



Learning - To Integrate Human Rights

A Report of

The International Human Rights Network

The International Human Rights Network

This paper by Karen Kenny is based on the work of the International Human Rights Network and its predecessor, *The International Human Rights Trust* established in Ireland in 1996. IHRN is a non-governmental organisation supporting actors in applying [Human Rights Based Solutions](#) in their work and details may be found at <http://www.ihrnetwork.org>. The process of development of this report was kindly supported by the Commission of the European Union and the Irish Department of Foreign Affairs. Originally published by Genprint Ltd. Dublin, Ireland, 1999.

Key principles and approaches

The IHRN advocates, among other approaches, the Sustainability Principle which requires:

“That Human Rights Operations must be based on the assessed needs of a host society, and co-ordinated with other complementary initiatives, so as to best contribute to a sustainable improvement of the human rights situation as part of an overall human rights strategy. This requires the active participation of the host society.”

The sustainable approach to human rights operations has received the support of the Development Committee of the European Parliament and the former United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mrs Mary Robinson.

This material may be freely reproduced provided the source is acknowledged. Comments are also invited:

International Human Rights Network
Glenboy House
Oldcastle, County Meath, Ireland
<http://www.ihrnetwork.org>
info@ihrnetwork.org

Founding Directors

Brian McKeown has acted as an independent development and human rights advisor. He was Assistant Secretary General of *CIDSE, International Co-operation for Socio-Economic Development* in Brussels 1968-72 after which he became founding Director of *Trocaire*, the Irish international development agency. During 21 years as Director, he worked on development and human rights issues throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America. He was a founding Board member of the *Asia Partnership for Human Development*, a consortium of international and Asian development agencies and headed the CIDSE consortium for Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. He was the first elected President of the *European Union-NGO Liaison Committee* which established the European Union's co-financing scheme with NGOs and a member of the *Irish Government's Advisory Council on Development*. He is a founding member and Trustee of the *African European Institute (AEI)- Association of Western European Parliamentarians for Southern Africa (AWEPA)*. In 1995 he was appointed the European Union's Coordinator for *the UN Human Rights Operation in Rwanda (HRFOR)*. More recently, he has acted as a consultant to the European Union on human rights issues including leading human rights identification missions to Togo and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He has recently been conferred with the *Knighthood of the Order of Gregory the Great* for his life's work for development and justice. He was co-founder and co-Director of *The International Human Rights Trust* from 1996-2003.

Karen Kenny is an independent advisor on the law and practice of human rights and humanitarianism. Previously she was a United Nations staff member appointed to plan and conceptualise what became the *UN's Human Rights Field Operation in Rwanda (HRFOR)*, was on the staff of the first UN human rights operation in *El Salvador (ONUSAL)* as well as at the (then) UN Centre for Human Rights working on various UN fact-finding and investigative mandates concerning the former Yugoslavia 1992-94. In this context, for *the Security Council's Commission of Experts* she coordinated a team of 40 to investigate allegations of widespread sexual assault in former Yugoslavia.

More recently, she advises a range of inter-governmental organisations from Unicef to ECHO on integrating human rights into their work at all levels from policy to training - as well as advising humanitarian and human rights NGOs. She is honorary research fellow in the University of Nottingham's *Human Rights Law Centre* and appointed as expert member of the *Irish Department of Foreign Affairs Standing Committee on Human Rights*. She authored *Towards Effective Training for Field Human Rights Tasks* (1996) as well as the discussion paper *Towards a Human Rights Partnership for Effective Field Work* (1998). She co-authored with Brian McKeown *The European Union and Human Rights Field Operations: if, when, how and with whom*, a policy discussion paper requested by the European Commission.

She has designed/delivered operational human rights training for the range of field human rights actors from international military and police to civilian personnel in many countries. From 1996-99 she co-designed and co-delivered the Canadian Pearson Peace-Keeping Centre's annual two week course on human rights in UN field operations and was team leader for advising the OSCE on a human rights training plan for its expanded OSCE Mission to Croatia. She was co-founder and co-Director of *The International Human Rights Trust* from 1995-2003, and has directed its successor *Network* since 2004.

CONTENTS

1 of 2

INTRODUCTION	7
SUMMARY	9
PART I THE CURRENT SITUATION	13
1. Context	13
2. Three Layers of Change	13
2.1 Restructuring	15
2.2 Expanding field work	15
2.3 Potential to integrate human rights	16
3. What do we mean by 'learning'?	17
4. Observations on the current situation	18
4.1 Fragmented learning	18
4.2 Change should be based on learning	21
PART II PROPOSALS: A LEARNING RESOURCE CENTRE	25
1. Overview	25
2. Establish a Learning Resource Centre	26
2.1 Aim: to enhance strategy development	26
2.2 Authority, independence and credibility	27
2.3 Methodology	28
3. Implementation in three phases	30
3.1 First phase beneficiary is OHCHR	30
3.2 Second phase beneficiary is the UN system	33
3.3 Third phase beneficiaries outside the UN	34
4. Close	34

ANNEX IA SAMPLE UN LEARNING PROCESSES	37
1. Learning in the UN system	37
2. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights	37
3. Office of Internal Oversight Services	38
4. Peacekeeping - DPKO	41
5. Peacekeeping: OHCHR and field practice	44
6. Learning at the humanitarian-human rights interface	44
7. Others learning in related areas	48
ANNEX IB BACKGROUND NOTE ON INTEGRATING HUMAN RIGHTS	49
ANNEX IC DISCUSSION PROCESS	53
ANNEX ID INTERNATIONAL FORUM, GENEVA, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	57
1. Introduction	57
2. Issues	58
3. OHCHR as focal point for human rights learning	59
4. Reciprocal support for follow-up	60
ANNEX ID INTERNATIONAL FORUM, GENEVA, PARTICIPANTS	61
ANNEX IIA A LEARNING STRUCTURE	65
1. Single authority	65
2. Doctrinally coherent	65
3. Credibility, authority and independence	65
4. Accountability	66
5. Transparency	66
6. Timely, relevant, auditable outputs	66
7. Mixed discipline team	66
8. Focus political and financial support for learning	67
9. Permanent status	67
ANNEX IIB LEARNING METHODOLOGY	69
1. The learning cycle	69
2. Range of methods	71
3. Inputs	72
4. Analysis	73

5. Output	74
6. Dissemination - feedback	75
7. Auditing	75

Introduction¹

“.....it has become apparent to all that the UN is as much in demand as in need of change....we are learning new ways to do what we do better....The fundamental objective of this reform effort is to narrow the gap between aspiration and accomplishment”

Kofi Annan, UN Secretary-General¹

This project was originally conceived to advance learning from the experience of human rights field operations, and used the working title of ‘Towards Systematic De-briefing for Human Rights Operations’. The need for such de-briefing was seen as an essential step to expand the base of valid information on which decision-making is founded in the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, and others involved in fielding such operations. As such, this project has been designed and implemented as a resource for the Office. Reflecting this, the Chief of the Activities and Programmes Branch was nominated as focal point for liaison with the project by the High Commissioner for Human Rights.

The project examined the systems through which some other field operators, especially others within the UN system, managed their learning from field experience. IHRN met for example with staff of UNDP, Unicef, the High Commissioner for Refugees, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, UN Volunteers Programme, the Office of Internal Oversight as well as the International Committee of the Red Cross and a cross-section of other NGOs. Of necessity, only a sample of the wide variety of UN agencies and programmes could be explored.

A wide range of learning approaches and structures are in use among these bodies and their strengths and weaknesses were readily identified by those involved. Each of these has developed in isolation from each other, and there is no cross-fertilisation among them. For example, some learning units follow-up the implementation of recommendations, others have not been given that authority.

In this context, it became clear that there is no single existing model within the UN, which could be recommended for the learning needs of the Office of the High Commissioner. Therefore, in addition to the above bi-lateral meetings, IHRN convened a series of four consultative meetings with individual experts from analogous disciplines. These took place during 1998-99 in Harvard, Bonn and Geneva and involved a range of expertise such as military lessons learning as well as management and organisational development. This expertise was drawn upon in order that their discipline’s experience of learning could be examined for adaptation to the needs of the Office of the High Commissioner.

In addition, IHRN has briefed the UN’s Inter-Agency Standing Committee Working Groups in both Geneva and New York, as well as briefing states in ‘the Geneva Group’ at a meeting convened by the Irish Mission to the UN at Geneva.²

The time and insights generously contributed by those it consulted in the course of the research is very much appreciated (**Annex Ic**).

¹ This report is cited as Karen Kenny, “Learning –To Integrate Human Rights” a Report of The International Human Rights Network, February 1999.

In the course of this work it became apparent that:

- a) The original conception of 'de-briefing for field operations' was too narrow. The de-briefing of staff is only one element essential for learning from experience required by the Office.
- b) More attention is needed for the implementation stage. A lesson is not merely the compilation of experience - a lesson is a decision to improve an existing situation, **which is only learned once it has been effectively acted upon.**
- c) Moreover, the learning needs and opportunities of the Office of the High Commissioner must be understood in the context of:
 - the lack of lessons-learning and accountability mechanisms in the Office; and in the context of
 - the current need to integrate human rights both within the Office, and across the UN system as a whole.

This Report aims to identify what is needed and to act as a stimulus to debate and discussion both internal and external to the Office - particularly the debate concerning what the integration of human rights across the UN system should mean for OHCHR's vision, priorities and role. This Report should be read together with the IHRN discussion paper *Towards a human rights partnership for effective field work* which it published in 1998. There, it was emphasised that there is a need for effective participation of host societies if field work is to be relevant and contribute to the sustainable improvement in the human rights situation.

This preparatory process culminated in this Report being considered at an International Forum convened by IHRN in Geneva on 28, 29 January 1999. This brought together a broad range of actors concerned with effective learning in the Office of the High Commissioner as well as in their own work. These stakeholders in the Office included partner UN agencies, representatives of host societies, other inter-governmental organisations such as the OSCE, the European Commission and ECHO, Council of Europe, the Southern African Development Community, a range of non-governmental organisations, and representatives of donor states.

There was broad agreement among participants regarding conclusions and recommendations from the Forum, and both these and the list of participants are included in **Annex Id**. Such broad agreement included the fact that the issues discussed have a value and relevance for each of the participating organisation's own learning needs; for their relations with each other; and especially as *reciprocal partners of OHCHR in its role as focal point for learning - to integrate full spectrum human rights in the work of the UN system*. Therefore, the discussion focused particularly on OHCHR's direct work and its contribution to the learning of its partners. The recommendations of the Forum include suggested phased steps towards an effective learning process.

SUMMARY³

Part I Current Learning situation

1. Part I gives an overview of the current learning mechanisms in the Office of the High Commissioner and a sample of those utilised in the wider UN system. In the post-Cold War uncertainties there has been a dramatic increase of pressure towards 'lessons learning' for the UN. A range of units, offices and inspectors have been established or appointed for the in-house evaluation of a number of agencies, from UN High Commissioner for Refugees to the Department of Peacekeeping Operations. These mechanisms, across a number of agencies, are fragmented and each display weaknesses as well as strengths. **Annex I a** outlines a sample of the variety of learning mechanisms in the UN system to draw them together and facilitate comparison.
2. In the case of OHCHR, three seminal processes of change have arisen almost simultaneously: the recently completed re-structuring process; the expansion of field-based activities; as well as the question of what the integration of human rights means for the Office. The full implications of the Secretary-General's Programme for Reform have yet to be worked out in terms of what it should, or will, mean for the Office of the High Commissioner. Yet restructuring of the Office, and a rapid expansion of its field activities is taking place before the contribution of the Office to this wider reform process has been identified.
3. Part I identifies the need for the Office to create an appropriate way of challenging current thinking and practice - both for the OHCHR's own activities, and to allow it to contribute to the coherent and consistent integration of human rights throughout the UN system as a whole.

PART II Proposals: a Learning Resource Centre for OHCHR and the wider UN system

4. There is a need for a permanent, continuous learning cycle, located and managed within the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights - a **Learning Resource Centre**.
5. The aim of the **Learning Resource Centre** is to enhance the overall effectiveness of the Office. To do this it must seek to fulfil **both** the functions of lessons learning and accountability - finding an effective balance between institutional development facilitator and judge.
6. To achieve this aim, it must have an appropriate mandate to do so. It is also necessary that it be located close to, and integrated within the policy-making centre of OHCHR if it is to have a real-time impact on policy discussion and formulation - and so as to encourage the processes which ensure more effective standard operating practices.
7. The **Learning Resource Centre** will benefit not only the Office's human rights methodology, but also the clarity of its mandate, the division of labour within the Office and with other partners, as well as its administration and policy-making. Such benefits include:
 - a) providing focus and support to the lessons learning of all three branches of the Office
 - b) pooling the lessons of the branches to ensure their coherence and consistent application in the work of the Office at all levels

- c) creating a reliable source of valid data, constantly up-dated for decision-making and problem-solving based on real experiences
 - d) stimulating the solution of general management challenges such as the sourcing, identification, selection, training and retention of talented staff
 - e) facilitating operational issues, including the development of standard operational procedures developing transparency regarding impact, benchmarks to measure success, and focussing on effectiveness rather than activity
 - f) facilitating informed policy making throughout the UN system, including for example the integration of human rights into all lessons learning practices
8. The on-going learning cycle involves the **Learning Resource Centre** analysing a broad range of data (inputs) to identify trends and issues requiring improvement; proposing concrete solutions; pilot-testing their application; following through in support of implementation; as well as auditing the outcome.
9. A range of methods and sources of information are needed as inputs to this learning process. These must be actively sought out and developed, including:
- a) routine and effective feedback from all staff, at headquarters and the field
 - b) host society input of views, suggestions, proposals
 - c) partner UN and other international agencies such as the OSCE and EU
 - d) non-governmental organisations
 - e) academic research networks
10. The quality of the impact and utility of the **Learning Resource Centre** is dependent on its credibility. In order to develop credibility, it is essential that it have a high degree of both independence and authority. This includes being mandated by, and reporting directly to, the High Commissioner, clearly working with her authority, and providing input directly into policy discussion. An official, at senior management level, should head the **Learning Resource Centre**.
11. Apart from management, other skills which the Centre will need to draw on, from within and outside the Office, will include librarian-archivist; information technology; experienced evaluators; a range of human rights policy, operational, and administrative experience as well as skill in translating lessons into training (a key element in translating lessons into practice). Initially, the **Learning Resource Centre** should draw on the experiences of existing learning initiatives within the UN system and outside it, which this Report has highlighted.
12. This cycle of learning is a continual process, which involves all staff, and encourages a questioning and learning culture. Moreover, as with any learning process, the benefits will not manifest themselves instantly. Tangible and worthwhile progress will only be evident after sustained effort. The first step requires the commitment to improve. This needs to be encouraged and resourced properly.
13. To focus support, a Forum of Experts is proposed to both provide an accreditation mechanism and to support the development and work of the **Learning Resource Centre**.

14. From the consultations which the project has undertaken, there is a great deal of real enthusiasm for the direction of these proposals and clear commitment to give the needed political and financial support to the High Commissioner in implementing them.
15. These proposals are intended to stimulate discussion and lead to the next step: translating them into specifics for implementation such as the resource implications for the Office - a process to be conducted internally, over time, with external support and with sustained effort.

Part I THE CURRENT SITUATION

1. Context

It is a cliché by now that the world is full of post-Cold war uncertainties. There are so many states in crisis/recurrent crisis, on the verge of crisis, or trying to recover from protracted breakdown, that there is now greater recognition in the UN and the international community that we need to redefine our approach to problems - and how we address them. UN agencies increasingly recognise that they cannot operate in watertight compartments and there has been some advance from the view that 'human rights' was something others did⁴. We are obliged to fully understand what we are doing and what impact, both good and bad, we are having.

2. Three layers of change at OHCHR

2.1 Restructuring

The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights⁵ has been undergoing change for several years. Not only changes in management structure⁶, but important substantive changes - with a dramatic increase in field-based presences and Technical Co-operation Projects as well as the challenge and opportunity of the Secretary-General's Programme for Reform. These latter changes are considered in following sections.

Firstly, **re-structuring** has seen the Office reorganised into three management units, called branches⁷:

1. Research and Right to Development Branch. This is the branch intended 'to be the thought leader' with primary responsibility for the promotion and protection of the right to development.
2. Activities and Programmes Branch. This is the branch intended 'to make things happen'. It has responsibility for advisory services and technical co-operation projects at the request of states. It is responsible for preparing, planning and evaluating field activities and missions; it supports the activities of Special Rapporteurs, Experts and Working Groups mandated to deal with situations or types of alleged violations of human rights and for providing information to human rights organs, the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner for Human Rights on such issues. It is responsible for the formulation of 'best field practice', procedural methodology and models for all human rights activities in the field.
3. Support Services Branch. This branch is responsible primarily for servicing those treaty monitoring bodies mandated, as well as 'to ensure excellent support' for the meetings of the Commission on Human Rights, the sub-Commission and related working groups.

