time to prepare for the briefings, have one-on-one meetings with Committee Members, or meet other UN representatives. One suggestion included having an additional day to assess what went well during the meetings and what could

be improved. This could make the trip a more valuable learning opportunity for participants and those at home. One person raised the issue of per diems not being sufficient in Geneva.

Virtually everyone who has cooperated with the Centre in its coordination activities during sessions found their **facilitation of NGO reports, formal and informal briefings** useful. A representative of an international organization was particularly thankful for practical advice on how to best present information to the Committee:

“I found the Centre’s guidance in terms of helping the NGOs to organize themselves extremely helpful, but also the advice [...] to really focus on the key issues and more importantly if there is any updated information [...] Having that insider view on what is the most useful way to present the information [...] is extremely useful”

A representative from the Central Asia region found the Centre’s support very helpful in being clear about what is needed and when from a participating NGO:

“I am not very familiar with these UN structures and I need very simple information, for example that in two months there will be a session [...] and we have to submit the report in one month and here is the example of the report. So for me it [was] very useful. [The] two times when we submitted our report, it was like this. The Centre just told us the deadline, and we submitted our information and then they helped us write the report”

Use the Human Rights Committee’s Concluding Observations to improve implementation of the ICCPR at the national level

The Centre contributes to the implementation of concluding observations in several ways. It encourages NGOs to submit follow-up reports to the Committee as part of its follow-up procedure. It has developed a template for such reports and a **grading system** that makes it easier than before to provide a quick overview of the status of implementation. Although the Centre allocates considerable efforts to **assessment notes on the implementation** of concluding observations, less than 10% of respondents were familiar with these.

In addition, the Centre conducts follow-up missions in selected countries reviewed by the Committee. **Follow-up missions** have been an indispensable addition to the Committee’s follow-up procedure and NGOs’ ongoing advocacy efforts on the ground. The Centre is in a unique position to be able to bring Committee Members along and is widely appreciated by the Committee, NGOs, and UN Offices for performing this role. The presence of a Committee Member definitely increases the profile of a mission among authorities. A representative of an international NGO, who had first-hand experience with the Centre’s missions, thought:

“That is what they [the Centre] were really useful for. To sit down, discuss human rights in a non-confrontational, non-politicized manner to look into the commitments made, how to reach improvements on those commitments within the next 4 years [...] If you do not

have dialogue, if you do not have the different actors in the country speaking to each other, then you cannot really progress on human rights”

The unofficial nature of these visits is both their strength and weakness. It is a weakness because the information gathered cannot be channeled back into the Committee’s work in a formal manner. Additionally, Committee Members do not have any UN security accompanying them and cannot benefit from their usual privileges. Nonetheless, those Members, who have joined follow-up missions, thought they were extremely effective in creating dialogue and urging States to implement their obligations.

Some were concerned whether the missions can really contribute to sustainable change. A number of interviewees recommended that the Centre invest more resources into studying the particular context in each country before engaging in follow-up activities. This could include becoming more familiar with the status of implementation and the work of the key actors (NGOs, UN Offices, universities, NHRIs, etc.), but also being aware of the particular difficulties faced by human rights defenders operating on the ground. A great number of partners have suggested that instead of organizing one-off or isolated follow-up events in a given country, the Centre place these in the context of ongoing advocacy events of local actors. Other suggestions included that the Centre apply a more holistic approach during its follow-up activities and place the Committee’s cobs in the context of a country’s various other obligations under international and regional human rights law. Doing so could increase the impact of these missions as more organizations could come on board and a stronger platform could urge the government to act.

In one partner country there was a lack of clarity about whether the Centre wants to continue its follow-up work after the mission and if so, in what form. Such details should be made clear to partners from the outset. Several partners voiced concern that one-off missions will not ensure continuous engagement from the part of the government. Civil society also needs more ongoing support in being able to effectively use the cobs for domestic advocacy. Ultimately, it is local civil society that will have to build up engagement and the Centre can only play a supporting role in this process. A few examples have indeed shown that where coalitions were successful, built on previous joint work, and supported by effective NGOs were very much capable of continuing follow-up activities on their own.

Overall, the Centre could increase the effectiveness of its follow-up missions by pursuing more in-depth engagement in each country. As a representative of a UN Field Office said:

“It is important [...] not to have only a mission [...] not to jump into another mission in another country, but to ensure that there is a follow-up to this effort [...] and they continue to coordinate with the people they worked with during the missions”

Since 2012 the Centre has had a number of projects dedicated to **creating synergies with other UN mechanisms**. Most partners see these efforts as effective tools for follow-up. They have the potential of making the cobs more relevant for local actors and establishing more ongoing engagement on the ground. The Centre’s work in this area, i.e. on the UPR or the CAT,

has mostly been project-based. It could be more strategic than right now. The Centre should always be careful to respect the mandate of other international NGOs who focus on one particular mechanism. It should have ongoing and somewhat regular dialogue with them about ways of effective cooperation.

A number of interviewees suggested that the Centre could gather lessons it has learned about effective ways of follow-up during its various activities and make them publicly available, perhaps in a brief publication. NGO partners would find it useful to learn about approaches that have worked in the various contexts and those that have been less useful.

Improve the protection of individuals through the use of the Human Rights Committee's Individual Complaints procedure

The Centre has pursued a number of activities aimed at improving protections for individuals whose civil and political rights may have been violated. These have included capacity building on OP1 for lawyers and NGOs, directly supporting litigation, engaging in advocacy that encourages States to implement the Committee's decisions, or operating the case law database.

While the Centre's various activities were generally quite known among respondents, only 10% knew about its **workshops on Optional Protocol 1**. The Centre's work on increasing the visibility of the OP1 procedure is appreciated by both the Committee and NGOs. However, the Centre should be somewhat cautious when it comes to its exact role. One Committee Member suggested that the Centre continue sharing information, but not actually take up cases. Another Member suggested just the opposite by saying the Centre should have a more proactive role in litigation.

Several NGO partners highlighted the **case law database** as extremely useful for their domestic litigation and advocacy efforts:

"It is possible for me and my colleagues to see comparative case laws from other countries [...] I share it with my colleagues that in A or B country this happened, they have this decision. We could use it to help us deal with our issues here" (NGO representative from the East-Africa region)

Ensure that any reform of the treaty bodies serves to improve the system and does not diminish the possibilities for NGO engagement

The Centre's participation in the treaty body reform process or the drafting of General Comments is seen important as long as it is relevant for its mandate. There is acknowledgment that the Centre is perfectly placed to feed into such processes, because of its vast expertise on civil and political rights and close cooperation with the Committee. Given the political implications of such discussions, the Centre is also well suited to participate as an independent NGO.

While quite many partners considered ratification campaigns useful, most of them thought that given the Centre's limited resources, this work should not be a priority. One staff member of an international organization thought:

"I do not think the Centre should bother with the whole area of ratification or supporting the Committee's complaint system, because I think there are other NGOs doing that. Leave it to other NGOs to do, it is fine"

It is however seen as a positive development that the Centre is investing resources into work around OP2. Given the 25th anniversary of this Optional Protocol, there is now momentum for such work.

Online resources

The Centre uses numerous online resources to facilitate engagement with the Committee and support implementation. Overall, these resources have been very useful for the Centre's partners. Some NGOs are less able to use them because of their limited Internet connection, especially in the Africa region. The **website** is seen by NGO partners and Committee Members alike as the most useful online resource. Most of them find it user-friendly. The website has become a go-to resource whenever partners need some basic information about Covenant and the Committee's work:

"I use it very often. When I need information or if I am doubting something I go on the website" (NGO representative from the Central-Africa region)

The Centre's website resources are widely known among its partners. The overwhelming majority of NGO partners found the information on the Committee, the Covenant, and State reviews useful for their work. Some found the website quite legalistic and perhaps more accessible for those active in the field already. A small number of partners had difficulties with finding documents on it and moved on to the OHCHR website instead. Although some of the information that the website offers can also be found on the Committee's page, the Secretariat thought this duplication was necessary and useful as the Centre takes a different angle on the information presented. A number of recommendations to improve the website were put forward (see section 4).