The new tri-partite structure is intended to reflect a new philosophical approach to the organisation of work, focussing on strengthening the processes which produce the outputs mandated by the human rights programme. It is intended to be a significant break with past practices, which involved duplication, lack of co-ordination, inefficient use of resources and an inability to build up expertise in substance and meeting servicing. It is intended that, without an additional co-ordination layer, the various activities will be co-ordinated within the normal work processes.

The general evaluation and oversight of the OHCHR's work remains the responsibility of the UN's Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) based at headquarters in New York. This forms a small part of the OIOS work in that it also has responsibility to support learning in all other agencies and programmes. The OIOS addressed the work of the OHCHR in-depth in 1989 and again more generally in 1995. It provided a key impetus for the recently completed restructuring of the OHCHR.

Apart from this general oversight, there is no specific responsibility within Office of the High Commissioner to facilitate learning from its own experience on an on-going basis.⁸

In 1995 the OIOS reported that the (then) Centre for Human Rights' administrative shortcomings were compounded "*by the...absence of a programme oversight mechanism to assess the results achieved.*" As regards performance evaluation, the OIOS team was "*unable to find any system of monitoring or assessment of results for feedback to upper management.*"⁹

However, even after the recent restructuring, the OIOS expressed its concern in October 1997 regarding this aspect of OHCHR's work:

*"In terms of oversight and administration, the situation remains disquieting. Over the past two years, OIOS has continuously stressed the urgency of establishing a system for monitoring the implementation of the work and assessing the results. The existence of such a system is not apparent as yet, nor are the plans for its establishment...its success will very much depend on the degree of commitment of management towards the broader issue of internal control and accountability. In that regard, it is essential that management enhance the staff's awareness of their respective accountability and embrace self-monitoring and self-evaluation as an integral part of managerial responsibilities...."*¹⁰

Restructuring has not specifically addressed the need to capture data on the Office's experience for either accountability or learning (at headquarters and in the field) nor the need to translate this into improvements for the future covering the range of management issues from methodology to administration.

2.2 Expanding field work

A second layer of change within the OHCHR has occurred in parallel with the restructuring described above. Since tentative beginnings in 1993, the Office has become increasingly involved in placing staff in the field.¹¹ **Field-based** international human rights work (expressly so labeled) is a phenomenon of this decade, and the expansion of the involvement of the Office of the High Commissioner has been dramatic since 1994.¹² In 1997, the second High Commissioner for Human Rights inherited a number of operations and the Office has continued to expand a rapidly multiplying matrix of 'field presences'. A total of twenty-two of these are projected by the Office to be in place by 1999. In addition, only a few years ago Technical Co-operation involved one or two projects per year - now there is field work of this kind in over 40 countries. Supply cannot keep pace with invitations from states.¹³

This is more than a mere expansion of previous activities - it is a watershed move into the implementation of human rights at field level. This has accelerated just as the new management structures have been put in place.

In this area of field-based activities, a relatively high level of awareness of the need for learning has emerged, not least because this has been repeatedly recommended by NGOs as well as by some donors such as the European Commission.¹⁴ For the most part, those recommendations propose either ad hoc reviews involving reports; or they propose that material be centralised to comprise 'institutional memory'. IHRN's 1996 work on training¹⁵ recommended an on-going independent Forum to codify best practices in field work, and in its 1998 discussion paper suggested that:

"There are strong reasons of principle why the High Commissioner's future work should learn from the operations of the past...[T]hey have been ad hoc, reactive, lacking essential accountability such as through meaningful input from the host society, systematic lessons learning through feedback from personnel serving with these operations; and independent evaluation of their strengths and weaknesses. In addition, there is not a clear rationale; they apply narrow field tasks and involve selective application of legal principle."

With the growth in awareness of the imperative to learn, some steps have been taken to reflect on how the Office's field work might be improved. For example, the new Office structure includes a Field Methodology and Advisory Services Team responsible for compiling and recording experiences, best practices, procedures and methodology for human rights field activities.

2.3 Potential to integrate human rights

A third layer of potential change was added while restructuring was on-going and while the work has been expanding into field-based activities. The UN Secretary-General announced his *Programme for Reform* of the United Nations in 1997 including the **integration of human rights in all UN activities**. This seminal reform programme coincided in 1997 with the appointment of the second High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mrs Mary Robinson, who has stressed that the UN's human rights work takes many forms and is spread through many agencies. The High Commissioner has stated that:

*"While I realis[e] that not all UN agencies and programmes [speak] the technical language of human rights, they all [do] work on human rights...the United Nations, in many ways and under many names, is undertaking the difficult work to strengthen human rights and reach people in practical ways daily so as to better own their own lives"*¹⁶

The High Commissioner intends to 'ensure leadership' on the integration of human rights across the UN system fully in keeping with the mandate she received from the General Assembly and the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action (VDPA)¹⁷.

The Programme of Reform has established Executive Committees (ExComm) composed of top UN management mainly covering four of the five sectors in which the UN is active:

- Humanitarian affairs
- Peace and security
- Economic and social affairs
- Development co-operation

These Executive Committees are cabinets which meet to assist the Secretary General. Significantly, there is no human rights ExComm because human rights has been designated by the Secretary-General as underpinning all the UN's activities and therefore to be integrated into its work in every

sector. The High Commissioner is the senior UN official appointed by the General Assembly as focal point for the Organisation's human rights work and she is represented on *each* of the UN's four ExComms when they meet in New York. In the same vein, the High Commissioner also participates in the Senior Management Group, chaired by the Secretary-General and made up of senior officials from the Secretariat as well as from UN Funds and Programmes.

The Secretary-General has expressed the imperative as requiring that the UN achieve "*unity of purpose, coherence of effort*"¹⁸. This imperative applies no less within the OHCHR itself. Integration requires in practice that the full spectrum of human rights (economic, civil, social, political, and cultural) be fully integrated in all the activities of the Office. In this context, the High Commissioner for Human Rights is committed:

*"in our work over the coming years, [to] reaffirm the importance of economic, social and cultural rights and the right to development and will recognise that progress toward the integration of economic, social and cultural rights, is indivisible and interlinked with civil and political rights"*¹⁹

3. What do we mean by 'learning'?

The very word 'learning' has lost clarity of meaning in contemporary speech. It is sometimes equated with 'taking in information' classroom-style²⁰, or with the mere compilation of experiences - this is not of itself learning.

- Learning is not a product suddenly unveiled for all the world to see, it is a **process**: "[Learning] is intimately related to action...so learning organisations are constantly enhancing their capacity to create...[surmounting] tendencies of traditional, authoritarian organisations to destroy people's spirit and to change only when they must. ...*Because the way people think and interact in those organisations will be different.*"
- It is not just taking in information, but understanding it, processing it, applying it, and most importantly, knowing the purpose for which something is learned, making it amenable to understanding, processing and application by others. This **action learning**²¹ is not classroom-based learning, but presents staff with real issues from the activities of the Office and invites better solutions. *It is vital that learners connect what they learn with what they actually do.*
- Learning requires a cyclical process of inputs, analysis, outputs, dissemination and auditing.
- Managers need to promote learning so that it gradually emerges as part of an organisation's culture -step by step²². To fully utilise its human resources OHCHR must be geared to learn at every opportunity - with learning regarded as not an occasional exercise, or an indulgence, but a continuous necessity.
- The process should encourage thinking 'outside the box' which questions assumptions and beliefs of an organisation and re-establishes first principles.

The Report is concerned with creating a situation where the act of learning is a continuous **learning cycle** and affects all staff.

4. Observations on the current situation

General observations are made here, which are drawn upon in Part II for the design of proposals outlined there.

4.1 Fragmented learning

- **Accountability:** In the field of development, and more recently humanitarian aid, the belief that all activity is necessarily positive is no longer common. This is not yet the case in the area of human rights where the twin imperatives of effective learning and accountability have yet to be addressed. There is a general lack of lessons-learning and accountability mechanisms in the OHCHR. Those existing mechanisms are *ad hoc*, fragmented, and lack an integrated learning cycle. This is the case at all levels - from tactical to operational and strategic.

The link between accountability and learning needs to be developed because accountability is itself a stimulus to learning.²³ This should be widely recognised by states, including donors, and other UN human rights actors. Accountability to victims regarding effectiveness should remain high on the agenda of the international community with heightened awareness in a period of stagnating or shrinking resources for human rights.

If strategy, mission, objectives, priorities and methods are unclear, it is difficult to measure achievement. The assessment of activities and their impact should be carried out objectively and independently, using appropriate benchmarks for performance.

- **Narrow information base:** The information base on which current decisions are made is narrow. There is a need for a broad range of inputs to ensure the OHCHR acts on the basis of valid information.

The OHCHR does not maximise the relevant work which occurs in all three branches of the Office, among UN partners and NGO and research networks outside it. Data is not pro-actively gathered and analysed in a manner that is capable of questioning or reinforcing first principles based on valid information.

Thus, the recommendations of those within the Office, and those external to it, are not actively sought, nor are they channelled to a central locus to be considered, pilot tested or followed-up for implementation.

- **Input from the three branches of OHCHR:** While the OHCHR restructuring intends to enhance priority for information exchange on substance horizontally among the branches - there is no mechanism to ensure mutual learning among them.

There is a need for a mechanism to ensure daily coherence and consistency in methodology and concepts applied by the Office across all the branches- especially to integrate full spectrum human rights.

- **All staff:** in the absence of any systematic input from field or HQ staff into a process of learning, each staff member is to some extent a learning cycle enclosed unto themselves. The OHCHR is

suffering a continual drain of experience which is not being tapped and channeled into learning. This is exacerbated by short staff contracts and a high turnover of personnel.

The absence of channels for feedback from staff is widely credited as a factor in staff frustration and burnout particularly in the context of changes involved in headquarters restructuring and inadequate resources. For field personnel this omission is especially serious when combined with a lack of systematic support to address cumulative, and post-traumatic, stress from working in dangerous or crisis environments.²⁴

- **Inputs from each field presence** need to be pooled: At present, each field presence is itself essentially a closed learning circle, with a lack of systematic harmonisation of policy, methodology, procedures, doctrine and principle.

Generally, "there is an increasing awareness within OHCHR of the need to better and more fully integrate field presences, and the work they carry out, into OHCHR's overall structures and goals. This is particularly important to ensure a consistent representation of OHCHR policy across all offices. Improved integration is a two-way process, requiring on one side a better, more systematic transmission of information, policy and methodology from Headquarters to the field, and on the other greater and more systematic efforts to ensure that experience, information and expertise from the field are analysed and incorporated into the development of OHCHR policy and methodology."²⁵

- **There needs to be meaningful input from host society** (local authorities and civil society).²⁶
- **External research networks, academics and international NGOs.** Ten years ago it was noted with appreciation by the Office for Internal Oversight Services that an evaluation of the OHCHR's work should benefit from the wealth of analysis and constructive critique available in the professional literature by well-known specialists and scholars - as well as that available from NGOs. It noted that "Almost no other United Nations programme generates such depth of interest by the relevant external professional peer group"²⁷ Yet this wealth is not being effectively tapped. Indeed, in the absence of internal channels nurturing feedback from the experience of staff, several of the OHCHR's former staff members have written in the academic literature - yet through this channel there is still is no focal point responsible for considering their recommendations.
- **No clear responsibility to learn:** There is no clear responsibility to account for learning from reviews, proposals or feedback. Addressing this requires more than *ad hoc* approaches. Self-evaluation will not meet the learning needs of the Office on its own. This requires the pro-active creation of a learning, questioning culture within the OHCHR. The limits on the creative capacity of the OHCHR are not merely the financial constraints, which are well known and serious. Such limits also flow from what has been called a culture of impunity, a tendency towards defensiveness in response to criticism, an atmosphere of fear instead of creativity, and lack of effective auditing of implementation of improvements:

"The lessons-learning process is undercut by 'the culture of impunity': that is, the failure to hold actors responsible for their actions....More often than not, accountability is something expected of someone else. Everybody-but also nobody- is ultimately responsible in the shell game".²⁸

- **The need to build a learning culture and ensure implementation:** Learning is not simply a question of identifying lessons - but of implementation. There is a need to address what Minear memorably calls a 'laconic learning curve'. He uses the multidonor study of Rwanda as an example of the

importance of evaluation exercises “- but also of their limited ability, in and of themselves, to produce institutional change”.²⁹

Generally, internal opposition to learning processes per se is common because learning involves change. This may include managers’ fear of being undermined, fear of failure, and so forth. It is therefore assumed that there will be some inertia to be avoided and minimised. There is a need to build a learning constituency, for as Senge points out:

“Very few organisations reward enquiry. When was the last time anyone was promoted for asking tough questions that challenged established policies and practices?”³⁰

In a period of change such as currently affecting the OHCHR’s restructuring, and the UN’s reform programme more broadly, staff suffer fear, insecurity and cynicism about the benefits of the change they see around them. Staff must deal with uncertainty and ambiguity in areas which were previously clear.

In contrast, learning requires:

- an atmosphere of trust, flexibility, a willingness to risk something new and having the authority to try it. Individuals must take responsibility for learning. This will take time, “Yet, ways may be found to institutionalise incentives for constructive criticism and promote a culture receptive to thoughtful critiques of current policy and suggestions of alternatives.”³¹; and
 - rigorous auditing with named individual’s being responsible for action, with timelines for implementation and follow-up - including the raising of questions by stakeholders such as donors and host society.
- **Need to evaluate all levels:** Overall, there is a need to evaluate from tactical to strategic levels and to put forward analysis that is credible and independent internally. Such learning needs to be brought to a central point. The OHCHR needs mechanisms to systematise learning in order to maximise effectiveness, credibility, impact, capacity, transparency and accountability.
 - **Learn from other learning mechanisms:** OHCHR’s counterparts in the UN system all have well established evaluation units and/or research programmes which provide recommendations and feedback aimed at improving the quality of their activities. For OHCHR’s own credibility it is essential that it develop a capacity for effective learning.

Yet the learning needs and leadership opportunities of the Office of the High Commissioner will not be adequately met by simply creating another stand-alone learning unit for its internal learning needs. *Of itself, the establishment of yet another such unit will not be a sign of progress.* The Office should avoid predictable weaknesses and build on the identifiable strengths of its ‘learning unit’ analogues among the UN bodies and externally - particularly concerning structure and methodology.

4.2 Change should be based on learning

In addition to the overall observations above, the challenge and opportunity of three major layers of change in OHCHR (restructuring; field activities; potential to integrate human rights) are each being approached without the support of an integrated learning process.

- **Re-structuring:** The effectiveness of the modest self-evaluation proposed in the re-structuring processes has been questioned above. While internal reviews or evaluations are to be more common, alone these are not adequate to meet the learning needs of the Office: lacking a follow-up mechanism; independence or distance from the work being evaluated; not being linked to individual or organisational accountability for performance; lacking a responsible proponent to ensure implementation of needed changes in a defined time period. The proposals in part II would *not displace the primary responsibility of line managers for learning* in their own areas of responsibility - rather they are intended to stimulate, reinforce and integrate such learning by addressing weaknesses such as these across all the activities of the Office.
- **Field activities:** Current approaches to learning are ad hoc, fragmented, receive input from a narrow base, are under-resourced, and lack implementation processes. They are not designed to question and identify lacunae in current practice and strategy or propose solutions. Recommendations which speak of compiling material *or ad hoc* reviews will not of themselves lead to learning as *there is a risk that these may be misunderstood as ends in themselves*. This area is an illustration of the narrow base of data on which strategic decisions are being made such as to expand the number of OHCHR field-activities.

Currently field methods evolve day by day on the ground, adjusting to the environment based on individual staff member's capacities. However, in the absence of systematic feedback from staff each individual remains a closed learning cycle - others outside that cycle are not benefiting from that learning as internal feedback is not systematically gathered and woven into the evolution of doctrine and training cycles.³² *There is no on-going process of feedback to link the Office's actual experience in field activities and the content of training it carries out for others, or its own staff.* As such, field methods and doctrine are not continuously evolving as such new, varying and fast-moving situations require. One result is that the Office can give only limited guidance regarding the training which should be provided by the many private training courses now intending to prepare participants as 'field human rights officers'. The Office is not in a strong position to give the leadership required nor to share with others engaged in such related and beneficial work, as it does not have the necessary base of tested and valid data.

- **Integration of human rights within the Office - learn from others:** As mentioned in section 2 above, the High Commissioner is committed to the integration of the full spectrum of human rights in the activities of her Office. Given the experience of agencies such as Unicef and UNDP towards the same goal, the OHCHR should itself learn from the strengths and weaknesses of their experience of integrating human rights. In this context, the OHCHR operates with a number of UN partners which have recently established units tasked with 'lessons learning' for its purposes.³³

However, there is currently no mechanism for the OHCHR to benefit from the learning taking place through this expanding network of 'learning units'. Each of the UN learning units currently operates in effective isolation from others and they vary greatly in methods, mandate, resources and effectiveness. Even where several units are examining learning from the same country situation or the same issue, there is no systematic pooling of experience or lessons to be learned in the area of human rights.