The overwhelming majority of Committee Members and NGO partners have found **session webcasts** useful for their work. The Centre has done a really valuable job by taking on this task and despite its limited resources has managed to make the work of the Committee much more visible and accessible for State officials, NGOs, UN Offices, and the media. As key Geneva-based partner summarized:

"The webcasts are invaluable for our work. Not only for NGOs, civil society, and the States that are being examined, but they are also extremely useful for State Officials as well. When we have a delegation here from the States [...], it is very useful for their

compatriots and members of their different Ministries back home to be able to look at that webcast and see how their colleagues are performing”

Several interviewees highlighted that making the webcasts a routine part of sessions has been one of the Centre’s key achievements. They have proven to be a really effective tool in bringing international mechanisms closer to those working on the ground. In some countries screenings have been organized so local actors can jointly watch the session. Some NGOs have used the webcasts to support media in reporting about the State’s obligations. The webcasts do need some improvement. Ideally, they should be run without any technical issues, properly archived, available in UN languages, and accessible for persons with disabilities. However, making these improvements would be a daunting task for the Centre, given its limited resources.

Almost all Committee Members and the majority of NGO partners consider **session overviews** useful. The overviews have been widely used by domestic NGOs who lack financial resources to attend sessions and also international organizations that have local researchers or do not have the capacity to be present for an entire session:

“Session overviews give us a sense of what is going on, even when we are not in Geneva. We have an understanding of what is taking place, so we are updated somehow” (NGO representative from the Central-Africa region)

The least useful resources by far have been the **blog** and the Centre’s **social media accounts**. These were also the least known and least used resources among NGO partners and Committee Members alike. The Centre’s social media presence could be made more regular and at the same time less technical and legalistic so it can draw in a wider audience invested in human rights. The **newsletter** was more known among Committee Members, but very few NGO partners were familiar with it. Some suggested that it could be part of the Centre’s routine to include new contacts in the newsletter subscription or to directly offer this possibility.

2.4 SUSTAINABILITY

Are the results sustainable? Is CCPR Centre support/involvement still required in order to achieve lasting results and where?

Since its inception in 2008, the Centre has been able to create a number of really sustainable results in terms of establishing a formal space for civil society engagement with the Committee, strengthening the follow-up to concluding observations, improving the visibility of the Committee’s work, and increasing NGO capacity.

First, the Centre has helped secure a **formal space for NGOs** to engage with the Committee. Formal and informal briefings are now an integral part of every session and are regulated by the Committee’s NGO policy. The Centre’s impact has been multiplied given that the Committee has applied a similar policy to guide its cooperation with NHRIs. Although the procedures are in

place and the Centre has no further work to do in this regard, the actual coordination of NGO inputs in this space will continue to be the Centre's responsibility.

Second, the Centre has **strengthened the follow-up to concluding observations**. It has helped put in place the **grading system**, which is now a fundamental and integral part of the Committee and the Centre's efforts to follow-up to concluding observations. **Follow-up missions** have become part of the Centre's routine work and have successfully involved a number of Committee Members. Even if the Committee had the resources to conduct its own in-country missions, the Centre's unofficial missions would still be an important addition to the Committee's work. Its networks with local actors would continue to be of great use for the Committee.

Third, the Centre has set up **webcasts** that now broadcast the Committee's sessions making them more visible and accessible for key stakeholders. The Committee and the Centre both agree that if the Committee had adequate resources, it could take over webcasting entirely.

Fourth, the Centre has greatly increased the **capacity of NGOs to engage with the Committee**. Using the Committee's mechanisms has become routine for a number of NGOs and they are likely to continue this engagement on the long run. Some NGOs have used their strengthened skills to engage with other UN mechanisms, such as the CAT or the UPR. In some cases the setting up or strengthening of local NGO coalitions has encouraged NGOs to continue their cooperation across regions and themes:

“Working with the Centre, we wrote a group report and for me it was very useful, because each NGO has brought its contribution to that report [...] It really changed our consideration in how NGOs can work together to promote human rights. I am still working with groups and organizations since that time and it really helped me to improve my capacities in working with coalitions” (NGO representative from the Central-Africa region)

However, the Centre's capacity-building work will continue to be needed in the near future. Having insufficient financial resources for continuous engagement and attending sessions, is likely to remain an issue for most NGOs. In addition, 4 years after the first in-country workshop, local NGOs routinely ask the Centre to organize the same (or very similar) event. There are several reasons for this:

- Staff of NGOs often change, which is generally the case in most human rights organizations
- Skills and knowledge gained at the first workshop are sufficient to submit a report, but not in-depth enough to last
- The ability of a coalition to effectively continue their work very much depends on the local actors, their resources, work styles, communication, history of cooperation, etc.
- One-off workshops and events are usually not very effective in creating ownership among local participants - NGOs may perceive the Centre as coming to the country

- to get information from local civil society and not as supporting them by strengthening their advocacy work
- The political or human rights situation may change on the ground
 - The Committee's working methods and jurisprudence develop over the years and NGOs have to be updated periodically.

All of these factors make it difficult for the Centre to achieve sustainable results. However, most of these risks could be *reduced* if the Centre was able to maintain ongoing engagement with its local partners. This could create more sustainable change and could also be more cost and time-effective on the long run:

“After the first cycle you have already identified who are the key players at the national level. Maintaining contact with those key actors is one way to ensure sustainability of the impact. Because then in the cycle of 4 years maybe you do not need at all to come to have a long-term mission of training on the ground. Maybe what you need is only a Skype conference to update the members of the coalition on the preparation for the second cycle” (Member of the Board)

Additionally, the Centre could also consider trying a training of trainers model that could increase the sustainability of its capacity-building results.

2.5 EFFICIENCY

How did the Centre perform on the allocation of human and financial resources in implementing its mandate? Did we achieve value for the money?

Since its inception the Centre has multiplied its budget and staff capacity. In 2008 and 2009 much of the work was carried out on a voluntary basis by the Centre's small staff. In 2009 the Centre managed to secure core funding and was able to employ two part-time (40%) staff members from 2010 onwards. By the end of 2014 the staff has increased to 5 members, each employed in at least 60% of their time. The Centre has managed to multiply its budget from 264.000CHF in 2010 to 368.000CHF in 2013 to over 650.000CHF in 2014.

Its external partners, Board, and funders view the Centre as being very efficient in allocating its resources. The Centre has been able to handle the expansion of its budget well and keep its costs low. Some examples include the low expenditure during in-country missions, the efficient use of free online communication tools, or staff per diems being allocated on the basis of being refunded.

In 2014 the Centre hired 2 Coordinators for the Central and West Africa and Asia regions. NGO partners, Committee Members, and the Board see this expansion as a very efficient way to organize the Centre's work. It not only considerably reduces the costs of stimulating NGO engagement in the two regions, but can also contribute to an increasing ownership of the Centre's objectives among local civil society. Regional Coordinators however have quite a

daunting task to be in charge of two large regions and do this work alone. Should there be sufficient financial and human resources in place, it might be slightly more efficient, if regional Coordinators conducted both capacity building and follow-up missions in their respective countries.

As part of a quite natural organizational development process since 2008, the Centre has increasingly taken on new activities that were initially not part of its core mandate. These activities have mostly focused on follow-up, increasing engagement with the two Optional Protocols, including launching the case-law database or encouraging ratification, strengthening synergies with other UN mechanisms, or participating in discussions around the treaty body reform process. The Centre has been careful to manage its funding in a way that its core activities can be delivered. In some instances, work that has not been funded was done on a voluntary basis by staff or interns, including for instance on individual communications – an area difficult to secure funding for.

It is increasingly difficult for the Centre to secure core funding and most of its budget is now project-based. This has inherent risks, i.e. that the Centre becomes increasingly project-driven and may have to reprioritize its activities along the way. The Centre will need to ensure that this does not affect its work on its core mandate.

To achieve value for money, the Centre needs to consider investing more resources into more long-term engagement with its partner countries. NGO partners have almost unequivocally agreed that for long-term impact, the Centre's engagement should be more continuous than it is right now. An NGO partner from the West-Africa region said:

“The Centre should be able to have very close contact and cooperation with civil society organizations in [country]. I felt that they only contacted us because they wanted information from us [...] There has to be a close bilateral cooperation between us - we want to maintain ongoing partnership”

An NGO partner from the Central-Africa region also echoed this opinion:

“They supported a group of organizations and followed them during a time and really gave them support to make a report and recommendations. Now I think that that collaboration with the Centre must continue. I think that it must be permanent”

Continuing the work on creating synergies with other UN mechanisms could have positive impact on making in-country engagement ongoing. Although the Centre has made efforts in this area and have had projects relating to the UPR or the CAT, its engagement could be more strategic and systemic to be more efficient.

Up until the end of 2014 the Centre has not had a detailed longer-term strategic plan that included the clear articulation of its overarching goals and objectives, outputs and results. Rather, planning was done on an annual basis. Its Strategic Plan for the period of 2015-2017 is

an important milestone in the Centre's organizational consolidation and is expected to boost the efficient allocation of its resources to fulfill its mandate.³

2.6 HUMAN RIGHTS BASED APPROACH

"The CCPR-Centre envisions the full and universal realisation of the rights proclaimed in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its two Optional Protocols."

The Centre works towards the full realization of civil and political rights in countries that ratified the ICCPR. In its first years the Centre was heavily relying on the voluntary contributions of the staff, Board, and others to fulfill this mandate. The level of commitment to human rights has been high in the organization from its inception to this day. This has manifested itself in how the Centre operates both internally and externally.

The Management has placed strong emphasis on establishing a work environment in which staff feels trusted and respected. Internal communication is open and direct. Overall, the organization is quite non-hierarchical. Processes of decision making are however ad hoc sometimes and tend to provide less opportunity for regional Coordinators to share their input. The Centre's gender balance among staff and financial equity when it comes to gender and regions could be improved.

The Centre is met with a high level of respect and trust by its external partners, NGOs, Committee Members, and funders alike. The Committee greatly appreciates the Centre's professionalism that is complemented with its direct and open communication. Committee Members feel respected and listened to during their various forms of cooperation with the Centre.

NGO partners commonly feel that their engagement with the Centre is based on mutual respect and trust. The Centre acknowledges that local NGOs are the experts on the human rights situation on the ground. Several partners appreciated that the Centre stayed in the background during briefings and advocacy meetings, letting local NGOs take leadership. On some occasions, NGOs were not entirely clear about the exact mandate of the Centre, which may have caused some misunderstanding about the extent and form of cooperation. This could be remedied by providing more information about what the Centre can and cannot offer. The Centre has been careful to not seem like it is imposing an agenda on local NGOs from the outside and indeed its work is seen as relevant by all of its partners. Some suggested that the Centre invest more into mapping the local contexts to be able to really tailor its work to each country, in particular before follow-up activities. Having regional Coordinators in place is definitely helpful in this regard.

³ Centre for Civil and Political Rights: Strategic Plan 2015-2017. *Strategies, planned activities and financial requirements of the CCPR Centre.*

3. INTERNAL ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

The Centre's **organizational culture** is characterized by a familial atmosphere where staff is met with respect, trust, openness and flexibility. The Centre's everyday running is done in quite an informal manner without relying on formal procedures. The majority of staff is content with this approach and does not necessarily feel the need to make fundamental changes in this regard. However, the lack of procedures and guidelines has already caused some difficulties in the running of the Centre and it is expected that it will continue to do so in an ever-growing organization that the Centre is.

To match the Centre's remarkable expansion in its budget, workload, and staff with organizational stability, it would be ideal if a number of more formalized guidelines were put in place. In particular, it would be important to set up procedures or guidelines for decision making, conflict management, and internal communication. The Centre's Strategic Plan for 2015-2017 marks a positive step in this direction as it has laid down a solid basis for organizational development.

By 2014 the Centre has managed to consolidate its human resources. It has established a 3-member team in Geneva, while its 2 regional Coordinators are based in Lomé (Togo) and Jakarta (Indonesia). The Centre is planning to further increase the number of staff and hire Coordinators for the MENA region, Latin America, Central Asia, and East Africa.

Training and support to new staff has mostly been sufficient, but quite inconsistent. Given its ongoing expansion, the Centre could put in place a process for including new staff members in its work. This could be an **introductory training** with the aim of ensuring that the quality of work is the same across the board. Some technical training on the various online tools used by the Centre would also be beneficial.

As finance and administration tasks weigh heavy on the Director and to some extent staff, it would be ideal if a new officer could take over these tasks.

Currently the Centre employs 4 men and 1 woman. Interns, who only get a small stipend, are mostly women. The Board includes 8 men and 7 women. The **gender balance** among staff in could definitely be improved.

Roles are quite clear for staff and are distributed in a way that there is some form of cooperation between all staff members during a cycle. This strengthens cohesion within the Centre. The ability of staff to substitute each other has worked very effectively, i.e. in times of sickness. Allowing all staff to be able to perform each role individually may increase the Centre's efficiency.

Staff is mostly satisfied with their current **workload**. Periods during Committee sessions, before and during in-country workshops or missions are quite work-intensive. At other times staff has much less to do. Overall, there is a good balance. **Work sharing** runs smoothly in the Geneva

office. Sharing tasks with regional Coordinators could also be a good idea, although more difficult given the distance and time difference.

The Centre is flexible when it comes to **working hours or working from home**. As long as the work is done, the Director is quite happy to meet the various requests of staff in this respect. This is much appreciated by staff. There is a feeling of being trusted, which is very positive.

Salaries are more competitive than ever before, although could be increased for most staff members. The staff is aware of the Centre's limited financial resources and is dedicated to work towards its mission. However, to ensure sustainability, it is important that everyone feels sufficiently compensated and wants to stay with the Centre on the long-term. Discussions between staff and the Director have proven effective in this regard and it is hoped that from the beginning of 2015 salaries will be perceived as fair by all. There is a need to ensure that when it comes to payment, there is **gender and relative regional equity** among staff. Policies on insurance, health hazards and security risks during missions should be in place.

Decision making: There are no clear procedures for how decisions are made in the Centre. Decision making is quite centralized and sometimes ad hoc. The Geneva team makes most decisions and although there are efforts to increasingly involve the Coordinators, it is not clear when and how consultations are done and whom they involve. The Board's involvement is quite limited, even in matters where it could be of great use, i.e. decisions about funding, salaries, internal conflicts, etc.

Internal communication: The flow of information is regular and secure among the Geneva team. Regional Coordinators have however felt excluded at times. There are currently no regular staff meetings in place and staff mostly communicates on a bilateral basis. Virtually all staff members agreed that staff meetings would be important to put in place. A monthly staff meeting, where everyone is present would be reasonable for all. There should be minutes taken during these meetings, which can later be shared with the Bureau and the Board, if needed. The Centre makes good use of online tools such as Google Drive and Google calendar, which have proven useful for all. Having an internal platform, where updates and questions can be shared, could further enhance communication. Overall, it is essential that the Centre improves its internal communication and does this before continuing to hire any additional staff members.

Conflict management: So far, staff has felt free to raise any concern or misunderstanding with fellow staff members or the Director, although these have been very few in number. In the few cases when they did emerge, they were either resolved between the parties, or staff asked for advice from the Director. There is currently no clear process for resolving conflicts, which may cause issues in the future. Some expectations towards staff are not laid down, including potential cases of conflict of interest or issues with representing the organization. It would be essential to have clear rules for these and also for handling conflict situations.