In the absence of a centre of responsibility for learning in the Office, there is no central location for these other units to address in order to pool human rights experience for the benefit of that Office, and the UN generally.

- **System-wide integration - help others to learn:** From the UN-system's point of view, attempts to learn where a human rights framework is notably absent can be seen in all sectors of its work. The framework is typically absent from the peacekeeping learning process, including the 1998 review by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations Lessons Learning Unit of the UN Transitional Authority in Eastern Slavonia (UNTAES). In the case of humanitarian aid, even where a crisis is quite clearly a human rights crisis, evaluations are frequently approached without that framework³⁴.

The human rights framework within which all UN activities take place, and which should guide their work, should be consistently interpreted by each of these learning units, and developed into a tool for the evaluation of each agency and each programme's work. There is therefore a need for ensuring that all UN evaluators and 'lessons-learners' understand and apply the human rights framework applicable to their work in a coherent, consistent manner.

- **No central focus:** In sum, the UN has no central focus for the holistic development, dissemination and tracking of lessons to be learned in the integration of human rights. This is an immediate obstacle to the coherent, consistent integration of human rights lessons and better practices across the UN system.

As the focal point for human rights in the UN system, OHCHR should play a role in addressing this lacuna, and to improve standards of accountability for the system as a whole.³⁵ Responsible states, including donors, need to make clear their view that supporting the integration of human rights across the UN system is a core function of the OHCHR. It is not merely a question of creating or strengthening links between the Office and other agencies in the UN system. It is IHRN's view that the potential inherent in the UN Secretary-General's commitment to integrate human rights throughout the activities of the Organisation is such that it should transform the way all UN agencies and bodies work: whether relief-aid, development, police, military or human rights 'specialists'. In addition, it should greatly enhance the coherence of these actors working together.³⁶

- **The need for OHCHR to learn first:** This can only be achieved if the Office of the High Commissioner demonstrates a credible learning system for its own activities first, with benefits demonstrable to other agencies.³⁷ As OHCHR is not the only human rights actor in the UN system it should benefit from the experience of others in integrating full spectrum human rights into their work to catch up from its recent 'meeting-servicing' past. In turn, it may build on this to establish credibility as a source of support and coherence for the integration of human rights in the learning units of the UN system as a whole.

- **Non-UN beneficiaries:** The Secretary-General sees UN reform as “outward looking”³⁸ and this applies also to the benefits of learning to integrate human rights. Beyond the UN system, there is a range of others who should be enabled to benefit from the human rights learning of the UN. These include the inter-governmental organisations involved in fielding human rights operations, the Organisation of American States, the EU, Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe and the Organisation of African Unity; all regional peace operations as well as all field development work.

PART II PROPOSALS: A LEARNING RESOURCE CENTRE

Reform is a process, not an event

- UN Secretary-General, Mr Kofi Annan

1. Overview

To address the issues identified in part I, this part proposes the establishment of a focus for learning with sufficient authority to ensure its recommendations are followed through and applied in practice. It seeks to address the need for proactive, incremental improvements in the quality of information used in OHCHR decisions, to deal with personal resistance to change, and to increase accountability for actions - in sum the need for an integrated learning system.

These proposals are drawn from:

- A comparison of the current situation with the concept of an integrated learning cycle;
- preliminary lessons which this Report draws from the experience of various UN learning efforts (outlined in Annex I a); and
- the incorporation of the experience of analogous disciplines.

Here part II firstly outlines the conceptual requirement for an integrated learning system. Proposals are then made for its phased implementation to meet the needs of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. Over time, this learning system should evolve to support the learning needs of integrating human rights across all the activities of the UN system. Learning - to integrate human rights - would be clearly a core function of the Office of the High Commissioner, and one in which it would yield a significant multiplier effect by maximising the effective human rights work of its partner UN agencies.

These proposals are in part rather abstract - of necessity. It is for the discussion they stimulate to translate them into specifics such as the resource implications for the Office - a process which can only be conducted internally, over time, with external support and combined with sustained effort.

Annex II a aims to draw together those elements of a learning **structure** which the project research indicated the Learning Resource Centre should benefit from.

Annex II b describes the kind of **methodology** to be considered for an integrated learning cycle for the OHCHR.

2. Establish a Learning Resource Centre

The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights should establish a permanent, continuous learning cycle located and managed within it. This would be an on-going process of analysis of a broad range of data (inputs) to identify trends and issues requiring improvement; proposing concrete solutions; pilot-testing their application; following through in support of implementation; as well as auditing the outcome. This continual process would involve all staff, and encourage a questioning and learning culture.

The complete process should be co-ordinated by a single authoritative unit within the Office thereby ensuring that information is centralised; that no trends are missed; and that there is clear responsibility to ensure that the outputs are appropriately acted upon. It is proposed that a Learning Resource Centre be established in the Office to carry out those tasks.

2.1 Aim: to enhance strategy development³⁹

The aim of the **Learning Resource Centre** is to enhance the overall effectiveness of the Office of the High Commissioner. The mandate of the Learning Resource Centre should be to make a strategic contribution as an essential management tool for the Office. As such it should seek to fulfil both the functions of lessons learning and accountability - finding an effective balance between institutional development facilitator and judge.

To achieve this, it must have an appropriate mandate to do so. It is also necessary that it be located close to, and integrated within the policy-making centre of OHCHR if it is to have a real-time impact on policy discussion and formulation - and encourage the processes which ensure more effective standard operating practices.

Benefits: The **Learning Resource Centre** should benefit not only human rights methodology, but also clarity of mandate, division of labour within the Office and with other partners, administration and support, as well as policy-making. Such benefits include:

a) Integrating three branches: providing focus and support to the lessons learning of all three branches of the Office and pooling their lessons to ensure their coherence and consistent application in the work of the Office at all levels

b) Strategy: creating a reliable source of valid data, constantly up-dated for decision-making and problem-solving based on real experiences. The Learning Resource Centre should reinforce the Office's development and communication of a clear sense of direction and purpose to staff and others, while also helping to motivate staff. There must be a common understanding of the aim of the Office, with the Learning Resource Centre contributing to the vision-setting needed at all levels with teams setting their vision consistent with the overall vision of the Office.⁴⁰

c) Personnel: stimulating the solution of general management challenges such as the sourcing, identification, selection, training and retention of talented staff. A key factor in the long-term success of the Office is the success it has in attracting, retaining, developing, motivating and utilising the best talent in the human rights field. Listening to staff, helping to identify the Office's present and future requirements for talent and training, helping to develop recruitment and selection strategies and

creating a questioning, learning work environment - should all be enhanced through the work of the Learning Resource Centre through a strong emphasis on developing internal resources.

d) Facilitating operational issues: including the development of standard operational procedures

e) Accountability: developing transparency regarding impact, benchmarks to measure success, and focussing on effectiveness rather than activity

f) Integration: facilitating informed policy making throughout the UN system, including the integration of human rights into all lessons learning practices.

g) Ultimately this is about creating a learning culture within the Office, one in which creativity and critical self-evaluation are seen as assets - rather than as a bar to advancement or future employment.

The function of the Learning Resource Centre should be clear: its success will be measured in increased effectiveness of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in fulfilling its mandates and contributing to the sustainable improvement of human rights through all aspects of the Office's work. It will not produce reports or recommendations or run training workshops as ends in themselves. *It will be expected to achieve change as well as developing the mechanisms to measure it.*

2.2 Authority, independence and credibility

A key question is how to ensure the output of the learning process is actually effective in achieving improvements. The **Learning Resource Centre** will need to have a number of features including the following, which are expanded upon in **Annex II a**, including:

a) Credibility, authority, independence: The quality of the impact of the **Learning Resource Centre** is a function of its credibility. In order to develop credibility, it is essential that it have a high degree of independence and authority. This includes reporting directly to the High Commissioner, clearly working with her authority, and providing input directly into policy discussion. The High Commissioner for Human Rights and ultimately the Secretary-General must be clear and consistent in supporting the Learning Resource Centre's work

b) Focus external support and secure funding: One early step should be the convening of a **Forum as a focus for support** to the Office of the High Commissioner in the development of its learning cycle. The commitment to improve needs to be encouraged and resourced properly. Such support is strongly indicated from sources ranging from member states to UN agencies, inter-agency mechanisms, donors, and the wide constituency of NGO and research networks supportive of the Office. This should be tapped through a Forum representing a range of disciplines to support and advise the Office of the High Commissioner on achieving an integrated learning cycle.⁴¹ It should also contribute to the accountability and transparency of the learning process itself and act as a 'gross error checker' for the Learning Resource Centre. States are a vital part of the learning constituency which the Learning Resource Centre and its advocates need to build. They have an essential role to play in supporting the process of learning and institutional change within the Office *by valuing the process* and therefore funding it appropriately and securely.

c) An official, at senior management level, should head the **Learning Resource Centre**. They should have a track-record in the field of organisational learning (evaluation, reviews, inspection and so forth)

with the management skills for team learning and constituency-building. They should have strong 'people-skills'; personal credibility born of working in the field; independence of mind; a vested interest in doing the job properly and should be passionate in this role. Skills which the Centre will need to draw on, from within and outside the Office, will include librarian-archivist; information technology; experienced evaluators; a range of human rights policy, operational, and administrative experience as well as skill in translating lessons into training.

d) It will need to build an internal learning constituency for learning (see **Annex II b** methodology).

e) Build incrementally: The learning process should be pilot tested, using trials. The benefits of learning should be demonstrated so that change is implemented by conviction, not compulsion. The first step should be used to develop procedures and relationships quietly, without a highly visible first project - but expanding into ever more systematic processes. For stakeholders such as staff or states, the cost-benefit will need to be convincingly demonstrated. The process will not appear costly if the outputs are demonstrable, yet anything of real value will not manifest itself instantly. It should be understood that tangible and worthwhile progress is usually only evident after sustained effort.

2.3 Methodology⁴²

Five steps: The learning process has five essential steps: information (inputs)-analysis-output - validation - audit.⁴³ Generally, the approach to methodological issues should retain flexibility to allow needed adjustments over time. Methods should be explored on an experimental, pilot basis and then examined for strengths and weaknesses. This should build on the positive and negative experience of other learners in the UN system through the *cartwheel hub of methodology* in phase 1 outlined below, with the Learning Resource Centre at its core.

No methods are excluded a priori. Evaluations which produce a report and recommendations are not of themselves sufficient for the OHCHR's learning needs. While such evaluations or reports may be commissioned of the Learning Resource Centre by the High Commissioner, the recommendations will need to be focussed through the five steps of the learning process: inputs, analysis, outputs, validation, audit.

The process of learning would be daily, continuous and the concern of all staff. Routine information flows from staff are emphasised, as well as the need to be pro-active in building relationships with external sources such as NGO and academic networks specialised in the areas of work of the Office of the High Commissioner.

Overall, the development of a cost effective and comprehensive learning system will itself be an evolutionary process. Working practices and relationships will need to develop as the system matures.

3. Implementation in three phases

A step by step, incremental learning process is proposed. Three phases are envisaged with the OHCHR being the key beneficiary of the first phase, the wider UN system integrating human rights the beneficiary of the second and the range of relevant external actors, such as regional organisations, the beneficiaries of the third phase. This can be visualised as concentric circles.

Later phases should evolve out of, and be shaped by the experience of the first phase. The three phases are inter-linked and should ultimately be on-going simultaneously once they have been introduced.

3.1 First phase beneficiary is OHCHR

Phase 1 is intended to mainly benefit the OHCHR. It has two over-arching aims:

- develop the methodology of the Learning Resource Centre by drawing on the network of existing 'lessons learned' units of various kinds across the UN system (see **Annex 1 a**); and
- To draw on the full range of external and internal inputs needed to integrate full-spectrum human rights throughout all the Office's activities.

Methodology network: This phase should establish a network among the UN learning units of various kinds and draw on their combined experience for the methodology of the Learning Resource Centre. This network for pooling methods may be visualised as a cartwheel with OHCHR at the hub, shown in schematic form in **Figure 1**.

The pre-existing learning actors (some of which are outlined in Part I) are themselves a source of lessons to be learned before embarking on setting up the Learning Resource Centre - as it is not merely one more such unit. The network should pool experience concerning all aspects of their work such as methodology; technology of communications, data storage, search and retrieval as well as identifying more effective methods of ensuring recommendations are applied in practice. This may lead to a set of agreed principles, recognised as needed for the effective functioning of an integrated learning system.

Annexes II a and II b draw together those principles and methodology which the project research indicated the Learning Resource Centre should apply. It should be seen as a starting point for phase 1's discussion among the network of learning units in the UN system.

While the primary beneficiary of this range of inputs is the Office of the High Commissioner in phase 1, the other learning actors in the network will certainly discover ways to improve their own methods of work through brainstorming about common challenges. In the course of consultations for this paper, several units have themselves identified limitations of their current methods, mandate or structure and have expressed interest in pooling learning experiences with other units acting in related learning cycles. This is not surprising given that several units have found themselves reviewing the same crises "from different perspectives, with different methodologies [but] without much consultation".⁴⁴

The UN Secretary-General has emphasised the need 'to identify and exploit ways of pooling resources' in ways such as these and to ensure inter-sectoral and inter-institutional coherence of activities and programmes.⁴⁵ A step towards this in phase 1 would be to identify skilled staff from other learning units for secondment to the Learning Resource Centre to advise on methodology - these may have learning experience gained in public service, other UN agencies, NGOs, military or commercial management sectors.

Among the learning actors, broadly and informally defined, there will inevitably be some instances of overlap of tasks with those of the Learning Resource Centre. Some of the learning actors have responsibility for investigation or audit functions, while others are evaluators. Overlaps will need to be addressed on a case by case basis to find the most effective solutions to divide labour. This will for example concern the Office of Internal Oversight Services and the Learning Resource Centre (see **Annex I a**). Clear arrangements for facilitating and mutually reinforcing the work of each should be identified.

In sum, phase 1 should benefit the Office of the High Commissioner's thinking regarding its own learning needs, but also reinforce the efforts of those who seek to strengthen other learning systems (such as DPKO, UNHCR etc).

Integrating full spectrum human rights for the Office: Phase 1 is needed to reinforce the application of the HCHR's commitment to full spectrum human rights in the work of the Office. Some disparate efforts are already underway, and this phase should help focus, consolidate and reinforce them.⁴⁶ This is *transformative integration* of human rights for the OHCHR's own work in all three branches (see background note at **Annex I b**). This draws on an earlier recommendation by IHRN:

*"Techniques to be applied in [OHCHR work] should be built upon systematic debriefing of all staff and upon the independent evaluation of past human rights operations with meaningful input from the host societies concerned. In addition, the techniques should be premised on two-way mainstreaming of human rights and development thinking"*⁴⁷

No inputs are excluded *a priori* (see **Annex II b Learning Methodology**), but certain sources should certainly be included from the outset. These are essential for expanding and systematising current inputs: input from all staff; host society where field presences are concerned; other UN agencies and external sources.

Outputs of this first phase would concentrate on evolving the Office's in-house strategy, methods and training ensuring coherent integration of full spectrum human rights across the Office's activities from field presences to the servicing of treaty bodies.

Training function: the Learning Resource Centre should co-ordinate a training plan for the staff of the Office, covering a period of two years and up-dated on a rolling basis. It should give a composite picture of training needs and planned responses to meet those needs by the Learning Resource Centre itself, the three Branches, states, external training institutions or NGOs.

3.2 Second phase beneficiary is the UN system

Overall, through the above two steps (creation of a methodology network among learning units, and through advancing in practice the indivisibility of full spectrum human rights) phase 1 should build the professional learning credibility of the Learning Resource Centre. This should demonstrate to the UN system as a whole the benefits of moving to phase 2 with the Office evolving as a credible and relevant hub of learning for human rights integration supporting the range of agencies and programmes.⁴⁸

The secondment of skilled staff from other learning units in the UN system or outside it, should be built on in phase 2. A multi-agency approach to staffing the Learning Resource Centre within the OHCHR should help development the approaches needed to facilitate human rights integration through **mutual learning**.

The Learning Resource Centre should literally be a resource for learning units system-wide, from the UNDP to the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, providing both the stimulus and resources such as a mobile team of facilitators to encourage the process. Without this phase 2 process, there is a risk that the OHCHR itself becomes a closed learning circle.

Over time, the network of learning should increase mutual accountability among agencies - increasing communication regarding methods applied on the ground, their human rights implications and improving coherence of action in the field with an enhanced consensus around a unified aim.