Reporting and supervision: There is no procedure in place for how reporting and supervision should take place. Currently, all staff report to the Director and vice versa. However, this

happens in an irregular and inconsistent way. A better and more active involvement of the Bureau and the Board should be facilitated, in particular when it comes to reporting about strategic decisions.

Interns have been indispensable for the functioning of the Centre since the very beginning. Although their stipend only covers lunch and transportation costs, it is positive that some compensation can be provided. There needs to be more clarity about the duration of internships, their start and end date, expected hours worked, as well as reporting and supervision.

The role of the Board and the Bureau: The use of the Board is far from being maximized. Board members could be consulted more frequently about organizational or substantive matters, given their vast knowledge and experience in the field. Board meetings are ad hoc and there are no resources to ensure all Board and staff members can be present. This would be ideal so the Board is effective and there is ownership of decisions among staff. Board and Bureau meetings should be held regularly and members should be provided with sufficient materials beforehand.

It is hoped that the **Advisory Committee** will start to be operational in 2015.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Centre's work is very well suited to fill the gaps in engagement and implementation that it identified in 2008. Its activities and resources have been extremely **relevant** for both NGOs and the Committee.

- The Centre should continue its work, prioritizing activities on capacity building, promoting engagement, and follow-up
- The Centre should also invest resources into encouraging reporting in non-cooperative States
- The Centre could be more clear about its mandate with NGO partners
- The Centre should consider putting in place a procedure for needs assessment to maximize its relevance for its NGO partners on the ground
- The Centre should continue its informal consultations with the Committee and Secretariat and if possible, could also seek more formal feedback from Committee Members on a regular basis.

Its partners believe that the Centre has made tremendous **impact** on increasing, improving and coordinating NGO engagement with the Committee. It has substantially contributed to strengthening follow-up to concluding observations, NGO efforts to engage with OP1, and overall supporting the implementation of the ICCPR.

- To increase its long-term impact, the Centre should maintain ongoing contact and cooperation with its partners on the ground
- The Centre might consider commissioning an evaluation of its impact at the end of its next strategic cycle in late 2017.

The Centre applies a good variety of tools and activities to fulfill its mandate. Partners see most of these resources as truly **effective** in increasing engagement and enhancing implementation. They have made a number of recommendations for improvement:

- The Centre should strengthen its outreach to the media, National Human Rights Institutions, and regional human rights bodies
- The Centre should consider setting up more transparent and objective criteria for recruiting its national partners and inviting participants to workshops
- The Centre should do its best to continue involving workshop participants from various regions in a given country
- The Centre should invest more resources into the translation and provision of printed materials as well as quality interpretation during workshops
- The Centre should continue using regional examples in its workshop curricula and if possible, facilitate the participation of fellow advocates from the same region
- If possible, the Centre should consider extending the length of partners' stay at sessions, so they can have additional meetings with the Committee and other mechanisms or evaluate their engagement during meetings and briefings
- The Centre may consider investing more resources into mapping the local contexts before pursuing follow-up activities

- The Centre's follow-up activities should be building upon ongoing local advocacy work and be synced with follow-up to recommendations under other UN and regional mechanisms
- The Centre could consider putting together brief publications on its lessons learned during its follow-up activities and on useful suggestions for NGOs about how to best directly engage with the Committee during sessions
- The Centre should carefully examine its position as directly litigating under OP1 of the Covenant
- The Centre should continue its engagement with important processes such as the treaty body reform of the development of General Comments as long as they relate to its mandate.

The Centre's most important contributions to **sustainable** change have been the establishment of a formal space for NGO engagement during sessions and the Committee's grading system. There is ongoing need for the Centre to continue the coordination of NGO engagement, webcasting, its follow-up missions, and capacity-building activities. The Centre needs to be clearer if its priority is to increase the number of countries it works in or to consolidate its impact through ongoing engagement with NGOs.

- The Centre should continue its work on the coordination of engagement and webcasting until the Committee is able and willing to take these over
- The Centre should continue to build the capacity of NGOs, promote direct engagement, and conduct follow-up activities as the need for these is ongoing
- To create more sustainable change, the Centre might consider prioritizing ongoing and in-depth engagement over universality, i.e. trying to cover all countries reviewed
- The Centre might additionally consider a training of trainers model on the ground so knowledge and skills can be more easily passed on to peers.

Throughout its remarkable expansion, the Centre has managed to **efficiently** allocate its financial and human resources to implement its mandate. It has kept its costs low and managed to ensure that its core activities are delivered. It has done so in an environment where it is increasingly difficult to secure core funding. In 2013 the Centre hired two regional Coordinators, which has greatly increased the efficient allocation of its resources. In late 2014 it prepared its first long-term Strategic Plan for the period of 2015-2017.

- The Centre should continue to keep its costs low during missions and through the use of free or low-cost tools for its organizational operation
- The Centre should consider putting in place procedures and guidelines on internal communication and training, decision making, conflict management, reporting and supervision before it continues to hire more regional Coordinators
- Once these procedures and guidelines are in place, the Centre should continue its efforts to strengthen its presence in the various regions
- The Centre should find ways to maximize the use of its Board and Bureau
- The Centre could consider allowing regional Coordinators to carry out all in-country missions themselves

- If the Centre wishes to prioritize longer-term impact on the ground, it should allocate sufficient resources to maintaining ongoing engagement with its local partners
- The Centre should do its best to try secure core funding that allows for maintaining and strengthening its core mandate.

The Centre's partners respect and trust the organization. The organizational culture is familial and also built on mutual respect and trust. There is a high level of commitment among staff to maintain a **human rights based approach** both internally and externally. The Centre has been careful to not seem like it is imposing its agenda from the outside and has worked closely with its partners on the ground.

- The Centre should maintain its professional and open relations internally and externally
- The Centre could improve the gender balance within the staff
- The Centre should strive to ensure relative equity in salaries across gender and regions
- The Centre should maintain efforts to have local NGOs lead during advocacy meetings, including during sessions and follow-up missions
- The Centre should consider increasing efforts to better map the political contexts on the ground, in particular before its follow-up missions.

5. CASE STUDIES

5.1 BOLIVIA

Background. Bolivia ratified the ICCPR and its OP1 in 1982, its OP2 in 2013. It was reviewed by the Committee in 1989, 1997 and most recently in 2013. The 2013 NGO report was submitted with the support of the Centre. The report highlighted the following key human rights issues in the country: barriers in the access to safe and legal abortion; lack of appropriate and comprehensive reparations to victims of past military regimes; breaches to the rights of indigenous peoples, including the right to prior consultation; violence against women, including women participating in political affairs; precarious prison conditions, and a new legislation that restricts the work of NGOs.⁴

Timeline of activities.

May 2013: The Centre co-organized a workshop with the *Comunidad de Derechos Humanos de Bolivia (CDDHH)* to support local civil society in preparing an alternative report to the Committee. The workshop brought together 25 NGO representatives from various regions of the country.

October 2013: The Centre sponsored two representatives of the *CDDHH* to participate in Bolivia's review before the Committee in Geneva. The two advocates took part in the formal and informal briefings and had in-depth discussions with individual Committee Members about the human rights situation on the ground.

February 2014: The Centre and the *CDDHH* jointly organized a follow-up mission in Bolivia with the participation of Víctor Rodríguez Rescia, Member of the Committee. The aim of the mission was to strengthen the State's efforts to implement the Committee's recommendations.⁵

Relevance. Partners felt that the in-country workshop addressed their needs very well. In particular, their practical skills to write an alternative report and their knowledge about the various mechanisms of the Committee greatly increased. There was close consultation between the *CDDHH* and the Centre prior to the event, which helped identify approaches that could be useful for civil society in Bolivia. NGOs feel that there is an ongoing need for additional follow-up missions.