Each agency's mechanism for tracking lessons to be learned from their own experience would pool that experience in the Learning Resource Centre. That Centre would neither replace their functions, nor be in a position to compel implementation of particular outputs. Rather, it will be for the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Secretary-General and key bodies such as the Executive Committees and the Inter-Agency Standing Committee to be persuaded of the merits of the general approach of the Learning Resource Centre and to support its output. In some cases, there may be specific consideration of particular lessons proposed by the Learning Resource Centre, and these may require advocacy by these actors to ensure they are applied.

Without compulsion, there will still be the need for the Learning Resource Centre to be **authoritative** and this is particularly evident in phase 2. Its work it will require clear and express political support: from the High Commissioner for Human Rights and states in phase 1 and, in addition, from the UN Secretary-General for phase 2. An appropriate parallel, in view of the importance of its role in the UN reform process is the authority and political support clearly accorded to UN Office for Internal Oversight Services:

*"The Secretary-General will continue to support the full and timely implementation by programme managers of recommendations made by the Office of Internal Oversight Services, which will continue to be a key element in the on-going reform process."*⁴⁹

States will need to contribute to the Learning Resource Centre's authority. Several of the learning units consulted emphasised they did not wish for more resources, but rather wished that responsible member states, including donors, would discuss the application of their recommendations when meeting senior management responsible for implementation, and ask: "*what has been done about this?*"

3.3 Third phase beneficiaries outside the UN

The learning in phases 1 and 2 is likely to produce outputs which are adaptable to the needs of actors beyond the UN. Examples range from member states who are developing their human rights national plans in pursuance of the Vienna Programme of Action - to the current discussion of a '*Human Rights agenda for the European Union*' regarding its internal and external policies.⁵⁰

Other obvious potential beneficiaries of the work of the Learning Resource Centre are regional inter-governmental organisations fielding peace support operations. There is a general need to develop a stronger human rights framework for such work and it is increasingly understood that common challenges are being faced by the several organisations involved in mandating, fielding or funding human rights operations - whether for example the European Commission, the OSCE or the UN. There is a need to pool common experience and contribute to better practices in areas such as training - as well as questions of coherence and co-ordination from the field to headquarters levels, and in national administrations. Such regional bodies should be encouraged to be actively involved by providing inputs and validating outputs of the Learning Resource Centre. In turn, the Learning Resource Centre should facilitate common mutual training to help rationalise scarce resources and maximise coherent actions once in the field. This is of particular significance in view of developments such as the OSCE Kosovo Verification Mission, where key questions arise such as the relationship between that Mission and the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights' field officers there.

Ultimately, when its learning expertise is honed through phases 1 and 2, the Office of the High Commissioner might consider directly supporting the learning work of others by having the Learning Resource Centre conduct assessments or de-briefings at the invitation of bodies such as the OSCE.

4. Close

Through this report IHRN hopes to contribute to what the UN Secretary-General has called integrative, holistic thinking - essential for effective learning:

*"the new United Nations of the twenty-first century cannot afford to perpetuate narrow non-integrative thinking and approaches. The global environment is too complex and interdependent...the challenges and demands are too great....institutional resources and capacities are too limited"*⁵¹

ANNEXES

ANNEX I a

SAMPLE UN LEARNING PROCESSES

1. Learning in the UN system

Within the UN system, individual agencies and programmes may have their own systems for learning beyond financial and auditing oversight. Not all do, including the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. The remit and resources of such units as do exist vary greatly, with a range of permutations involving one or more of the inspection, auditing, investigation or evaluation functions. In some cases there is a degree of transparency in publishing and sharing outputs while in others there is none. There is no common concept, methodology, output nor systematic sharing of inputs or outputs among such learning units.

A sample of these is given in outline here, highlighting some significant features of relevance to the proposals in Part II.

2. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

Overall, the Price Waterhouse Study and resulting restructuring is a form of learning process. It is analogous to those undertaken recently by UN High Commissioner for Refugees through its Delphi Project, or the International Committee of the Red Cross' Avenir Review.

In addition to the restructuring, there are several units within OHCHR which incorporate aspects of learning from experience into their work. These capture, collate or analyse information in one way or another. Some examples in each branch are given to illustrate the variety of forms and disparate efforts towards learning currently in place: the Research and Right to Development Branch, the Activities and Programmes Branch and the Support Services Branch.

The Research and Right to Development Branch: Duties include providing substantive analysis and support to the High Commissioner in her mandate to enhance system-wide support for the right to development. It is also to carry out substantive research projects on the whole range of human rights issues in light of the priorities established by the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action. It has responsibility for the information services of the human rights programme, including the documentation centre and library, enquiry-services and management of the human rights databases. The other branches have important roles to play in implementing the right to development through their work - facilitating the work of the treaty bodies in the case of one branch or in delivering education using materials on the right to development field activities of the other. This branch archives large amounts of raw data on diverse aspects of current work, training and associated subjects. The branch has the capacity to research and analyse a wide variety of subjects.

The Support Services Branch: Annual meetings of the experts appointed under special procedures by the Commission on Human Rights (Special Rapporteurs, Working Groups etc.) have been introduced. The on-going *Review of the Mechanisms of the Commission on Human Rights* conducted by the states members and co-ordinated by its Bureau, is a learning process with most obvious implications for the work of this Branch. Written submissions have been requested from 'interested parties', member states and NGOs. The submissions contain 'proposals for enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency' of the mechanisms and bodies of the Commission on Human Rights.¹ In this context, the High Commissioner established an 'Internal Taskforce on human rights mechanisms' in May 1998. Recommendations flowing from the review will be made to the Commission at its fifty-fifth session in 1999.

The Activities and Programmes Branch, includes Technical Co-operation². This Branch is responsible for field presences in some 22 countries and Technical Co-operation projects in some 40 countries. The Board of Trustees of the Voluntary Fund for Technical Co-operation recently recommended the establishment of a Project Approval Committee. Some projects contain an evaluation component in the proposal.

Team working methods have been recently introduced to OHCHR, itself a potentially important aspect of learning methodology. Internal discussion is added to by innumerable external conferences, workshops, etc. a number of which are attended by OHCHR staff each year. Where insights are yielded, there is no locus within the OHCHR to whom new ideas can be routinely addressed for active consideration as appropriate.

3. Office of Internal Oversight Services

This is a key learning partner for the Office of the High Commissioner as the Office is within its oversight functions. It provides analogies for several of the proposals made in Part II. As such, key elements are described here. The OIOS consists of the:

- Audit and Management Consulting Division
- Central Evaluation Unit
- Central Monitoring and Inspection Unit; and the
- Investigations section

a. Status and authority

The OIOS was established by consensus resolution of the General Assembly in 1994 to intensify the Organisation's audit, evaluation, inspection, investigation and compliance monitoring. It has a pro-active and advisory role and is to give assistance and provide methodological support to programme managers in the effective discharge of their responsibilities.

It is headed by an official of the level of Under-Secretary-General in whose view it:

"was by itself a most meaningful and effective reform step taken by the General Assembly. Through that decision, the Assembly added an important new element to the management culture of the United Nations, an element that had been lacking for almost five decades, namely, independent internal oversight within the Organisation."... "It has heightened fiscal awareness among staff, contributed to streamlining many administrative and other United Nations activities, watched over the strict observance of rules and regulations, promoted economic solutions and battled irregularities and wrong doing against the Organisation.

OIOS recommendations have aimed at structural change, better management, more accountability and increased transparency.”³

The Secretary-General has recently described the Reports of the Office of Internal Oversight Services as “*an extremely valuable source of reference and guidance in the development of the overall vision and specific measures connected with the reform effort...[it] is an important new element in the management culture of the Organisation*”⁴

b. Tracking and follow-up of recommendations

The semi-annual reports of OIOS on the subject-areas it has considered include:

- descriptions of problems, abuses and deficiencies
- recommendations not approved by the Secretary-General (none to date)
- recommendations in previous reports on which corrective action has not been completed or where management revised a decision from a previous period
- recommendations on which agreement could not be reached with management or where requested information or assistance was refused (there have been no such situations)
- the value of cost savings recommended and amounts recovered

In general, “The strong emphasis by OIOS on the full implementation of its auditing, inspection, evaluation and investigation recommendations has caused some *profound changes* within the management culture of the United Nations. Programme managers are increasingly aware of the fact that mere acceptance of recommendations is no longer sufficient, as it often was before the creation of the OIOS. To get ‘off the hook’ of OIOS review, meticulous implementation of its recommendations is required. A computerised monitoring system now tracks recommendations issued by OIOS. The sense of responsibility and accountability thus instilled can be expected to reduce further the occurrence of abuse and to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of management.”⁵

The specific follow-up procedure varies with each OIOS function - whether audit, investigation or evaluation. The most relevant function for present purposes is that of evaluation where “Procedures for monitoring the recommendations in reports on in-depth evaluations has been established for many years. The Committee for Programme and Co-ordination receives a triennial review three years after adopting its decisions on the evaluation. The triennial review assesses compliance with those recommendations the Committee endorsed and, if necessary, makes recommendations for further action. During the intervening three years, progress in compliance is monitored.”⁶

c. Political support for compliance

The authority and political support required as an impetus towards compliance is significant:

*“The Secretary-General will continue to support the full and timely implementation by programme managers of recommendations made by the Office of Internal Oversight Services, which will continue to be a key element in the on-going reform process.”*⁷ Furthermore, regarding implementation:

“OIOS reports have been received with increasing interest by the General Assembly, the media and the general public. The attention that the Assembly devotes to our findings and recommendations is very important and highly appreciated: it is the most weighty leverage this

Office has and directly influences the rate of compliance, which I am proud to state, continues to climb".⁸

d. Support for learning across the UN system

Operational Funds and Programmes: In addition to establishing the OIOS, the General Assembly in the same resolution asked the Secretary-General for a detailed report on methods "*by which the OIOS could support the funds and programmes in enhancing their internal oversight mechanisms*". In its final version the report describes the internal oversight functions in each of the funds and programmes (HCR, Unicef, UNDP, UN Population Fund) and makes specific recommendations to improve and strengthen oversight.⁹

The responses have varied, and include:

- UNDP inviting the Under-Secretary-General of OIOS to become a member of its Management Review and Oversight Committee
- The OIOS and UHCHR signing a memorandum of understanding on the provision of internal audit services to UNHCR
- The International Trade Centre UNCTAD/WTO responding likewise.

The OIOS is under a general obligation to provide guidance to heads of departments and offices concerning two basic areas of management, namely keeping track of the progress of work through monitoring and attempting to assess the effectiveness of work through what is termed self-evaluation. "In general, OIOS studies have shown that adequate monitoring and evaluation practices do not exist in many departments and offices."¹⁰ To this end, guidelines have been circulated setting out minimal elements of programme monitoring and evaluation that should be in place in each department and office. For programme performance monitoring, submissions to OIOS are now required in three instalments. Under the new guidelines, only one submission is required if the department or office has *an adequate monitoring system of its own in place* and allows OIOS read-only access to the system. The ultimate objective is to assist in the establishment of departmental monitoring systems that will permit OIOS to eliminate elaborate and bureaucratic submissions.

e. Resources

Significantly, the Central Evaluation Unit of the OIOS does not feel its work is hampered by lack of resources. Rather, it would prefer more states to make a point of raising specific OIOS recommendations with the UN management to whom they are addressed. It is political reinforcement of the OIOS work from responsible member states at every opportunity that is sought.

In addition to the OIOS, the Board of External Auditors and the Joint Inspection Unit also work in related areas of supervision. There are on-going efforts to co-ordinate the work of the OIOS with these bodies to contribute to providing comprehensive oversight services for the Organisation.

4. Peacekeeping - DPKO

A Lessons Learned Unit (LLU) was established in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations in response to a recommendation by the OIOS (see 3 above). The objectives of the Unit are to derive lessons from peacekeeping operations and recommend their application to improve the planning, management, conduct and support of on-going and future operations - as well as to develop institutional memory on peacekeeping.¹¹

a. Independence

Situated within the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, whose work it is deriving lessons from, raises the question of independence. Much depends on the individual personalities heading both the Unit and heading the DPKO with management responsibility for the Department as a whole, and their commitment to learning. Being situated within its parent department brings advantages such as access to information and engagement of professional colleagues, as well as disadvantages, including more circumscribed terms of reference and less direct independence. Methods based on quiet persuasion and trust are used of necessity by a Unit in such a position (see Methods below). It has been suggested that being part of the Department may mean that it is better resourced than it would be if it were external to it.

The reports of the LLU are not formally addressed to anyone but are issued when the Chief of the Unit decides they are complete. On the issue of independence, the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations has rejected the suggestion that it should approve the LLU reports, instead they continue to be merely “made available”, not submitted, to it for its consideration. In like manner, the reports are made available to UN member states.

b. Methodology

A mixture of methods is used, although there is little automatic or routine inputs directed to the Unit as such. Overall, “Studies are conducted in close co-operation with mission personnel, troop contributing countries, Secretariat, regional/intergovernmental organisations, Specialised Agencies and NGOs.”¹² A great deal of internal DPKO consultation is a feature of the work of both for reasons of enhancing the likelihood of implementation of recommendations, and because of the LLU position within DPKO.

Methodology may involve the following steps:

- study available documents and reports on the Operation
- interview DPKO Desk Officers
- interview relevant officials from other Departments and Specialised Agencies
- request assessments from Troop Contributing Countries
- interview political and military officials or relevant permanent Missions
- de-brief senior mission officials: only Heads of Mission, Force Commanders, or heads of units are required to submit end of assignment reports. Working alongside the LLU is a small Civilian Police Unit, which has no expressly identified learning system. End of mission reports are requested of Police Commissioners and vary in format, detail, and are not compulsory

- circulate a questionnaire to selected mission officials for feedback: a questionnaire was used in Angola to try to garner feedback more broadly from middle and senior management. This was not found useful (see OCHA below)
- undertake field visits: building trust and a personal rapport with relevant senior mission officials has been found to be important as often this oral information is found to be the most reliable and valuable
- consult selected external experts on the operation
- hold internal consultations within the UN system
- hold a workshop/seminar with Troop Contributing Countries, UN and mission officials, Specialised Agencies, selected NGOs and experts
- publish lessons learned report: for each review of a peacekeeping mission, an internal report is produced, although as much as possible is said to made public in the mission report

In the Triennial Review of the start-up phase of peacekeeping operations the need for systematic inputs to the learning process was emphasised:

“Formulating the lessons of experience” The DPKO should adopt policies on end-of-mission assessments, exit interviews, debriefings, mid-mission assessments and mission records, and establish a documentation centre...and seek additional resources to implement them”¹³

c. Tracking and follow-up of recommendations

As LLU reports are not addressed to a particular responsible body (see independence above), implementation remains the responsibility of the concerned Department or Agency or Unit. The LLU itself tracks implementation by publishing an annual Status of Implementation Report. However, the Unit's reports have been criticised for narrow dissemination and for being of little practical value in the field (see dissemination-practical application, below).

d. Resources

The LLU has been funded from the Voluntary Trust Fund for Peacekeeping and was not funded on a stable basis as of end of year 1997.¹⁴ At one point the Unit had eight professionals and three secretaries financed by the Trust Fund, but this is now reduced to four professionals.

e. Dissemination, practical application

The LLU has established a Resource Centre with a selection of documents pertaining to peacekeeping operations in both electronic and hard copy. Mission-specific documents, such as end-of-mission reports, reconnaissance or fact-finding mission reports, technical survey mission reports, rules of engagement, guidelines for troop-contributing countries, status of forces/mission agreements, mission standard operating procedures and other policy documents are being collected for each mission. The Resource Centre has a home page on the Internet.

“However, missions are not connected to it as a matter of standard policy - [they] are connected to the Resource Centre only if they individually subscribe to a commercial Internet server.”¹⁵

The importance of using information technology and not paper-based systems is evident here.

In 1998 the Triennial Review repeated criticism it had made four years earlier regarding the weak field utility of the 'Lessons learned' Resource Centre. The materials are not fully indexed and the collection is still not known or available to the missions in the field. There is no Departmental policy directive to assist the Resource Centre to collect and disseminate mission-specific documents such as standard operating procedures and other documents of a similar nature which record the practical experience of the mission. Consequently, the problem described in the Progress Report of four years ago has still not been properly addressed:

"ONUMOZ staff...were unable to obtain any reference documents from United Nations Headquarters or other Missions with regard to procedures applied in other peace-keeping missions on such important issues as demobilisation, cease-fire monitoring, storage and safe-keeping of investigations into violations of the agreement etc...Such an archive should be created, indexed and made available to missions on a DPKO intranet site as soon as possible." 16

Manuals, guidelines and directives have been issued from DPKO *"However, in the absence of the systematic collection or review of mission standard operating procedures...it is not clear the extent to which these lessons learned reports, and manuals, and guidelines and directives, reflect lessons derived from experience at the level of precision needed to be of practical value in the field"*¹⁷

More generally, the Training Unit (military) within the Mission Planning Service of DPKO works in parallel to the Lessons Learned Unit. It works on development of doctrine which reportedly was last updated in 1991 - significantly prior to the Secretary General's intention to integrate human rights throughout the UN's peacekeeping work. A key element of the learning cycle is dissemination through improved training (still the responsibility of Troop Contributing Countries) and this is supported by the Training Unit through Training Assistance Teams and the maintenance of a database through which states' Permanent Missions can identify points of contact within other states, including sources of training.

In 1999, standby planning for the Multinational United Nations Standby Forces High-Readiness Brigade (SHIRBRIG) will be advanced. SHIRBRIG has been developed by a group of states from four continents, led by Denmark. It is intended that up to 5,000 troops capable of deploying in less than 30 days for up to 6 months will be operational in 1999. Of key relevance to proposals made in part II is the question of the development of its doctrine, standard operating procedures and advance training.

5. Peacekeeping: OHCHR and field practice

In 1994, the OIOS recommended that the Centre for Human Rights should be the designated 'responsibility centre' for the human rights component of peacekeeping missions and that it should begin implementation of the associated functions (such as standard operating procedures)¹⁸. As of 1998, this has not been implemented and the status of that recommendation is unclear in view of the OIOS' 1995 report on the (then) Centre's lack of capacity to deal with the extra work which the then field operations posed.

The idea was that, to translate the lessons of experience into practice, in the case of each of the major substantive tasks of peacekeeping missions, the DPKO Lessons Learned Unit, together with the responsibility centre associated with the component or task should:

- a) review the relevant mission standard operating procedures and related material, DPKO handbooks, manuals and training materials, end-of-mission assessments and lessons learned documents, and derive from them policies and procedures for these tasks, or modify existing policies and procedures and present them for consideration and approval, as appropriate, to the relevant intergovernmental bodies, including the Special Committee on Peacekeeping; and
- b) present a report on these activities to the 1999 session of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations¹⁹

Thus, prior to the advent of the Secretary General's Programme for Reform, there was an opportunity to integrate human rights into the practice of peacekeeping which OHCHR has not yet been in a position to maximise. Proposals in Part II are intended to increase that creative capacity to meet, and create, opportunities such as these.

6. Learning at the humanitarian-human rights interface

6.1 Overview

The interface between human rights and humanitarian action is crucial for the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. Humanitarian aid actors have in the last years expended much energy examining the need to learn effectively.

The myriad of initiatives in this area include several flowing from the Rwanda multi-donor Joint Evaluation of 1995 such as the Applied Learning Network on Accountability Programme (ALNAP), a clearing house initiative which is partly donor driven attempt at self-evaluation of training etc. This brings together for a meeting twice a year all the key players in the humanitarian system who deal with complex emergencies: UN, NGOs, Unicef, HCR, ECHO evaluation unit. The Task Force on the Great Lakes chaired by UNDP (with DPA, DPKO, HCHR, ICRC and USG Prendergast) seeking "Principles for Countries in Crisis"; as well as the ACC, headed by UN Secretary-General, with all the heads of agencies. In 1997 it sought to define peacebuilding for coherence, and tasked the Department of Political Affairs to test a more strategic, integrated approach in a 'Strategic Framework for Afghanistan' to reduce the disconnect between assistance and political interface.

Several major international meetings have ensued to seek principles/lessons to apply from the experience, such as the DFID -ECHO London Meeting of 7 April 1998; the Stockholm meeting of April 1998 which was attended by the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the UN Co-ordinator for Humanitarian Affairs and a cross-section of people from affected countries, donors, NGOs, academics.

A taste of the range of learning efforts in this sector is briefly given here, before highlighting some significant features of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees' learning process.

6.2 The Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs

A learning unit was established by OCHA's predecessor, the Department of Humanitarian Affairs in 1996 to:

- establish a studies programme on lessons learned on humanitarian issues to be implemented internally; and
- co-ordinate the preparation of additional studies to be undertaken by outside consultants or jointly with outside consultants/institutes as an integral part of the DHA annual/biannual workplan.²⁰

The express needs which the DHA studies programme was intended to address were to:

- "increase DHA's corporate effectiveness in responding to emergencies and its cohesiveness as a corporate entity;
- increasing DHA's accountability vis a vis victims and donors; and
- ensuring that DHA functions as a reflective institution which builds on the experience and capacity of all its staff."

a. Independence

It was understood that "in order to ensure credibility and maximum utility, all studies will be drawn up independently, under the responsibility of the study teams/ individuals assigned to them and under their signature". The learning process benefited from the strong support of the then Under-Secretary General, Peter Hansen.

b. Methodology

The studies are either lessons learned and impact assessment studies, or thematic studies designed to feed more directly into policy development. A range of inputs has been sought from the broad humanitarian community, including NGOs. Studies are intended to be based on unfiltered and unfettered access to people and information. Full consultation of all concerned personnel is intended and draft reports are reviewed by relevant staff at DHA HQ and in the field prior to their finalisation. Other methods have been experimented with such the use of a questionnaire in Liberia to try to capture the wealth of experience being lost, including how to set up operations of this kind. It was intended to be completed before humanitarian actor's departure but was found to be less than successful - itself a valuable experience to learn from.

c. Resources

Within one year the OHCA unit had three staff full-time and it has reached beyond its own staff to engage outside researchers in its studies.

d. Dissemination, practical application

Terms of reference for each study would specify whether the output was for internal OHCA, or more public dissemination. OHCA, “as a corporate entity, will review findings and recommendations and decide on appropriate follow-up action.” The recommendations of all studies commissioned by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) are considered for application by the IASC. Studies of particular significance have concerned Afghanistan; multi-lateral sanctions; a multi-country study on landmines; and a study on aid and structural violence.

The Unit’s approach is generally regarded as less constrained by politics, more wide-ranging and independent in nature than other learning units such as that of DPKO. “DHA reviews have sparked interest across the broader humanitarian community and attracted a wide following in academic and policy circles”²¹, and been praised by the Office of Internal Oversight and the Joint Inspection Unit for its bold approach.

6.3 UN High Commissioner for Refugees

In addition to the management review of the work of UN High Commissioner for Refugees known as the Delphi Project, the relatively new **HCR Field Inspection and Evaluation Service** was re-modeled in 1995²².

a. Independence

An Inspector heads the Service, a senior manager credited with strong people skills, personal credibility born of long field work and who reports directly to the High Commissioner for Refugees. These elements contribute to it being seen as having a certain independence of action.

b. Methodology

The Service has visited 60 countries to review HCR operations there in the last 5 years. For each such field mission, one report is produced, examining issues at all levels from strategic to tactical. The High Commissioner has set as a priority for the Service that it cover all the states in which HCR is operational in 4 to 5 years. This work-plan is intended to be changed if there is an emergency.

In addition to such country missions, thematic studies may be undertaken by the Service at the request of the High Commissioner, one example concerns an in-depth study of staff stress²³.

- The working methods which have evolved are intended to be collaborative and non-confrontational. For example, if a particular HCR country programme is under review, there will

be briefings beforehand with those officials who may be, or feel they will be, a focus of criticism.

- A significant feature is the sharing of the main recommendations with relevant officials while the report is still in draft form. This is both so that they have a chance to respond to criticism in a draft report and in order to elicit their support in implementation of final recommendations. The full draft report goes to all the stakeholders (such as the head of operations) with the plan of action including listed recommendations.
- All are asked to respond in writing within one month with any criticisms of the draft. If there is a major disagreement it goes to HCR (smaller disagreements are negotiated). If a major disagreement remains, it goes into the final report as 'the Inspector decided to retain his first recommendation'.

One of the benefits of this circulation of the draft report is that points can be made there which may not be intended for the final report. It gives officials a stake in reading it, thinking and responding and thus taking part in the process.

- The Inspector may report orally or in writing to the High Commissioner.

c. Tracking and follow-up of recommendations

Once the finalised plan of action has been circulated for a particular evaluation mission, three months later the Service seeks a report of initial implementation of those recommendations. Then, after a series of such mission reports, the Service prepares a report on general trends and general mission management, and makes more global recommendations. These form a series of Inspection Notes, which compile lessons to be learned and shared with all managers, as they must be accessible to all end users. This goes to the Senior Management Committee.

HCR has an Organisation Management System (OMS) which requires certain steps to be taken before a manager can physically proceed with access to budgets, and if there is delay in such access vulnerable populations suffer. This means there can be very immediate and visible consequences for actions or omissions of managers.

7. Others learning in related areas

The World Bank has an Operations Evaluation Department (OED), an independent evaluation unit reporting to the World Bank's executive directors²⁴. It rates the development impact and performance of all the Bank's completed lending operations. Results and recommendations are reported to the executive directors and fed back into the design and implementation of new policies and projects. In addition to the individual operations and country assistance programmes, OED evaluates the Bank's policies and processes. OED publishes evaluation studies, impact evaluations, OED Precipis, and Lessons and Practices. On occasion, OED staff and consultants contribute individually to series published by the World Bank.

The European Commission Evaluation Unit in Brussels undertakes reviews, which lead to documents drawing lessons to be learned and making recommendations. In addition, synthesis of lessons have been produced such as "International Human Rights Observer Missions", by the Directorate General for Development based on experience of supporting UN operations in Rwanda, Burundi and Angola²⁵

Others include the OECD's Development Assistance Committee Expert Group on Evaluation and national donor evaluation units.

ANNEX I b

BACKGROUND NOTE ON INTEGRATING HUMAN RIGHTS²⁶

The potential inherent in the UN Secretary-General's commitment to integrate human rights throughout the activities of the Organisation is such that it should change the way all field operators work: whether relief or development agency, police, military or human rights 'specialists'. In addition, it should revolutionise the way we work together.

1. Human Rights and conflict

There has long been theoretical recognition of the link between human rights violations and peace. Here, we speak not only of civil and political rights but those economic, social and cultural rights whose denial through structural injustice and discrimination lie at the root of conflict. 'Today's human rights violations are tomorrow's conflicts'²⁷. Left unaddressed human rights violations contribute to conflict escalation, making peace and ultimately reconciliation infinitely more difficult to achieve. Peace without justice is indeed a contradiction in terms. A glance at recent conflicts on all continents illustrates this.²⁸

2. The UN Charter 50 years ago

Understanding the link between human rights and conflict sheds new light on Article 1 of the Charter where the purposes of the UN are set out. Not only is to 'promote and encourage respect for human rights' an express purpose of the Organisation - it is also at the heart of the other aims, including that of maintaining international peace and security. The latter is increasingly understood to mean human security and not merely state security. From the outset, the UN has had the legal mandate from its member states in Article 1 of the Charter to integrate the promotion of human rights in all its activities.

3. Human Rights and peace-support operations

In fact, human rights work is inherent to peace-support operations in all their aspects, although hitherto it has rarely been understood as such. By definition, the UN's military, police and political personnel aim to provide freedom from fear - while those UN and NGO personnel who provide relief and rehabilitation support aim at freedom from want. In reality, both aims are common to all peace-support actors though they use different methods to achieve them when a host state is unwilling or unable to do so alone.

In the early 1990s, the link between human rights and conflict was openly applied to a UN peace-support operation for the first time in El Salvador (ONUSAL). It placed civilian human rights officers on the ground six months before there was a ceasefire and before uniformed UN contingents (military or civilian police) arrived to verify compliance with the peace agreements.

Several other 'human rights operations', run from the UN headquarters in New York, followed as a specific element of peace-support operations: Haiti (MICIVIH, a joint operation with the Organisation for American States), Cambodia (UNTAC), Croatia (UNTAES) and Guatemala (MINUGUA) are examples of these. Meanwhile a new post of UN High Commissioner for Human Rights was created by the General Assembly, with the first incumbent taking up that post, just as Rwanda imploded into genocide. The new office of this High Commissioner in Geneva has established 'human rights operations' in addition to those run by the UN Departments of Political Affairs or of Peacekeeping Operations in New

York. By 1999 there are expected to be 22 such Geneva- UN human rights field 'presences' around the world, of varying size and mandate.

Just as in the early days of 'peace-keeping' itself, the first experiences have been ad hoc and reactive with, even today, minimal learning from one to another.²⁹ As a result there has frequently been a rigid compartmentalisation among the 'disciplines': military, police, humanitarian aid, development aid and classical human rights 'specialists'. They have each been weakened due to the lack of a unifying underlying concept the only real source for which is international law and principle³⁰.

4. Integrating human rights in all UN activities

Fifty years on, Kofi Annan's proposal in his 'Programme for Reform' to integrate human rights in the work of the UN merely makes an official policy of fulfilling the promise of the Charter.³¹ Following through on this proposal the Secretary -General established Executive Committees (ExComm) composed of top UN management, covering four of the five sectors in which the UN is active: peace and security, humanitarian affairs, economic and social affairs and development co-operation.

These ExComms can be likened to a government's cabinet which meets to assist the Secretary - General. There is no human rights ExComm because human rights has been designated as an issue which underpins all the UN's activities and must be integrated into its work in every sector. Thus the second High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mary Robinson, is represented on each of the UN's four ExComms when they meet.³² These developments have the potential to change the way each of us works across the spectrum of field activities.

5. Integrating human rights in practice

The commitment to integrate human rights is first of all a reminder that our own behaviour is governed by international legal obligations. The Secretary-General should ensure that where there are allegations such as torture or unlawful detention made against UN personnel, that there are meaningful channels for complaints to be heard, to be promptly and impartially investigated and to ensure that they are prosecuted and punished appropriately at the national or international level.

Secondly, the field 'presences' under the office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights do not yet fully reflect the indivisibility of the full spectrum of rights (civil and political, social, economic and cultural), and particularly the human rights of women. All the UN member states reaffirmed by consensus at the Vienna World Conference on Human Rights in 1993 that all human rights are indivisible and inter-dependent.³³ Increased efforts are needed to reflect this inter-dependence in field work, and to move beyond the old Cold War approaches in which the Western block inappropriately prioritised civil and political rights and the East block social and economic rights.³⁴ There is a need for two-way integration of human rights and development thinking.³⁵

Thirdly, integrating human rights in all our activities means that not only those labelled 'human rights specialists' have responsibility for human rights tasks. It also means that integrating human rights applies to our work in all places at all times, regardless of our immediate mandate which authorises us to deploy. This is because the root of authority for integrating human rights is not the Secretary-General's report or a 'new' UN policy. The obligation flows from the UN Charter and from international human rights law given its nature as an inter-state organisation.

Integrating human rights in all our fieldwork poses tensions and dilemmas for all of us: for the military commander under pressure to get a convoy through who can undermine the protection of international law by making inappropriate compromises; for the UN negotiator who needs to relate a cease-fire to durable peace based on justice, for the aid worker providing food to displaced populations that is also being diverted to feed combatants. But the questions have to be asked because each of us, while doing our respective jobs, should be consciously part of the common human rights aim. The example of the failed Arusha Agreement regarding Rwanda signed in 1993 illustrates all too clearly that the UN negotiators should ensure that human rights concerns are at the heart of peace processes that the UN is involved in brokering, mediating, facilitating or verifying. Yet it is difficult to apply lessons that should have been learned. Once again, in 1998 over Kosovo, negotiations have ignored the human rights causes of what is again mis-presented as a 'humanitarian aid crisis'. This time it is the OSCE observers who are deployed.

6. Learning - to integrate human rights

Integrating human rights will require all of us to examine our mandates and doctrines, and our ways of operating. As organisations we will need to recognise that we all have a common human rights aim and that we need unity of effort to achieve it. We will have to learn each other's professional languages and breakdown stereotypes through common training. We will have to recognise each other's professionalism and ensure our efforts are mutually re-enforcing through an efficient but well co-ordinated division of labour.

We will also have to review how we assess, analyse and describe a crisis by applying the link between human rights and conflict, and by asking why a crisis is occurring? We will need to apply a rights-based approach to the programme cycle, and question the design of our interventions, what we do, how and with whom we do it, for how long and why, from a rights-perspective.³⁶ And we will need to ensure that our work is informed by, and uses the available human rights framework and its tools (ranging from the UN Treaty Bodies, to Special Rapporteurs and regional mechanisms, to the vital work of local and international NGOs) to the maximum.

Perhaps most fundamentally, both as individual organisations and collectively, we will have to re-examine how we measure 'success'. The question is the same now for all our work, whether military, aid or human rights 'specialist':

Have we harnessed our energies and pooled our skills with the host society and with each other, toward a sustainable improvement in the human rights situation?