Impact. NGOs have more capacity to engage with the Committee in the reporting process. Through the Centre's practical recommendations, they have increased their skills in writing an effective shadow report. They also have strengthened knowledge and skills to follow up on

⁴ Bolivia: Informe alternativo de la sociedad civil sobre la aplicación del Pacto de Derechos Civiles y Políticos (Respuestas a la lista de cuestiones - CCPR/C/BOL/Q/3). Comunidad de Derechos Humanos with the support of Centre for Civil and Political Rights. 15 September 2013. <http://bit.ly/1L8pTW2> Last accessed: 20 January 2015.

⁵ Concluding observations on the third periodic report of the Plurinational State of Bolivia. Human Rights Committee. CCPR/C/BOL/CO/3. 6 December 2013. <http://bit.ly/1L8y0Sc> Last accessed: 20 January 2015.

recommendations. They strengthened their national coalition and successfully carried out joint follow up activities. As per impact on the ground, one of the Committee's three key recommendations was for Bolivia to set up its National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) to fulfill its obligations under the OPCAT. In December 2013 the Parliament successfully adopted Law 474, which establishes the NPM.

Effectiveness. The training event brought together a coalition of local NGOs whose capacity was much strengthened, in particular to write an effective alternative report. The coalition incorporated input from all participating NGOs and also had consultations with others who were not able to participate due to financial limitations. It was recommended that the Centre make available more printed copies of its materials. Another suggestion was to make trips in Geneva longer so advocates have sufficient time to have more meetings with Committee Members who may have questions about the human rights situation on the ground. Additional days would also be needed to discuss what went well during the briefings and what could be improved. These learning points could then also be shared at the national level.

Sustainability. Bolivia is one of best examples if creating sustainable change on the ground. The participating coalition has done a fantastic job at continuing their engagement after the review and following up on the concluding observations. This success is much due to the nature of the cooperation and work sharing among NGOs, which is based on mutual respect and transparency. Since the Centre's follow-up mission, the individual organizations have each been monitoring the implementation of recommendations relating to their particular thematic areas. In December 2014 the coalition had a meeting with State officials about progress made since the review and will shortly submit its follow-up assessment report to the Committee.

5.2 DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO

Background. The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) ratified the ICCPR and its OP1 in 1976. The Committee reviewed the DRC in 1987, 1990, and 2006. The State report for the country's fourth review has been awaited since 2009. The government has made repeated promises to fulfill its reporting obligations but has so far not lived up to these.

In 2011 the Centre launched a 2-year project to advance the protection and promotion of civil and political rights in the Great Lakes region of Africa, including in the DRC. The project aimed to boost the impact of the UPR and use it to strengthen the implementation of the ICCPR and the CAT. In the DRC, the particular objectives were to ensure the implementation of UPR and Committee recommendations as well as the Committee's decisions in individual communications; to encourage the State to submit its follow-up report to the Committee (pending since 2007), its fourth State report, and its report to the CAT. The project in the DRC was subject to considerable delay because of the difficult political climate in the country.

The DRC was reviewed during the UPR process in 2009 and 2014. The Centre supported the NGO submission for the DRC's second UPR review that was prepared by *RENADHOC*, the *National Network of Congolese Human Rights NGOs*.⁶

Timeline of activities.

February 2013: The Centre co-organized a workshop with *RENADHOC* on litigation under OP1 of the ICCPR. The event brought together 14 lawyers, 2 of whom joined from outside the capital. Part of the workshop was dedicated to discussing the DRC's upcoming UPR review and potential NGO actions. Additional advocacy meetings were held with government and UN representatives.

June 2013: The Centre held a workshop in Kinshasa to prepare local NGOs for the submission of their contributions to the DRC's 2014 UPR. The workshop was attended by 21 NGO representatives under the auspices of a troika coordinated by *RENADHOC*. The group prepared an assessment of the implementation of the DRC's 2009 UPR recommendations and put forward suggestions for its second review.

April 2014: The Centre supported 2 civil society representatives to participate in the DRC's UPR review in Geneva. Local advocates met diplomats and shared their key concerns about the human rights situation on the ground.

Fall 2014: The Centre held in-country advocacy meetings with local officials to follow up on the UPR recommendations.⁷

Relevance. Human rights violations are routinely carried out with impunity in the DRC - the Centre's support in building the capacity of local activists to engage with international mechanisms was an important contribution to ongoing efforts by civil society. The training on OP1 was the first of its kind in the DRC. It supported lawyers who had been working extensively at the national level, but had not had much exposure to the complaints procedure before. Given the lack of State reporting in the DRC, the UPR provided a crucial opportunity to highlight violations of civil and political rights at this UN platform. There is still a great need for NGOs to gain skills for following up on UPR recommendations and to use the Committee's complaint mechanism.

Impact. The training on OP1 was an opportunity for local lawyers to examine cases that could potentially be submitted to the Committee. The workshop also strengthened local efforts to build

⁶ Rapport de la coalition sur la mise en oeuvre du 1er Cycle de L'EPU-RDC. *RENADHOC* - National Network of Congolese Human Rights NGOs. September 2013. <http://bit.ly/1xU7MK7> Last accessed: 20 January 2015.

⁷ Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Democratic Republic of the Congo. Human Rights Council. A/HRC/27/5. 7 July 2014. <http://bit.ly/1CHGYIT> Last accessed: 20 January 2015.

coalitions among advocates from the various regions. For some there has been a shift in how useful they perceived NGO coalitions - some feel their knowledge about the human rights situation has greatly increased. The report and the meetings organized with diplomats in Geneva had great impact on the DRC's UPR report. The coalition report was quoted on 21 occasions in OHCHR's documentation. The follow-up meetings have had the impact on local UN Offices and NGOs. Some mentioned that there are ongoing discussions about strategies to facilitate the implementation of the recommendations.

Effectiveness. The Centre's support in bringing NGOs together from various parts of the country was a very effective way to strengthen civil society and produce a strong UPR report. The Centre's capacity building on OP1 and the Committee's jurisprudence has been much appreciated. Suggestions were made for the Centre to include the NHRIs in its engagement process as the NHRI is currently being set up and could be supportive of civil society. A better use of local media was also recommended.

Sustainability. Some of the participating NGOs have continued to have informal consultations. Although the Centre's support has been much appreciated, there is also a need expressed for ongoing engagement with NGOs on the ground.

5.3 MOZAMBIQUE

Background. The Centre first got in touch with its partner organizations in Mozambique in 2011, when the country was undergoing its UPR review. Their initial meeting in Geneva led to their joint work on the country's review before the Human Rights Committee.

Mozambique ratified the ICCPR and its OP2 in 1993. Its first State report was awaited for 17 years. The Committee agreed to postpone Mozambique's first review in 2012 in lack of a report. Eventually, the State submitted its first report in 2012 and was reviewed by the Committee in October 2013. The Centre worked closely with its 2 local NGO partners during the review process, the *Liga Moçambicana dos Direitos Humanos* and the *Centro de Estudos de Democracia e Desenvolvimento*.

The NGO coalition report that the Centre supported included crucial information on arbitrary arrests and detentions, cases of torture and prison conditions.⁸ Other issues of concern included access to justice, freedom of expression, freedom of assembly and association, and equality and discrimination, particularly against women, persons with disabilities, and individuals suffering from HIV/AIDS, extreme poverty, widespread corruption and lack of good governance.

Timeline of activities.

2011: The Centre organized an informal briefing via Skype videoconference that allowed NGOs in Mozambique to feed into the formulation of the Committee's List of Issues.

⁸ Mozambique: Civil Society Report on the Implementation of the ICCPR (Replies to the List of Issues CCPR/C/MOZ/Q/1). October 2013. http://www.cccprcentre.org/doc/2013/10/Mozambique-final-report_v3.pdf Last accessed 20 January 2015.