**

ANNEX I c DISCUSSION PROCESS

<i>Organisation</i>	<i>First name</i>	<i>Surname</i>	
AICF-USA	Tasha	Gill	External Relations
APSO	Tony	O'Dwyer	Head of training
Canada Dept Nat'l Defence	Ray	Hook	Maj., Director, The Army Lessons Learned Centre (former)
CANADEM	Paul	LaRose Edwards	Executive Director
Chrysalis	Grahame	Morphey	Managing Director
Comhlámh	Connall	O'Caomh	Lessons learning
DHA	Yvon	Madore	Senior Humanitarian Affairs Officer, Africa II Section, Complex Emergency Division
DPA	Alvaro	de Soto	Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs
DPA	Eiko	Ikegaya	Associate Political Affairs Officer, Asia Division
DPA	B.G	Ramcharan	Director, Africa 1 Division (now Deputy HCHR)
DPA	Francesc	Vendrell	Director, East Asia and the Pacific Division
DPA	Teresa	Whitfield	Special Assistant to the ASG for Political Affairs
DPI	Fred	Schottler	Peace and Security Section
DPKO	Runo	Bergstrom	Co-ordination Officer, Lessons Learned Unit
DPKO	Brendan	Corcoran	Deputy Civilian Police Advisor, Civilian Police Unit
DPKO	Leonard T	Kapungu	Chief, Lessons Learned Mechanism, Mission Planning Service
DPKO	OP	Rathor	Civilian Police Advisor, Civilian Police Unit
European Commission	Barbel	Jacobs	Delegation to the UN, Gva
European Commission	Francesca	Mosca	Head, Human Rights Unit, DGVIII (former)
European Commission	Vanessa	Proctor	Delegation of the European Commission, NY
European Commission	Athanasios	Theodorakis	Deputy Director General, DGVIII Development
European Commission	Henk	van den Kwast	DGI Political Division
European Commission	Angel	Viñas	Director, Multi-lateral Relations
European Commission	Jose	Zarzoso	Human Rights Unit, DGVIII
exHRFOR	Ahmad	Partow	Information Technology consultant
exHRFOR/MONUA	Todd	Howland	Harvard Human Rights Programme
exMICIVIH	Nancy	Dorsinville	Harvard Human Rights Programme
Fletcher Sch Law and Dip	Eileen F	Babbitt	Asst Prof Int'l Politics/Director, Prog on Int'l Negotiation and Conflict Resolution
Fletcher Sch Law and Dip	Dana	Brown	
Fletcher Sch Law and Dip	Javier	Kinney	
Fletcher Sch Law and Dip	Patrick	O'Brien	
Fletcher Sch of Law and Dip	Polly	Laurelchild-Hertig	NGO training specialist
Harvard University	Liliana	Obregon	Harvard Law Programme
Harvard University	Peter	Rosenblum	Human Rights Law Project
ICRC	Yves	Etienne	Chief, Training Division
ICRC	Jacques	Hertzschuch	Chief, Department of Human Resources
ICRC	Rieke	van Beerendonk	Health Advisor

Annex 1c Discussion Process

Internat'l IDEA	Armineh	Arakelian-Davidian	Senior Regional Advisor on Refugee Women, UNHCR(fmr)
Int'l Centre HR Democratic Dev	Iris	Almeida	Director of Programmes
Irish Mission to UN, Gva	Anne	Anderson	Amb, Permanent Representative
Irish Mission to UN, Gva	Niall	Burgess	First Secretary
Irish Mission to the UN, NY	Anne	Barrington	Deputy Permanent Representative

Annex 1c Discussion Process

<i>Organisation</i>	<i>First name</i>	<i>Surname</i>	
Irish Mission to the UN, NY	Maurice	Canavan	Military Attaché
Lawyers Cttee Human Rights	Robert O	Weiner	Latin America and Caribbean
Lutheran World Federation	Gerry	Puelle	Lutheran World Federation
No Peace Without Justice	Regina	Monticone	No Peace Without Justice
Norwegian Miss to UN,Gva	Petter F	Wille	Counsellor
OAU	Dasta	Negousse	OAU Mission, Gva
OAU	VD	Toko	Deputy Permanent Observer, Gva
OCHA	Antonio	Donini	Chief, Policy Development Unit
OCHA	Martin	Griffiths	Deputy Emergency Relief Co-ordinator
OCHA	Norah	Niland	Studies and Lessons Learned Unit
Office Internal Oversight Svces	David	Curzon	Chief, Central Evaluation Unit
OHCHR/UNHCR	Jasmine	Sherif	Consultant on training
OHCHR-Geneva	Zdzislaw	Kedzia	Senior Advisor the to the High Commissioner for Human Rights
OHCHR-Geneva	Gianni	Magazzeni	Special Assistant to the High Commissione for Human Rights
OHCHR-Geneva	Erin	Mooney	Human Rights Officer
OHCHR-Geneva	Rita	Reddy	Chief, Activities and Programmes Branch, focal point for this project
OHCHR-Geneva	Mary	Robinson	High Commissioner for Human Rights
OHCHR-Geneva	Bride	Rosney	Principal Advisor, High Commissioner for Human Rights
OHCHR-NY	Maarit	Kohonen	Human Rights Officer
OHCHR-NY	Jose	Rosenberg	Human Rights Officer
OSCE	Sune	Danielsson	Ambassador, Co-ordinator for Training, CPC Vienna
Oxfam America	Emira	Woods	
Trócaire	Mary	Healy	Projects Department
Trócaire	Eamonn	Meehan	Head, Overseas Programmes
Trócaire	Niall	Tobin	Emergency Co-Ordinator
Tufts University	Sherman	Teichman	Director, Education for Public Inquiry and International Citizenship(EPIIC) Program
UK Ministry of Defence	Alec	Bain	Lt.Col, Lessons Learned Unit, Ministry of Defence
UN Div Adv Women	Amina H	Adam	Chief, Co-ordination and Outreach Unit, Dept Ec Soc Affairs
UN Staff College Project	Jon	Ebersole	Humanitarian Affairs Officer
UNDP	Colleen	Duggan	Complex Emergencies Training Initiative Security Specialist, Emergency Response Division
UNDP	Frank	O'Donnell	Deputy Director, Emergency Response Division
UNDP	Michael	Steinmeyer	Governance Division
UNDP/Harvard University	Jonathan	Moore	Senior Advisor to Admin'r Humanitarian Issues/Assoc, John F Kennedy Sch of Govt
UNHCR	Sten	Bronee	Chief, Protection, Training and Support Section, Division of International Protection
UNHCR	Bernard	Doyle	Senior Emergency Officer, Emergency Preparedness and Response Section
UNHCR	John	Horekens	Director, Regional Bureau for Europe/Director for Change, Delphi Project
UNHCR	Udo	Janz	Documentation and Info Management, Centre for Doc and Research

Annex 1c Discussion Process

UNHCR	Pirkko	Kourula	Head, inter-Organisation Affairs and Secretariat Service
UNHCR	Denis	McNamara	Director, Division of International Protection
UNHCR	Christine	Mougne	Senior Inspection Officer, Field Inspection and Evaluation service
UNHCR	Indrika	Ratwatte	Senior Protection Officer

Annex 1c Discussion Process

<i>Organisation</i>	<i>First name</i>	<i>Surname</i>	
UNHCR	Daphne	Skretvedt	Staff Counsellor
UNHCR	Richard	Towle	Senior Human Rights Liaison Officer, Division of International Protection
UNHCR	Kirstin	Young	Personal Assistant to the Director, Division of International Protection
Unicef	Jean Claude	LeGrand	Child Rights
Unicef	Guillemette	Meunier	Programme Officer, Child Rights, Division of Evaluation, Policy and Planning
Unicef	Martin	Murama	Project Officer, Office of Emergency Programmes
Unicef	Viktor	Nylund	EMOPs
UNV	Diane	Conklin	
UNV	Kevin	Gilroy	Programme Manager, Humanitarian Relief and Liaison
UNV	Bill	Jackson	Chief, External Relations
WFP	Mohamed	El Kouhene	Programme Liaison Officer, NY
WFP	Bhim	Udas	Deputy Director, WFP Geneva Office
WHO	Louisa	Chan	Prog Analysis and Support Officer, Donor Rels Div Emergency and Humanitarian Action
WHO	Friederike	Tschampa	Programme:Health as a bridge for peace

ANNEX Id INTERNATIONAL FORUM, GENEVA

Learning - to Integrate Human Rights

28-29 January 1999

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Introduction

The International Human Rights Network convened an international Forum in Geneva on 28-29 January 1999. This Forum based its discussions on IHRN's report **Learning - to Integrate Human Rights** which illuminates the fundamental concepts mentioned here.

The Forum was attended by participants from the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Department of Peace Keeping Operations, the United Nations Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Unicef, the United Nations Volunteer Programme, the Presidency of the Council of Ministers of the European Union (Germany), the Commission of the European Union, the European Community Humanitarian Office (ECHO), the Council of Europe, the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) - Sweden, the Parliamentary Forum of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the UK Ministry of Defence, the UK Department for International Development, the Irish Department of Foreign Affairs, the International Committee of the Red Cross, the Centre for Human Rights (CALDH) Guatemala, the Centre for Development - Rwanda, Medecins sans Frontiers- Holland, the Lutheran World Federation, the International Service for Human Rights, the Central American Centre of International Studies - Nicaragua, the UN Staff College Project (CETI), UN Observer Mission in Angola (MONUA), the Human Rights Co-ordination Centre - Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chrysalis Management Consultants, Reseau des Femmes - Rwanda as well as the Due Process of Law Foundation - Washington, DC.

The international Forum marked an important step in a process which has been uniquely valuable, both for the *range of actors* involved and for its *fundamental questioning* of what learning should mean for all field actors. For these reasons, the recommendations in the Report and the consensus arising from the meeting constitute a uniquely valuable contribution to a more integrated and holistic approach to learning.

- q There was broad agreement that the issues discussed have a value and relevance for each of the participating organisation's own learning needs; for their relations with each other; and especially as reciprocal partners of *OHCHR in its role as focal point for learning - to integrate full spectrum human rights in the work of the UN system*. Therefore, the discussion focused particularly on OHCHR's direct work and its contribution to the learning of its partners.

2. Issues

Both the Report and the discussions arising from it raise issues which are critically important for the considered use and professionalisation of all human rights field activities, for evaluating their impact

towards the sustainable improvement of the human rights situation and for the integration of human rights through the UN system as a whole. Foremost among these issues are the following, which represent a fundamental challenge to the credibility of organisations and their field presences:

- q The need to acknowledge explicitly that the overall aim of field presences is to facilitate the sustainable improvement in the human rights situation. Empowerment of local human rights actors by reinforcing their efforts (and not replacing them) requires their active participation at all stages from initial problem analysis to evaluation. Such participation is a necessary condition for relevance and for seeking to have a sustainable impact through temporary presence.
- q The need to focus on prevention of human rights crises and the building of a culture of peace- and not merely providing reactive presence during a human rights crisis.
- q The need to seek, and take full account of all relevant views in identifying and learning lessons about the changes which will lead to improvements our work. In contrast to the current situation, this must involve the participation of all stakeholders: in addition to **host societies**³⁷, field and support personnel, partner UN agencies, the international community and donors, other IGOs as well as NGO and academic networks. To learn from these sources, their input will need to be actively nurtured and sought out.
- q The need to stimulate awareness of the minimum requirements for effective learning as discussed in the Report- and the need to translate that awareness into effective action. Learning is not the mere compilation of experiences - it must be an on-going process which is independently validated. It must keep pace with change and ensure that presumptions are questioned and tested.
- q This on-going learning process should be directly linked to policy decision-making and strategic thinking to help ensure decisions are based on valid information. The process should be designed to actively promote a creative, questioning and learning atmosphere.
- q The learning process should thus facilitate the development of an agreed internal doctrine within organisations. This is particularly relevant if there is to be effective integration of human rights throughout the activities of the United Nations: more attention must be devoted to clarifying the human rights framework applicable if there is to be coherence of human rights learning both within and between organisations.

3. OHCHR as focal point for human rights learning

These issues are relevant to all field actors, but the Forum paid particular attention to their relevance to OHCHR because of its pivotal mandate for the integration of human rights across the UN system. The Forum welcomed the commitment of OHCHR to develop towards learning, illustrated inter alia through the 1998 review of some field missions, the first meeting in Geneva of heads of field presences, and the commitment to establish a project cycle approach for field presences. However, beyond this, acknowledging the nature and scope of *actual learning needs* is a necessary step towards addressing them, and much remains to be done to achieve an effective learning cycle:

- q Learning should be the concern of the whole of the Office. Field presences are only one in the range of tools available to the OHCHR within its mandate - particularly in light of the challenge and opportunity which integrating human rights in the UN system represents for the Office. The choice of tool should be a considered one based on: participatory needs assessment; the capacity and

means available to the Office; identified and achievable objectives; the clear comparative advantage of that tool vis a vis other tools available to the Office - and vis a vis those available to other partners.

- q Active listening to all stakeholders as a basis for further action; in particular independent evaluation and validation of activities in consultation with them.
- q The meaningful participation of host societies from the outset.³⁸
- q The development of methodology and capacity for on-going debriefing of field staff as part of the learning cycle.
- q The systematic exchange of information and experience among field presences as well as among all the branches of the OHCHR. This is essential to reflect in practice the indivisibility and interdependence of all human rights in all the work of the Office.
- q Development of the methodology for impact analysis of the Office's work as agents of change; measuring success by the degree to which a contribution is made to the sustainable improvement in the human rights situation - and building on the work of colleagues in development to adapt the necessary bench marks and indicators to do so.
- q Systematic training of staff assigned to field presences and at headquarters using the validated outputs of the learning process, with re-testing of content and delivery on an on-going basis.³⁹
- q The development of a mechanism with the necessary authority, independence and credibility to test assumptions, validate data, ensure the implementation of on-going learning within OHCHR and contribute directly to policy and strategy-making.
- q Action within OHCHR is hampered by a chronic lack of financial and human resources. In these circumstances, the issues outlined may be addressed on a phased basis, e.g. to start with, applying a comprehensive learning cycle as illuminated in the Report to one field presence.⁴⁰
- q This should facilitate the development over time of a Learning Resource Centre with value and relevance for all field actors.

4. Reciprocal support for follow-up

The participants acknowledged that, as partners of OHCHR, they have an obligation to act in co-operation with, and in support of, the Office as it develops this process. In particular this means acting responsibly to emphasise that impact and quality are needed in the Office's work.

**International Forum, Geneva
28th and 29th January 1999**

Participants

United Nations

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

Bertie Ramcharan

Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights

Rita Reddy

Chief, Activities and Programmes Branch

Gianni Magazzini

Co-ordinator, Field Methodology Unit

Francesca Marotta

Field Methodology Unit

United Nations Development Programme

Thord Palmund

Special Adviser, Management, Development and Governance Division.

Marit Gjeltén

UNDP European Office

Department of Peace Keeping Operations

Nicola Koch

Policy Analyst, Lessons Learned Unit

Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs

Norah Niland

Policy and Analysis Division (Afghanistan Human Rights Programme)

Yasmine Sherif

Policy Development Unit

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Richard Towle, Senior Human Rights Liaison Officer, DIP

UN Children's Fund

Guilleumette Meunier, EMOPs

United Nations Volunteer Programme

Kevin Gilroy

Programme Development Specialist

European Union (Presidency of the Council of Ministers)

Michael Schaefer

Senior Counsellor
German Mission to United Nations- Geneva

Martin Huth
German Mission to the United Nations - Geneva

Commission of the European Union

Tim Clarke
Head, Human Rights Unit - Development Directorate

Carmen Marquez Ruiz
Human Rights Unit - Political Directorate

Camilla Bruckner
Strategy, Planning and Policy Unit
European Community Humanitarian Office (ECHO)

Maria Macchiaverna
Advisor, Human Rights Unit - Political Directorate

Council of Europe

Claudia Luciani
Deputy Head of Division, PanEuropean Co-operation Programmes

Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe

Ambassador Sune Danielsson
Co-ordinator for Training

International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance

Armineh Arakelian
Senior Capacity Building Officer

Myriam Mendes Montalvo
Senior Capacity Building Officer

SADC Parliamentary Forum

Hon. Speaker Dr.Mose Tjitendero
Speaker of the National Assembly of Namibia
Chair, SADC Parliamentary Forum

Isabella Wellmann
Special Assistant to the Hon. Speaker
National Assembly of Namibia

National Governments

Ambassador Anne Anderson
Irish Permanent Representative to the United Nations - Geneva

Niall Burgess
First Secretary, Irish Mission to the UN - Geneva

Nessa Delaney
Development Co-operation Division, Department of Foreign Affairs, Ireland

Sarah Beeching
Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs Department, DFID-U.K.

Non-Governmental Organisations

Pascal Daudin
Legal Adviser
International Committee of the Red Cross

Maarten Merkelbach
International Committee of the Red Cross

Paul Seils
Head of Legal Services
Centre for Human Rights (CALDH) Guatemala

Marie M. Uwamariya
Director
Centre for Development-Rwanda

Hanna Nolan
Humanitarian Affairs Department
M.S.F. Holland

Priscilla Singh
Office for International Affairs and Human Rights
Lutheran World Federation

Adrien Zoller
Director
International Service for Human Rights
Alfredo Forti
Director
The Due Process of Law Foundation, Washington, DC

Veneranda Nzambazamariya
President
Reseau des Femmes- Rwanda

Alejandro Bendana
Executive Director
Central American Centre of International Studies- Nicaragua

Individual Experts

Lt. Col. Alec Bain
Directorate General, Development and Doctrine,
Ministry of Defence - U.K.