Spring 2013: The Centre and its partners co-organized a workshop on the ICCPR and the Committee with the participation of 20 NGOs. The workshop aimed at increasing knowledge and skills on engaging with the Committee and submitting an alternative report. The workshop was opened by the Minister of Justice, who reiterated his willingness to closely cooperate with NGOs for the effective implementation of the ICCPR.

October 2013: The Centre supported 2 NGO representatives to participate in the Committee's 109th session in Geneva. The advocates participated in formal and informal briefings before the Committee and shared their key concerns on the human rights situation.

November 2014: The Centre organized a workshop on follow-up to support the implementation of the Committee's concluding observations.⁹

Relevance. Given that Mozambique was reviewed for the first time in 2013, there was a lack of knowledge and skills on how to engage with the Committee's mechanisms. Before their cooperation with the Centre, the partners' exposure to face-to-face advocacy with Committee Members and sessions was lacking. For some it was difficult to imagine that they would ever present before UN and State officials.

Impact. The interest of the Centre's partners in engaging with international human rights mechanisms has significantly increased. They are more aware of the importance of international mechanisms. They now have first-hand experience with how State reviews are run and how they can directly influence Committee Members to consider their key concerns. Their engagement in Geneva also allowed them to network with other invested NGOs. The Centre and its partners managed to strengthen dialogue between NGOs and the Ministry of Justice. Through the dedicated work of local partners the cobs are now available in the local language and their visibility has increased.

Effectiveness. The Centre's jointly organized workshop was effective in bringing an NGO coalition together and producing a coalition report. The Centre's partners translated the cobs into Portuguese and widely disseminated them at the national level. The Centre should allocate sufficient resources to translations, so key materials are available in the local language(s) well in advance of training events. The lack of translations caused some difficulties during the 2014 workshop.

Sustainability. Mozambique is a good example of the Centre's sustainable results in terms of increasing the interest and capacity of its key partners. NGOs have incorporated the use of international mechanisms into their everyday work and routinely cite the ICCPR and the cobs in their local advocacy and litigation. However, there have been some concerns regarding sustainability among members of the NGO coalition. In particular, a number of NGOs have dropped out between the two events and lost interest in the process. This may be because of a

⁹ Concluding observations on the initial report of Mozambique. Human Rights Committee. CCPR/C/MOZ/CO/1. 19 November 2013. <http://bit.ly/18gfubF> Last accessed 20 January 2015.

lack of ownership of the workshops' objectives and a lack of in-depth and ongoing engagement. Some participants were unclear about how their cooperation with the Centre and the Committee would continue. The need for continued engagement in between workshop events was articulated clearly.

5.4 INDONESIA

Background. Indonesia ratified the ICCPR in 2006. Its first State report was submitted in 2012, with considerable delay. The Committee first reviewed Indonesia in 2013.

The coalition report that was supported by the Centre and was submitted by the *Human Rights Working Group (HRWG)* identified the resurgence of executions and attacks on religious minorities as priorities as key issues.¹⁰ Additional issues highlighted by the NGOs were restraints on freedom of expression and intimidations against human rights activists and journalists, summary executions in Papua, on-going impunity for past human rights violations and crimes against humanity, persistent discrimination, particularly against LGBT individuals, religious minorities and migrant workers, the situation of women, and the situation of the indigenous.

Timeline of activities.

December 2012: The List of Issues NGO report was submitted to the Committee with the Centre's support.

March 2013: The Centre organized a Skype videoconference with Indonesian NGOs and the Committee prior to the adoption of the List of Issues.

June 2013. The Centre co-organized an in-country workshop on the ICCPR with its national partner the *HRWG*. The workshop brought together 15 local NGOs.

July 2013. The Centre was involved in coordinating the NGO briefings held at the Committee's 108th session. The briefing on Indonesia was attended by more than 25 civil society representatives.

January 2015: The Centre conducted a follow-up mission in Indonesia to support the implementation of the Committee's concluding observations.¹¹ Although planned for 2014, the mission took place in 2015, because of the local elections.

Relevance. Although some of the participating NGOs were familiar with the reporting mechanisms in the UN, learning about the particularities of the Committee and hearing about regional examples of engagement were much needed and appreciated. This was particularly

¹⁰ Indonesia: Civil society report on the implementation of the ICCPR. Human Rights Working Group. 28 June 2013. <http://bit.ly/18giOU3> Last accessed 20 January 2015.

¹¹ Concluding observations on the initial report of Indonesia. Human Rights Committee. CCPR/C/IDN/CO/1. 21 August 2013. <http://bit.ly/15I5DKP> Last accessed 20 January 2015.

important given that Indonesia was coming up for its first review before the Committee. The need for information from the Centre on the implementation of recommendations was highlighted. The suggestion was that the Centre could engage with representatives of the Indonesian Mission in Geneva and share what it learns from them about planned steps of the government.

Impact. The County Rapporteur on Indonesia was very positive about the usefulness of coalition report and referred to it during the dialogue with the State on several occasions. The issues of executions and attacks on religious minorities were pinned down by the Committee as requiring immediate attention by Indonesia. One of the key impacts on the ground has been that participating NGOs are now spreading the knowledge and skills they learned during the process within their own groups. NGOs also learned from each other about the various thematic areas represented at the workshop.

Effectiveness. Indonesian NGOs compiled a well-tailored report to the Committee that highlighted the key human rights issues of concern. National partners ensured that the State review was widely covered by media. Following the review, NGOs maintained ongoing discussions with government officials to ensure that implementation is taken seriously.

Sustainability. The Centre's ongoing cooperation with NGOs was recommended. There is awareness however that local engagement with decision makers will ultimately be the task of local NGOs.

Annexes

Annex I: Staff, Board members, interns 2008-2014

Staff

Patrick Mutzenberg	Director	2008-
André Kangni Afanou	Central & West Africa Coordinator	2013-
Andrea Meraz-Sepulveda	Human Rights Officer	2013-
Daisuke Shirane	Asia-Pacific Coordinator	2013-
Vincent Ploton	Head of External Relations	2014-
Haewen Fortunato	Webmaster	2012-
Peggy Brett	Programme Officer	2008-2013
Liliana Trillo Diaz	Programme Officer	2011-2013
Fabiana Gugliotta	Administration Assistant	2013
Hamdi Addow	Fellow Researcher	2011
Laure Bonjour	Administrative Assistant	2010
Samar Khamis	Consultant	2010
Francesca Restifo	Consultant	2010
Sara Song	Designer	2010
Jacques Moynat	Auditor	2010
Harry McKnight	Accountant	2009
Benedetto Urios	Webmaster	2008-2011

Board members

Rafael Rivas Posada (President)	2012-
Hassan Shire (Vice-President)	2008-
Florian Irminger (Treasurer)	2010-
Sihem Bensedrine	2008-
Rafendi Djamin	2008-
Diallo Abdoul Gadiry	2008-
Sarah Joseph	2008-
Asger Kjaerum	2011-
Victoria Kuhn	2008-
Jakob Th. Moller	2011-
Chantal Mutamuriza	2008-

Lucia Nader	2008-
Marina Narvaez	2008-
Philippe Tremblay	2009-
Rachel Brett	2008-2013
Ahmed Tawfik Khalil	2008-2011
Damien Scalia	2008-2009
Boris Wijkström	2008-2009