Jon Ebersole
Crisis Environments Training Initiative (CETI)
UN Staff College Project (former)

Todd Howland
Legal Adviser
MONUA - Angola

Ian Martin
Deputy High Representative
Director, Human Rights Co-ordination Centre, Bosnia

Grahame Morphey
Managing Director
Chrysalis Management Consultants

International Human Rights Trust / Network

Noeline Blackwell
Chairperson, Board of Trustees

Karen Kenny
Co-Director

Brian McKeown
Co-Director

Conference Administrators

Christine Higgins
Rita Morrissey-Schindelholz
Siobhan Curtin

ANNEX II a

A LEARNING STRUCTURE

This annex aims to draw together those elements of a learning structure which the project research has identified the Learning Resource Centre should benefit from. Some of these have been discussed in the text. These elements would be a starting point for phase 1's discussion among the network of learning units in the UN system.

1. Single authority

The learning process should be co-ordinated by a single authoritative unit to ensure that all necessary information is centralised; that no trends are missed; and to guarantee that the outputs are appropriately acted upon.

2. Doctrinally coherent

The analysis of lessons to be learned should be based upon current international human rights law and principle. In particular, the aim of contributing to a sustainable improvement in the overall human rights situation should be at the core of learning⁴¹.

3. Credibility, authority and independence

Authoritative: For the Learning Resource Centre, there must be clear and express political support from the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Secretary-General for its work

Direct reporting line: The Learning Resource Centre must have a clear and direct reporting line to the High Commissioner herself as an element of independence and credibility.

Building a learning constituency: From the outset, internal and external sensitisation to the need for a Learning Resource Centre will need to be built by consensus, over time and in incremental steps. The output of the process must be accepted by senior management and member states. If managers are convinced of the need for the output, they will accept their role in the input and process functions - essential for a system.

While nurturing self-questioning, the LRC will also need to develop provisions for safeguarding the privacy of staff and other sources of information and prevent reprisals before such a learning atmosphere is achieved

The LRC should be headed by an official of a level appropriate to the importance and complexity of the task. They should be a credible professional with a track-record in the field of organisational learning (evaluation, reviews, inspection and so forth) with the management skills for team learning and constituency-building

4. Accountability

The learning system itself should be accountable, for example through providing regular and comprehensive reporting to key stakeholders, including the training units of all the UN agencies.

5. Transparency

This is part of both credibility and accountability; it is an element in nurturing external inputs; and ultimately provides leverage towards compliance. For example, building on attention from the General Assembly, the media and the general public, the Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight has said that this “*is the most weighty leverage this Office has and directly influences the rate of compliance, which I am proud to state, continues to climb.*”⁴²

6. Timely, relevant, auditable outputs

Learning for all levels: analysis should cover all levels from strategic to operational and tactical and should help ensure consistency and coherence across all areas of activities.

Timely and accessible: A dynamic system is required to produce timely lessons which are accessible to all users - otherwise they will lack utility and credibility to beneficiaries.

Relevance: Analysis and resulting outputs must be relevant to the beneficiary’s development - both current and in the future.

Auditable: Outputs should be auditable, so that they can be monitored for appropriate action. There must be clear accountability for following up output. *Credibility is enhanced when there are consequences for inaction.*

7. Mixed discipline team

The Learning Resource Centre will require a range of disciplines in its team to ensure that learning can be pooled from analogous fields with varied learning systems such as: management, military, humanitarian, police or development fields. These all have varied evaluation and review experience in their respective disciplines. Other more obvious skills needed are human rights and pedagogy. Hand-picked secondments from a range of UN agencies should be considered, as should the engaging of external credible professionals in the learning process: “The studies reviewed confirm an indispensable role for an outside researcher in keeping the system honest”⁴³

8. Focus political and financial support for learning

States have an essential role to play in supporting the process of learning and institutional change within Office of the High Commissioner in phase 1 and in the UN system in phase 2. This goes beyond adding to the authoritativeness of the process mentioned above, and requires that the process be valued and therefore funded appropriately and securely. States are a vital part of the learning constituency which the Learning Resource Centre and its advocates need to build.

9. Permanent status

The learning system must be an on-going process, itself becoming the accessible institutional memory of the Office of the High Commissioner.

ANNEX II b LEARNING METHODOLOGY

1. The learning cycle⁴⁴

The translation of experience into learning should be based on an integrated learning cycle such as in **Figure a**. The cycle provides a mechanism for change which ensures the Office, and the UN more widely, benefit from their own experience.

It illustrates that training of staff is an essential, but not sufficient, element of an effective learning system. The oval lines around TRAINING and FIELD WORK are currently closed doctrine cycles in which current training (such as in field presences like HRFOR (Rwanda)) or daily work at headquarters (such as in the Research and Right to Development Branch) are carried out, as described in Part I. An integrated learning cycle ensures that such experiences are fed into the overall learning of the Office - illustrated by the integration of those cycles into the overall learning cycle of the Office.

The aim is to ensure relevant lessons and information are captured to ensure that necessary changes can be made to current and future practices, doctrine, training, management structures, staff and equipment to ensure maximum effectiveness.

Doctrine and better practices are the result of continuous learning - they are not static.

Five steps are required for an integrated learning system. They are input, analysis, output, validation and follow-up auditing.

1. The inputs are a series of information flows which generate observations, data and ideas from multiple sources inside and outside the Office⁴⁵. The inputs will be received from all three branches of the Office, systematic input from all staff at all levels at HQ and in the field, key interlocutors such as the host society in the case of field presences, partner UN and other agencies, as well as academics, NGOs, member states, the media.
2. Analysis: research, analysis, staff consultation and decision-making will produce ideas, trends and issues which are of importance to different teams within the Office.
3. The outputs should be steered along appropriate lines of development for staffing and decision-making as shown in **Figure a**.
4. Validation consists in ensuring feedback on the appropriateness of a previous output, so that any needed refinements and corrections can be made as part of the continuing learning process.
5. The routine system continues by tracking and auditing the outputs in order to ensure that relevant actions are taken.

The learning outputs should be achieved within the framework of the principles proposed in **Annex II a**.

The methodology which may be applied by the Learning Resource Centre is outlined here.

2. Range of methods

The approach to methodological issues should retain flexibility to allow needed adjustments over time. Methods should be explored on an experimental, pilot basis and then examined for strengths and weaknesses. This should build on the positive and negative experience of other learners in the UN system through the *cartwheel hub of methodology* in phase 1, with the Learning Resource Centre at its core.

No methods are excluded a priori. Evaluations which produce a report and recommendations are not of itself sufficient for the OHCHR's learning needs. While such evaluations or reports may be commissioned of the Learning Resource Centre by the High Commissioner, the recommendations will need focussed through the five steps of the LRC's learning process: inputs, analysis, outputs, validation, audit.

The process of learning is daily, continuous and the concern of all staff.

Non-paper based learning:

- Electronic inputs in simple formats are needed including those for staff to make regular and easy inputs by 'filling in the blanks' on electronic questionnaires
- An electronic database is essential for archiving, searching and recall to ensure outputs are timely and accessible. This is true for outputs such as training instructions and doctrine - otherwise it can, and does, take years for these to be prepared, let alone up-dated and re-issued
- Yearly electronic up-dates should be envisaged, with an annual report (in addition to that outlining the work of the Learning Resource Centre) compiling lessons learning outputs
- Technology should be compatible with that used by key partner agencies - UNDP, UNHCR, Unicef, where possible

A key reference point is the computerised tracking system for recommendations in use by the Office of Internal Oversight Services. This should be examined for adaptability to the Learning Resource Centre's needs. This is the kind of benefit which pooling method learning should yield in phase 1. Where there are existing elements/models these should be maximised to produce cost-effective solutions.

3. Inputs

Inputs refers to observations, ideas and data - the raw material for analysis.

1. Internal inputs derived from OHCHR itself: Within OHCHR, there is capacity to find solutions - particularly by actively listening to staff. The task of the Learning Resource Centre is to be the link, the resource, which centralises the generation of hypothesis, and brings all the pieces together.

- Phase 1 emphasises the work already going on in the Office as a source of learning to be shared horizontally within the Office. For example pooling the learning of the Research and Right to Development Branch with that of the Activities and Programmes Branch, and vice versa

- Cost-effective inputs must be simple and time-efficient. Interviews, particularly in the field, are a costly and time intensive manner of gathering information. They are useful mainly for a review of a country operation. Here, the regular and routine information flows are given priority. It is important to maximise the information flows already in place such as weekly situation reports by field presences
- Systematic input from all staff on an on-going, routine and informal basis: Examples of inputs from field work include: mandates, planning reports, post-mission reports from management, units and individuals. Inputs from training will include post-training reports. Specific ideas from staff which reach the Learning Resource Centre should receive a response to the individual to explain the way in which the idea has (or has not) been used
- To achieve timely outputs, the routine transmission of observations and data should be within a defined period of the end of the relevant event such as a field mission or training period
- Mandated information flows: to ensure the routine and regular receipt of relevant information, a directive from the High Commissioner should mandate the information flows. An introduction to the work of the Learning Resource Centre should be included in training for all present and new staff, whether they are at HQ or in the field
- Tasked information flows: Management - led requirements, or developing trends and issues will require a greater depth of information than will be available through the routine system. The LRC researchers will need to acquire information from other sources
- Other forms of ideas generation will evolve incrementally, particularly through the experience pooled in the network of relevant learning units within the UN and the range of analogous disciplines⁴⁶.

2. A range of external inputs: While the internal information should be regular and routine, external information will need to be sought out, through building beneficial relationships.

- With other UN agencies, particularly field partners (especially pooling lessons identified by others regarding the same situation).
- Systematic input from host societies where the OHCHR is working.⁴⁷
- Academics worldwide generate papers relevant to the work of Office of the High Commissioner. The Learning Resource Centre should build links with this resource and, for example, propose areas of research it needs which may be a suitable for Master's thesis research and establish links with charitable trusts involved in funding human rights research to make sure they are aware of current needs as identified by the LRC.⁴⁸
- Similar testing of ideas should be developed with NGOs specialised in aspects of the Office's work.

The Learning Resource Centre should facilitate access to its primary data by external sources where the results of their work are of clear interest to the Office. At present, this valuable source of inputs is under-developed. For example, external researchers are frequently unable access data other than by expensive, and sometimes insecure, field visits. The electronic formats used with the field by the

Learning Resource Centre should be flexible and be used for strategic partnerships with external researchers.

4. Analysis

Analysis based on the above inputs should be conducted, or given focus, by the Learning Resource Centre with additional support as needed from the three branches of the Office.

Assistance from external subject matter experts may be tapped as needed through the external networks nurtured. Inputs, above, referred to the contribution of academia to the work of the LRC, while the LRC should in turn act as a resource to the academic community in a mutually beneficial partnership. External, or mixed evaluations should be an important source of analysis.

The analysis is intended to generate output in the form of ideas, trends or issues whose integration into OHCHR may improve operational effectiveness.

5. Output

The output after analysis is essentially advice to facilitate improved decision-making⁴⁹. Typically, much thought is directed towards the input part of the learning cycle - and not enough is given to the output stage. There is a range of means through which lessons can be disseminated, and 'marketed' by the LRC. Suggestions are made here. This is an essential link to the implementation stage of the learning cycle.

Routine output may take the form of a hypothesis (a proposed 'lesson') expressed where feasible on one page once the Learning Resource Centre has decided the issue is important enough to be taken on. This may be circulated for comment to relevant OHCHR staff. Replies on paper or in electronic format should be sought with counter-propositions or improvements to the hypothesis encouraged. The LRC's co-ordination of the feedback would be facilitated by an electronic system treating each proposal as a 'field' (in information technology terms).

The LRC should identify who needs to act upon the hypothesis and involve them in the process. Output may include a named proponent or 'champion' for each proposed improvement, and a timeline for implementation. Three questions therefore arise for each hypothesis:

- Is it likely to benefit the OHCHR's sustainable human rights impact and effectiveness?
- What priority and timescale should it be given?
- Who is responsible for implementation?

Output may be addressed to any level of activity of the Office, not only confined to global ideas for improving the human rights impact of the Office. Less obvious examples might aim to improve:

- the design, use or efficiency of meetings/equipment
- safety in the field
- savings for OHCHR
- the working environment
- identification of self-development/training needs. For this, managers and staff may need support from the team in the Learning Resource Centre as they may be: "unable-or perhaps

unwilling- to identify areas in which they need to develop and have little or no knowledge of the myriad of techniques, approaches and activities at their disposal”⁵⁰

The LRC should be prepared to give support to implementation as the experience of other learning units shows that sometimes technical or detailed instruction is needed.

Archiving of outputs should be on the Office Intranet -organised by task and professionally indexed. A useful parallel may be the work of the UN Electoral Assistance Unit concerning its archiving (itself implemented in response to recommendations of the Office for Internal Oversight Services).

Priorities: the workplan of the Learning Resource Centre will need to be flexible, and external pressures on priorities should be expected with donors increasingly active in raising questions, as has occurred in the humanitarian aid sector.

In addition to its routine output, the Learning Resource Centre should produce an annual up-date according to issue-area. Such a compilation of current learning should be in electronic format for ease of up-dating and correction for internal use. This allows correction of earlier ‘lessons’ (hypotheses) as required by the on-going feedback received. In addition, such an annual compilation may be produced in paper format as some will find this more tangible and therefore more readily applicable.

An annual compilation should serve as a training up-date for staff. In addition, there is a need to ensure that relevant external training bodies are aware of changes to the OHCHR’s preferred doctrines, tactics, techniques or procedures prior to the start of their training year.

Publication: some such outputs will therefore need to be made public e.g. where useful for external generic training such as the recent initiative by the Swiss Government to prepare rosters of potential OHCHR staff, as well as the established NORDEM and CANADEM rosters. This output should also be beneficial for training provided by other UN agencies to their staff, furthering coherence in integrating human rights across all the activities of the UN system. Publication is itself an important element of transparency and accountability.

6. Dissemination - feedback

The LRC should be literally a centre for learning resources rather than provider of standard ‘solutions’ or ‘manuals’. The archive of lessons to learn, trends etc should be systematically marketed by the Learning Resource Centre to those who need to learn them both internally and externally i.e. targeted to those to whom they are relevant so that the lesson is need-connected.

Dissemination of an annual training up-date published by the Learning Resource Centre (see outputs above) may be advanced internally through a core team of trainers linked to the LRC. This team may also be available to other UN system trainers and those outside the UN - perhaps for an annual ‘training of trainers’ workshop. This is to ensure clear understanding of the evolving doctrine and better practices of OHCHR, which in turn should inform the training given by others. It is important to ensure that this is being understood in the same way by all and should help ensure others understand and apply the lessons. Such a training cycle should be co-ordinated with the UN Staff College Training Project, including the intended peacekeeping training to be delivered there by the OHCHR. This annual production may evolve into an OHCHR Official Publication CD-ROM to allow the regular and timely inclusion of lessons as amendments to Doctrine and better practices.

7. Auditing

The purpose of audit is to track action taken to implement learning outputs. Such tracking is facilitated by having named 'champions' responsible for implementation (see outputs above), as well as a specific timeline. The LRC should provide the High Commissioner with an annual report of its activities (in addition to the training up-date which may be needed to disseminate outputs, above). This would summarise the ideas, trends, issues and lessons which were presented for implementation together with the action taken by staff to implement them for the preceding year.⁵¹

Build internal commitment to learning: Part I outlined some of the obstacles to learning present in the current situation. The LRC will need to enhance the prospects for implementation by the manner in which it carries out its work, for example:⁵²

- i) advancing implementation by involving staff and enhancing awareness of the need for change
- ii) increasing horizontal communication across branches and teams- and the flow from bottom to top (and vice versa) without undercutting the intermediate managers
- iii) systematically broadening inputs and involving those with most specific knowledge or experience at all levels; encouraging colleagues to help think through the ramifications of proposed outputs
- iv) obtaining the participation of those who must carry out the decisions, including in drafting recommendations where appropriate; creating where possible alternatives to choose from among the creative solutions offered by staff and externally; avoiding appearing as if an attack on an old strategy is an attack on those who espoused it
- v) legitimising the advancement of new practical ideas
- vi) building shared views of what is required and working particularly with teams as these are important units for integrated learning and performance⁵³
- vii) seeking data and arguments sufficiently strong to dislodge preconceived ideas or blindly followed past practices
- viii) avoiding premature outputs or closure which could lead the decision in inappropriate directions
- ix) emphasising process with early solutions likely to be partial, tentative or experimental
- x) communicating to all that systematising learning is inevitable and non-negotiable

Stimulating change: the annual report of the LRC's work would also report obstacles, delay or inaction in achieving implementation. This is linked to the process of building a learning constituency (above).