Interns and pro bono

Claudia Squillacioti	2014
Justine Batura	2014
Regina Paulose	2014
Brian Frenkel	2014
Isobel Edwards	2014
Helena Rodriguez	2014
Cecilia Ercole	2014
Yun Zhang	2014
Sandesh Shrestha	2014
Jérémy Bacharach	2014
Élodie Stein	2014
Charlotte Penel	2013
Guillaume Beaumier	2013
Ivan Tugues Rodriguez	2013
Paola Reyes Parra	2013
Sanae Kermass	2013
Ana Paola Burgos	2012
Janay Farmer	2012
Yuka Hashimoto	2012
Kai Kan	2012
Delly Mazawo Sesete	2012
Ashley Tucker	2012
Armelle Vessier	2012
Lavinia Wasserman	2012
Hamdi Addow	2011
Kai Kan	2011
Leontiy Korolev	2011
Jordan Shepherd	2011
Sandra Carter	2010
Jockum Hilden	2010
Mark Shope	2010
Charles Duverger	2009
Kristen Hunsberger	2009
Maude Fournier	2009
Susanne Goelles	2009
Orsolya Kizer	2009
Marion Frenay	2009

Annex II: Donors 2008-2014

Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust	2010-2012; 2013-
Individual donors	2009-2014
Swiss Ministry of Foreign Affairs	2009-2010; 2011-2012; 2013-
Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs	2013-2014
German Ministry of Foreign Affairs	2013; 2014
Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs	2010-2011; 2013-2014
Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs	2014-
City of Geneva	2012-2013; 2014-
Australia (AUS Aid)	2012-2013
State of Geneva	2009; 2010; 2011; 2012-2013; 2014-
Open Society Foundations	2010; 2012-2013; 2014
Loterie Romande	2009-2010; 2011-2012; 2014-
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	2009-2010
Commune de Carouge	2009

Annex III: Key countries 2008-2014

Benin	2014
Burundi	2012-2014
Chad	2014
Cambodia	2014
Haiti	2012-2014
Ivory Coast	2014
Malawi	2013-2014
Nepal	2013-2014
Sierra Leone	2014
Uzbekistan	2010-2014
Venezuela	2014-2014
Angola	2013-2014
Bolivia	2013-2014
Cape Verde	2012-2013
Democratic Republic of Congo	2012-2014
Indonesia	2013-2014
Mauritania	2013-2014
Mozambique	2013-2014
Peru	2013-2014
Rwanda	2009-2011; 2014
Jamaica	2011-2013
Paraguay	2012-2013
Philippines	2012-2013
Jordan	2010-2012
Togo	2011-2012
Cameroon	2010-2011
Moldova	2009-2011
Mongolia	2010-2011
Tanzania	2009

Annex IV: Survey questions

CCPR-Centre: 5-year evaluation

This survey forms part of the CCPR-Centre's external evaluation that looks at its work since its inception in 2008. It is to collect feedback from civil society, Members and Secretariat of the UN Human Rights Committee (HR Ctte) about the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the Centre's work over the years. It is for people who have collaborated with the Centre in the past 5 years.

When answering the survey questions, you are not asked to represent any organization or body you have worked with. We are genuinely interested in your personal opinions and experiences.

Your contributions and opinions will be taken and reproduced on the basis of non-attribution.

It would be greatly appreciated if you could also volunteer to be interviewed. Gaining in-depth knowledge about your experiences would be invaluable input for this project. Therefore we kindly ask you to indicate if we can contact you for an interview and please provide your contact details in the last section. Interviews will take place in December.

Questions marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory to answer, because they are essential for the evaluation.

Introduction

***1. Please indicate the region you work in. Tick as many as apply.**

- Africa
- Asia-Pacific
- Europe
- Latin America
- North America
- Global
- Other (please specify)

***2. Please indicate what thematic areas you work on. Tick as many as apply.**

- Civil and political rights in general
- Torture
- Death penalty
- Freedom of religion
- Freedom of assembly/association/ expression
- Asylum
- Women's rights
- Child rights
- Minority rights
- Other (please specify)

***3. Please mark how you identify yourself. Tick as many as apply.**

- Female
- Male
- Other (specify if you wish)

***4. Please mark which describes you best:**

- Member/Secretariat of the Human Rights Committee (former or current)
- Staff or member of international NGO
- Staff or member of domestic NGO
- Other (please specify)

Questions for NGO partners

***5. Please mark how you have collaborated with the Centre. Tick as many as apply.**

- Participated in workshop(s) organized by the Centre
- Participated in formal briefings coordinated by the Centre
- Participated in informal briefings organized by the Centre
- Participated in submissions to the HR Ctte coordinated by the Centre
- Participated in follow-up missions organized by the Centre
- Previously employed by the Centre
- I have not collaborated with the Centre
- Other (please specify)

***6. Which THREE are the biggest barriers you have faced when it comes to engaging with the HR Ctte?**

- Engaging with the Committee is not a priority for my organization
- Lack of knowledge about the ICCPR and its Optional Protocols
- Lack of knowledge about when and how NGOs can engage the Committee
- Lack of skills to write NGO reports and other submissions
- Lack of skills to speak in front of UN audiences
- Lack of knowledge about using concluding observations for domestic advocacy
- Lack of knowledge about individual complaints to the Committee
- Lack of people to do UN advocacy
- Lack of financial resources to do UN advocacy
- Lack of financial resources to travel to HR Ctte sessions
- Language barriers
- Other (please specify)

***7. Please mark how useful the following CCPR-Centre online resources have been for you: [Very useful – somewhat useful – not very useful – not useful at all – I have not used/participated in this – I don't know about this – N/A]**

- Twitter account
- Facebook page
- Session webcasts
- Session overviews
- 'NGO Guidelines'
- Case law database
- Blog
- Website resources about the HR Ctte and the ICCPR
- Website resources about State Reviews
- Mailings about upcoming Sessions
- Newsletter
- Other (please specify)

***8. How has the Centre impacted your work over the years? Please mark whether you agree with these statements: [Strongly agree - Somewhat agree - Neither disagree nor agree - Somewhat disagree - Strongly disagree - N/A]**

- Knowledge in my institution/organization about the ICCPR and its Optional Protocols has increased.
- Knowledge in my institution/organization about how and when NGOs can engage the HR Ctte has increased.
- Skills in my institution/organization to speak at briefings have improved.
- Knowledge in my institution/organization about the HR Ctte's follow-up procedure has increased.
- Skills in my institution/organization to use the individual complaints mechanism have increased.
- Skills in my institution/organization to write effective NGO reports and other submissions have improved.
- Knowledge in my institution/organization about how HR Ctte sessions are run has increased.
- Skills in my institution/organization to follow up on Concluding Observations have improved.
- Knowledge in my institution/organization about the Committee's jurisprudence has increased.
- Other (please specify)

***9. Thinking about the next 3 years ahead, which THREE of these are you most likely to seek support from the Centre? You can mark up to three answers.**

- Knowledge about the ICCPR and the HR Ctte
- Knowledge about how NGOs can intervene
- Support in writing NGO reports and other submissions
- Support in forming coalitions
- Support in making interventions at UN sessions
- Support in using the follow-up and assessment procedure
- Support to use Concluding Observations for domestic advocacy
- Support to submit individual complaints
- Other (please specify)

Questions for the Committee and its Secretariat

***10. Please mark in what form you have collaborated with the Centre. Tick as many as apply.**

- I used written contributions coordinated by the Centre
- I participated in informal briefings organized by the Centre
- I participated in in-country follow-up missions organized by the Centre
- I participated in workshops organized by the Centre
- Other (please specify)

***11. Which THREE are the biggest challenges you have faced as a Committee Member in implementing the mandate of the Committee?**

- Low number of NGO submissions
- Low quality NGO submissions
- Lack of NGO participation at Sessions
- Lack of effective follow-up on Concluding Observations
- Lack of cooperation with State Parties
- Lack of financial resources for the Ctte
- Issues with the Secretariat / OHCHR
- Other (please specify)
-

***12. Please mark how useful the following CCPR-Centre online resources have been for you: [Very useful – somewhat useful – not very useful – not useful at all – I have not used/participated in this – I don't know about this – N/A]**

- Twitter account

- Facebook page
- CCPR website
- Skype briefings
- Session webcasts
- Session overviews
- Case law database
- Blog
- Newsletter
- Other (please specify)