- First, officials must be able to measure actual difference in the effectiveness of their work in order that a real **value** is placed on the LRC.
- Second, there needs to be built over time a sense that professionalism requires implementation of the learning output.

- Third, the IRC may need a process of escalation from persuasion and convincing to ultimately shaming managers into implementing change. This uses peer values and persistence to achieve change.

NOTES

- ¹ Kofi Annan, 'The Quiet Revolution' in *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organisations*, Vol 4, No.2, Apr-Jun 1998, p.123, at p.128.
- ² The Geneva Group comprises informally: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Japan, Portugal, Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, USA.
- ³ In all its work, IHRN understands human rights as covering economic, social and cultural rights as well as civil and political rights.
- ⁴ A background note in **Annex Ib** discusses this further.
- ⁵ The UN's Centre for Human Rights formally became the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights on 17 September 1997.
- ⁶ In June-August 1994, a review was carried out of the programme and administrative practices of the secretariat of the (then) Centre for Human Rights within the framework of the Secretary-General's Programme of administrative reform aimed at enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the Organisation (A/49/892). In 1995, the Office for Internal Oversight Services recommended a reappraisal and restructuring of the Centre to define its mission and facilitate its implementation, intended to be completed by June 1995(A/49/89, 26 April 1995). The management consultants Price Waterhouse were invited to assist, and the process was completed during 1998.
- ⁷ Secretary-General's Bulletin, organisation of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, ST/SGB/1997/10, 15 September 1997
- ⁸ **Annex I a** outlines the type of current learning efforts underway within the Office of the High Commissioner. These include the first meeting of the Heads of its Field Presences which took place in Geneva in August 1998. It is intended that this will be repeated perhaps annually and some 68 recommendations flowing from the meeting are being followed up by an ear-marked team within the Office.
- ⁹ Review of the Efficiency of the Administrative and Financial Functioning of the UN, Annex on the Programme and Administrative practices of the Centre for Human Rights A/49/892, p.7, para.21. The work of the OIOS is outlined in **Annex I a**.
- ¹⁰ Report of the Secretary-General on the activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services, Preface by the USG for Internal Oversight Services, Karl Th Paschke, A/52/426, 2 October 97, paras 55-56.
- ¹¹ For a discussion of early developments, see Karen Kenny, "Formal and Informal Innovations in the United Nations Protection of Human Rights: The Special Rapporteur on the former Yugoslavia", *Austrian Journal of Public and International Law* 48, 19-77 (1995).
- ¹² For background and bibliography, see Karen Kenny, *Towards Effective Training for Field Human Rights Tasks: Recommending an on-going international process to codify best field practice*, International Human Rights Network, 1996, particularly section 5 and Annex IV. In 1998 IHRN raised issues of concern in this development in its discussion paper *Towards a Human Rights Partnership for Effective Field Work*.
- ¹³ See <http://www.unhcr.ch/html> generally, and OHCHR *Technical Co-operation in the Field of Human Rights On-going Projects and Activities*, October 1998, including Opening Statement by Mary Robinson, High Commissioner for Human Rights, Ninth Session of the Board of Trustees of the Voluntary Fund for Technical Co-operation in the Field of Human Rights, (Geneva, 6-8 July 1998).
- ¹⁴ See note 12 and the bibliography in *Towards Effective Training*.
- ¹⁵ "in the immediate term, the priority is not the delivery of training but rather the identification of best field practices through learning lessons from the experience of human rights operations to date", note 12, at p. viii
- ¹⁶ Statement by Mary Robinson, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights to the Third Committee of the General Assembly, New York, 14 November 1997. On the Programme for Reform, see generally UN Doc. A/RES/52/12, 12 November 1997; UN Doc. A/52/L.72/Rev.1, 19 December 1997.
- ¹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁸ Adapted from Kofi Annan, note 1, at p.129.
- ¹⁹ Note 16.
- ²⁰ Senge, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organisation*, A Conversation with Peter Senge, Innovation Associates, Farmingham MA.
- ²¹ Stuart Crainer, *Key Management Ideas: Thinkers that changed the management world*, 1996, citing the Reg Revans book of that title, 1980, at p.194.
- ²² Crainer, *ibid.*, concerning 'double loop-learning' at p.198-203.
- ²³ In simplified terms, Senge (note 20) illustrates the vital link between accountability and learning by describing the process of learning to ride a bicycle "- you learned from doing something and observing the outcome - you fell off the bike and got up again, rode some, fell off and got up again, and all of a sudden you got it - right?"
- ²⁴ Examples include the lack of any systematic input from those leaving the HRFOR Rwanda operation in July 1998, some after serving there for three and a half years.

- ²⁵ Concept paper, Meeting of Heads of Field Presences, Geneva, 4-7 August 1998; and generally *Human Rights in Action*, background document for Meeting of Heads of Field Presences, Geneva 4-7 August 1998.
- ²⁶ Discussed in "Towards a human rights partnership for effective Field Work", a policy discussion paper of The International Human Rights Network, 1998.
- ²⁷ Report of the Secretary-General to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) of the Economic and Social Council, In-depth Evaluation of the Human Rights Programme, E/AC.51/1989/2, 21 April 1989, paras. 3, 8 and 21.
- ²⁸ This observation was made by Minear in the analogous field of humanitarian aid, "Learning to Learn", Discussion paper prepared for a Seminar on Lessons Learned in Humanitarian Co-ordination, Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Sweden, Stockholm April 3-4 1998, at paras. 57 and 61.
- ²⁹ Ibid, paras 24 and 28.
- ³⁰ Note 20.
- ³¹ Minear, note 28, at para 68.
- ³² A key partner for the OHCHR's field operations in providing personnel has been the UN Volunteer Programme. As a contribution to de-briefing some Volunteers, UNV is publishing a set of personal accounts of some who have been working in field-based human rights, comparing and contrasting work in Guatemala and Rwanda. Although not intended as an evaluation, it will contain lessons in the in-depth interviews which are proposed for consideration. It is intended to be published in 1998 as *Working at the Grassroots: UN Volunteers and Human Rights*.
- ³² A key partner for the OHCHR's field operations in providing personnel has been the UN Volunteer Programme. As a contribution to de-briefing some Volunteers, UNV is publishing a set of personal accounts of some who have been working in field-based human rights, comparing and contrasting work in Guatemala and Rwanda. Although not intended as an evaluation, it will contain lessons in the in-depth interviews which are proposed for consideration. It is intended to be published in 1998 as *Working at the Grassroots: UN Volunteers and Human Rights*.
- ³⁵ Similar reasons were advanced for the establishment of the Department of Humanitarian Affairs learning process, see DHA Evaluation and Lessons Learned Studies: Procedures and Methodology, 19 January 1996.
- ³⁶ A note on these issues is attached at **Annex I b** as background for the proposals in Part II. During 1999, research on this issue by The Humanitarianism and War Project of the Thomas J. Watson Jr. Institute for International Studies at Brown University, in association with The International Human Rights Network is intended to contribute to clarifying these issues.
- ³⁷ An example of this may be the on-going need to integrate women's human rights into its own work, learning from work such as that by the High Commissioner for Refugees, Unicef and UNDP. The OHCHR would then more readily be able to provide input for the study on gender in peacekeeping which the Lessons Learned Unit of DPKO is currently undertaking.
- ³⁸ Note 1, at p.131.
- ³⁹ This section has particularly benefited from the insights of Grahame Morphey, Managing Director of Chrysalis, management and organisational development specialists.
- ⁴⁰ "Without such vision, organisations have no chance of creating the future, they can only react to it", James C. Collins and Jerry I. Porras, Organisational Vision and Visionary Organisations, *California Management Review*, Volume 34, Number 1, Fall 1991, at p.32.
- ⁴¹ This builds on the recommendation made regarding training for "an on-going international process to codify best human rights field practice", see *Towards Effective Training*, at note 12.
- ⁴² **Annex II b** discusses methodology in more detail.
- ⁴³ Insights into the learning cycle have been drawn particularly from Lt. Col. Alec Bain, UK Ministry of Defence, "Lessons Learned", a paper by DGD&D for The Army Doctrine Committee, 11 May 98, DGD&D/1/128/10.
- ⁴⁴ The point is made in these terms by Larry Minear regarding the functioning of the DHA/OCHA and DPKO 'lessons learning' units, note 28, at para. 54.
- ⁴⁵ Note 1, at p.130.
- ⁴⁶ For example, there are efforts to apply *Interim measures for the Integration of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights into Technical Co-operation Practices and Procedures* GLO/97/AH/20, this is intended to produce a *Manual for UN Officials and Practitioners*. In addition, a project for *Interim Measures for the Integration of a Gender Perspective into Technical Co-operation Practice and Procedures* is underway, GLO/96/AH/24.
- ⁴⁷ See *Towards a Human Rights Partnership for Effective Field Work*, note 12, at p.v.
- ⁴⁸ Examples of external sources who are seeking full integration of human rights include, Julia Hausermann, *A Human Rights Approach to Development*, A Discussion Paper Commissioned by the Department for International Development of the UK Government, Rights and Humanity 1998; Andre Frankovits and Patrick Earle *The Rights way to Development: Manual for a human rights approach to development assistance*, for the Human Rights Council of Australia Inc., May 1988.
- ⁴⁹ Note 9.
- ⁵⁰ See web-page <http://www.iue.it/AEL/Welcome.html>
- ⁵¹ Adapted to this context, note 1, at p.136.

- 1 Decision 1998/112 of the CHR established the terms of reference for the review. See <http://www.unhcr.ch/html/menu2/2/54chr>.
- 2 Interim measures for the Integration of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights into Technical Co-operation practices and procedures GLO/97/AH/20 - as well as GLO/96/AH/24 on same for Integration of a Gender Perspective into Technical Co-operation Practice and Procedures (the former will produce a *Manual for UN Officials and Practitioners*).
- 3 Report of the Secretary-General on the activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services, Preface by the USG for Internal Oversight Services, Karl Th Paschke, A/52/426, 2 Oct 97.
- 4 Note 3 above, Report of the Secretary-General on the activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services.
- 5 Note 3, p.11.
- 6 Note 3, p.12.
- 7 Ibid.
- 8 Emphasis added, note 3, Preface.
- 9 A/51/801.
- 10 Note 3 at para 13.
- 11 For the Unit's functions and methodology, completed activities, programme of work throughout 1998 and resource requirements, see the report on its work submitted to the General Assembly, August 1997 (A/51/965).
- 12 Committee for Programme and Co-ordination of the Economic and Social Council, Report by the Secretary-General, Triennial review of the implementation of recommendations made by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination at its thirty-fifth session on the evaluation of peacekeeping operations: start-up phase, E/AC.51/1998/4, 13 March 1998, at p.7.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 See A/C.5/51/SR.73 and resolution 51/239B.
- 15 Note 12, at para.7.
- 16 E/AC.51/1994/3 para 10, recommendation 4; and p.9.
- 17 The OIOS Evaluation Report of the Termination Phase of Peacekeeping Operations, 13 March 1998, p.10 and 28.
- 18 E/AC.51/1994/3.
- 19 Note 17.
- 20 DHA Evaluation and Lessons Learned Studies: Procedures and Methodology, 19 January 1996.
- 21 Larry Minear, "Learning to Learn", Discussion paper prepared for a Seminar on Lessons Learned in Humanitarian Co-ordination, Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Sweden, Stockholm April 3-4 1998, at para.55.
- 22 See generally, Strategy Paper for Inspection and Evaluation Service, December 1997, GEN/97/02; Lowell Martin, UNHCR Evaluation Co-ordinator, Planning and Organising Useful Evaluations, UNHCR Inspection and Evaluation Service, January 1998.
- 23 Staff Stress and Security: a management challenge for UNHCR: Synopsis report, Inspection and Evaluation Service, October 1997, EVAL/SYN/02/97; the Evaluation report itself is EVAL/02/97.
- 24 <http://www.worldbank.org/html/oed/evaltxt.htm>
- 25 DGVIII/4/FMmib D(98), 15 May 1998
- 26 This note by Karen Kenny is published in the Relief and Rehabilitation Network Newsletter, edited by Koenraad van Brabant, Number 12, November 1998, at p.5.
- 27 Statement by Mr Kofi Annan, Secretary-General of the United Nations to the opening of the fifty-fourth session of the Commission on Human Rights, Geneva 16 March 1998
- 28 For example, seven conflicts come to mind in Asia: Cambodia, Bouganville, East Timor, Myanmar, Kashmir, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan, Middle East - Palestine; four in the Americas: El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Colombia; five in Europe: former Yugoslavia, Cyprus, Abkhazia, Nagorno-Karabach, Northern Ireland; and eight in Africa: Rwanda, Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Western Sahara, Southern Sudan, Angola, Liberia, Sierra Leone.
- 29 While there was some progress in Guatemala=s MINUGUA using for example multi-disciplinary teams, Croatia=s UNTAES, a contemporaneous operation, learned little from the human rights operations which went before.
- 30 See *Towards a Human Rights partnership for effective field work* a discussion paper of The International Human Rights Network, August 1998, by this author.
- 31 Report of the Secretary-General on *Renewing the United Nations: a Programme for Reform*, to the General Assembly, A/51/950, 14 July 1997.
- 32 Her role can be summarised as "to ensure leadership" in human rights for the UN system, Statement by Mary Robinson, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, to the fifty-second session of the UN General Assembly Third Committee, New York, 14 November 1997.
- 33 Declaration and Programme of Action, UN World Conference on Human Rights, Vienna 1993, 14 HRLJ352, 1993.
- 34 For example, there are efforts to apply *Interim measures for the Integration of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights into Technical Co-operation Practices and Procedures* GLO/97/AH/20. In addition, a project for *Interim Measures for the Integration of a Gender Perspective into Technical Co-operation Practice and Procedures* is underway, GLO/96/AH/24.

³⁵ See note 5.

³⁶ See for example, Andre Frankovits and Patrick Earle "The Rights way to Development: Manual for a human rights approach to development assistance" for the Human Rights Council of Australia Inc., May 1988; and the training courses such as the annual two-week course *Human Rights in Modern Peacekeeping*, at the Lester B. Pearson Canadian International Peacekeeping Training Centre, website: <http://www.ppc.cdnpeacekeeping.ns.ca>

³⁷ "Host society" for present purposes is defined to include host authorities at all levels as well as the range of "civil society" actors, see *Towards A Human Rights Partnership for Effective Field Work*, discussion paper of The International Human Rights Network, 1998.

³⁸ The question of how to facilitate this host society participation is the focus of on-going IHRN work.

³⁹ A working lunch was convened by IHRN during the Forum to exchange information on common training needs and approaches among: Council of Europe, European Commission, OSCE, UN OHCHR, International IDEA and the Irish Department of Foreign Affairs.

⁴¹ Statement of Principles, Round Table on the promotion of the rule of law through effective training for field human rights tasks, convened by The International Human Rights Network, Dublin 28-29 November 1996.

⁴² Note 3, emphasis added, at Preface.

⁴³ Minear, note 21, at para. 68

⁴⁴ This section draws particularly the insights of Lt. Col. Alec Bain, UK Ministry of Defence, "Lessons Learned", a paper by DGD&D for The Army Doctrine Committee, 11 May 98, DGD&D/1/128/10.

⁴⁵ The UN Secretary-General has clearly articulated the importance of input from national and international civil society, academia and the private sector, see Kofi Annan, 'The Quiet Revolution' in *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organisations*, Vol 4, No.2, Apr-Jun 1998, p.123.

⁴⁶ To illustrate the range of methods which may be considered and tested, one system uses team brainstorming on a particular issue with up to eight people using separate PCs at the same time. This can generate over 100 reasoned ideas in one hour. These are fed into a database and the group prioritises them for follow-up.

⁴⁷ Further consideration is being given to this element by The International Human Rights Network and it is a focus of its work in 1999.

⁴⁸ Examples may include the Ford Foundation and the Airey Neave and Leverhulme Trusts.

⁴⁹ The output of the analysis stage may also be the validation of existing doctrines, systems and processes - thus identifying areas where no changes appear to be needed at that moment.

⁵⁰ Fiona Dent, co-author *Signposts for Success*, cited by Stuart Crainer, *Key Management Ideas: Thinkers that changed the management world*, 1996, at p.213.

⁵¹ The report may be analogous to that of the Joint Evaluation Follow-up Monitoring and Facilitation Network, "The Joint Evaluation of Emergency Assistance to Rwanda: A Review of Follow-up and Impact One Year After Publication", February 2 1997; and the Joint Evaluation of Emergency Assistance to Rwanda: A Review of Follow-up and Impact Fifteen months after Publication", June 12, 1997) JEFF - which was since disbanded after the second follow-up report. In contrast, the Learning Resource Centre should be permanent.

⁵² Adapted from James Brian Quinn "Managing Strategic change", *Sloan Management Review*, Summer 1980, at p.1

⁵³ Senge, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organisation*, A Conversation with Peter Senge, Innovation Associates, Framingham MA.