***13. Please mark how the Centre's support has impacted the Committee's work: [Strongly agree - Somewhat agree - Neither disagree nor agree - Somewhat disagree - Strongly disagree - N/A]**

- The number of submissions the Committee receives has increased.
- The quality of submissions the Committee receives has improved.
- Informal briefings have facilitated the flow of information between the Ctte and NGOs.
- Formal briefings have facilitated the flow of information between the Ctte and NGOs.
- The dissemination of Concluding Observations has improved.
- Civil society follow-up and assessment on Concluding Observations has improved.
- Other (please specify)

***14. Thinking about the next 3 years ahead, on which THREE of these are you most likely to seek support from the Centre? You can mark up to three answers.**

- Increasing the capacity of NGOs to engage with the Committee
- Coordinating formal briefings
- Organizing informal briefings
- Session webcasts
- Translating Concluding Observations
- Disseminating Concluding Observations
- Contributing to the assessment of the implementation of Concluding Observations
- Supporting the implementation of Concluding Observations and Views where implementation is problematic
- Organizing in-country follow-up missions
- Campaigning for the ratification of ICCPR/ OP1/ OP2
- Contributing to elections at the HR Ctte
- Increasing synergies with other international human rights mechanisms (UPR, CAT, etc.)
- Other (please specify)

The next questions are about the RELEVANCE of the Centre's work.

***15. What types of activities of the Centre have been the most relevant to your work so far? 1 = the most relevant 4 = the least relevant**

- Capacity building and legal support (in-country workshops, NGO coalitions)
- Promoting NGO engagement with the Committee (briefings and advocacy at UN headquarters, webcasts, session overviews, etc.)
- Follow-up and assessment activities (in-country follow up missions, follow-up reports, etc.)
- Supporting the Committee's complaint system (Case Law Digest, workshops, etc.)

16. If you have any additional comments about the relevance of the Centre's work, please share them here:

17. How often does the Centre consult you about how it could support your work?

- Always
- Often

- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

18. Would you like to be consulted more often?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe (please specify)

The following questions are about how EFFECTIVE the Centre has been in supporting your work.

***19. Please describe how effective the following CCPR-Centre activities and tools have been in supporting your work. [Very useful – somewhat useful – not very useful – not useful at all – I have not used/participated in this – I don't know about this – N/A]**

- In-country workshops on how to engage with the HR Ctte
- Facilitating NGO coalitions and submission of reports and other contributions to the HR Ctte
- State review webcasts
- Formal briefings during sessions
- Informal briefings during sessions
- Session overviews
- Translations of Concluding Observations into national languages
- In-country follow up missions
- Case law database
- Assessment notes on implementation of HR Ctte recommendations
- Support to engaging in other international human rights mechanisms e.g. Committee against Torture and Universal Periodic Review
- 'NGO Guidelines' on engagement with HR Ctte
- Workshops on Optional Protocol 1
- Other (please specify)

20. How would you rate the effectiveness of the CCPR Centre in your geographic region? [Very effective - Somewhat effective - Not very effective - Not effective all]

21. Which of these institutions or individuals should the Centre prioritize to reach out to increase its effectiveness?

- NHRIs
- Regional human rights organizations
- Other Treaty Bodies
- UN Special Procedures
- Victim groups
- Media
- Other (please specify)

22. How often do you visit the CCPR Centre's website?

- Several times per week
- Several times per month
- Once a month
- A few times per year
- Never

23. What is your general impression of the website (navigation, content, user friendliness)?

24. Is there any additional information you think the Centre could offer to support your work on civil and political rights? Please explain.

- No
- Yes (please explain)

The next questions are about how the Centre can make its work EFFICIENT.

***25. Which of these areas should the Centre prioritize in its work over the next 3 years? Please rank them! 1 = first priority 6 = sixth priority**

- Capacity building and legal support (in-country workshops, NGO coalitions)
- Promoting NGO engagement with the Committee (briefings and advocacy at UN headquarters, webcasts, session overviews, etc.)
- Follow-up and assessment activities (in-country follow up missions, follow-up reports, etc.)
- Supporting the Committee's complaint system (Case Law Digest, workshops, etc.)
- Supporting campaign for ratification of the ICCPR and OP1
- Supporting campaign for ratification of the OP2

26. If you think there are any additional areas the Centre should prioritize, please specify:

27. How often would you like to have email updates from the Centre about key events and issues?

- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Other (please specify)

The following questions are about the IMPACT and SUSTAINABILITY of the Centre's work.

***28. How would you assess the Centre's overall impact on facilitating the participation of NGOs in the work of the Human Rights Committee? [Not significant at all - Very significant; 1-10]**

29. What is your advice about how the Centre could make its work more sustainable?

30. Are there any other comments you would like to share about the Centre's work?

31. I am available for an interview:

- Yes
- No

***32. Please provide your contact details:**

- Name
- Country
- Email Address
- Skype ID

Thank you!

Thank you so much for taking the time to participate in this survey! We really appreciate your input, which will enable us to evaluate the Centre's work over the past 5 years.

Annex V: Terms of Reference

Objectives of the evaluation

The CCPR Centre seeks to get an external expert perspective on its institutional achievements and to position its future development with its first external evaluation, based on the perspectives of CCPR Centre actors, partners, beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholders. The evaluation should seek to assess the following principles:

- **Relevance:** was the Centre mandate suitably designed to address the problems identified? Was it relevant to the needs of its target group and beneficiaries?
- **Efficiency:** how did the Centre perform on the allocation of human and financial resources in implementing its mandate? Did we achieve value for the money?
- **Effectiveness:** how far have we delivered on our intended outputs and results? Could we achieve similar or better results with different methodology(ies)? How could things be done better in the future?
- **Sustainability:** are the results sustainable? Is CCPR Centre support/involvement still required in order to achieve lasting results and where?
- **Impact:** what contribution did we make to the change we wanted to see? What were the final results of our activities during the initial five years?

The evaluation report is intended for CCPR Centre staff, management and Board, the stakeholders consulted as part of the exercise, as well as our donors, including core donors. This evaluation, which is the first of its kind for us, is not intended as an assessment of specific CCPR Centre interventions or as an impact assessment of HR Ctte recommendations. It should instead focus on the core of our work.

Scope of the evaluation and consultations with country based stakeholders

This is a desk based evaluation. However, the evaluator will be required to interview relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries in at least some of our target countries. In addition to country based actors, the evaluator will also be requested to interview other relevant external stakeholders such as current and members of the HR Ctte and their Secretariat; as well as other international human rights NGOs who monitor the HR Ctte. Interviews may be conducted by skype, telephone, and/or through written questionnaires.

Proposed evaluation methodology

The external evaluator will be provided with all data and information relevant to the activities of the CCPR Centre between 2009-2013, including internal reports (e.g. for the Board), mission reports, project documents, annual reports, reports from partners, memorandum of understanding, etc. The evaluator will also be provided with contact details for relevant project stakeholders and beneficiaries, including in the target countries mentioned above. Special arrangements may be agreed to translate relevant documents and facilitate interpretation during country visits.

At minimum, the evaluator is required:

- To undertake a review of all relevant documents
- Discuss with CCPR Centre staff, including the Director, Board members, and former staff
- Organise interviews/questionnaires with key stakeholders, However, applicants are welcome to propose different or additional evaluation methodologies, including details on the methods for the verification of information.

Deliverables and schedule

The evaluator is expected to submit a first draft evaluation report to the CCPR Centre by 15 November 2014. The final report should be submitted 30th November 2014. The report should include at least the following sections:

- Background & introduction
- Methodology
- Main findings with regards to the evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and human rights based approach
- Main findings related to the countries reviewed as part of the evaluation
- Recommendations to CCPR Centre
- Relevant annexes, including questionnaires, persons & institutions interviewed, relevant documents related to the CCPR Centre activities, etc.

CCPR Centre, 9 September 2014