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TERMS OF REFERENCE

Evaluation Team Lead Consultant – Senior Specialist
Evaluation Team Second Consultant – Junior Specialist

EVALUATION OF THE UNDG HUMAN RIGHTS MAINSTREAMING MULTI-DONOR TRUST FUND 2011-2019

Location: Home based with Possible travel if conditions permit
Type of contract: International Consultant
Languages Required: English
Estimated Start Date: June 15th 2020
Expected Duration of Assignment: 50 Days for Team Lead Senior Specialist Consultant & 40 Days for Team Member Junior Specialist Consultant

1. BACKGROUND

The UNSDG Human Rights Mainstreaming Multi-Donor Trust Fund (HRM MDTF) (hereinafter “the Fund”) commenced on 1 December 2010, with an initial operating period up to 31 December 2013. The Fund has been extended 5 times, and is currently due to end on 31 December 2024.¹

The Steering Committee of the Fund is responsible for setting the strategic direction of the Fund, reviewing funding proposals and approving allocations. The Steering Committee decided in 2019 to initiate an independent, external evaluation² of the Fund. This decision is supported by the Technical Secretariat of the Fund, which is responsible for, inter alia, “preparing periodic progress reports on the programme implementation and analyzing implementation bottlenecks and presenting recommendations to the Steering Committee on measures to accelerate the implementation”.

With the Delivering Together Facility planned to close in 2020, the Fund will again be the primary funding source for UN inter-agency work on human rights mainstreaming in development, including Human Rights Advisors at the Resident Coordinator Offices. In view of this, and in the context of the repositioning of the UN development system (UNDS), it is timely to evaluate the extent to which the Fund has progressed towards its objectives, identify achievements and shortcomings or bottlenecks, and develop evidence-based recommendations for the next phase of the Fund’s operations.

¹ The Fund end date was last extended in December 2019 in accordance with MPTF Office procedures. The Administrative Agent and 4 of the 6 Participating UN Organizations have thus far signed the new MOU.
² HRM MDTF Terms of Reference, “5. Evaluation: Monitoring and evaluation of the Fund will be undertaken in accordance with the provisions contained in the TOR, which are consistent with the respective regulations, rules and procedures of the Participating UN Organizations.”
The Technical Secretariat of the Fund (hosted by DCO) has commissioned the evaluation on behalf of the Fund Steering Committee and will provide the management support. It will be overseen by a multi-stakeholder Reference Group.

The primary users of the evaluation will be the participating UN organizations of the Fund, DCO, the Administrative Agent (MPTFO), and Member States including the current contributors to the Fund. Additionally, other potential donors and other entities that are members of the UNSDG are intended audiences of the evaluation.

2. CONTEXT

The Fund provides valuable financial support to the UNSDG to strengthen human rights mainstreaming in the UNDS through initiatives at HQ, regional and country levels.

In 2008, the UN Secretary General issued a policy decision which reaffirmed “the centrality of human rights in the development work of the United Nations and stresses the universality of human rights and the unique role and mandate of the United Nations system in this regard.” The Secretary-General further tasked OHCHR and the UNDG Chair to initiate “an interagency process to explore the modalities to further strengthen system-wide coherence, collaboration and support for RCs and UNCTs in mainstreaming human rights, taking into account lessons learned from Action 2”. The establishment of the UN Development Group Human Rights Mainstreaming Mechanism (UNDG HRM) was the direct response to this directive. Such a dedicated mechanism enabled the UNDG to consolidate the achievements of the Action 2 programme from 2004-2008 as well as those from various workstreams under other existing UNDG Working Groups, and provided a platform for continued interagency collaboration to strengthen policy coherence and operational support to UNCTs.

The Fund was then established to “support the implementation of objectives and priorities of the UNDG HRM, established by the UNDG Principals on 30 November 2009, to further institutionalize the mainstreaming of human rights into UN operational activities for development by further strengthening system-wide coherence, collaboration and support for UNRCs and the UNCTs on human rights mainstreaming, as well as to strengthen the coherence of UN responses to national priorities, thus ensuring strong national ownership and capacity to fulfill human rights obligations. The MDTF will support strategic activities at global, regional and country level that ultimately contribute to the transformational change and/or impact at the country level.”

In contributing to the overall objective, the Fund focuses on four primary components:

1. Promoting a coordinated and coherent UN system-wide approach towards the integration of human rights principles and international standards into UN operational activities for development;
2. Providing coherent support for Resident Coordinators and UN Country Teams in mainstreaming human rights;

---

3 Purpose of the Fund as outlined in the original Terms of Reference of the Fund (dated 21 October 2010): http://mptf.undp.org/document/download/10163. This was updated in February 2019 to reflect changes in the UNDG/UNSDG working mechanisms, but was not changed significantly.
3. Developing a coherent UN-system wide approach, through cooperation and collaboration among UN agencies, to providing support towards strengthening national human rights protection systems at the request of governments; and

4. Contributing to the integration of human rights issues in the overall UNSDG advocacy on development agenda and global issues.

It is important to highlight that a significant objective of the Fund (further reinforced by the objectives and priorities of the UNDG/UNSDG human rights mainstreaming coordination mechanisms) was supporting policy coherence at HQ level, in order to strengthen system-wide coherence and collaboration on human rights mainstreaming at the country level. The UNDG also integrated relevant elements of the Human Rights up Front initiative, launched by the Secretary General in late 2013, into UNDG activities to mainstream human rights into development, some of which were supported by the Fund.

The governance of the Fund is set out in the Terms of Reference. The governance structure has been revised from time to time to facilitate transparent, effective and efficient decision-making and to adapt to changes in the working mechanisms of the UNSDG. Currently the Fund is governed by a Steering Committee comprised of up to 6 Participating UN Organisations. The Administrative Agent - the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTFO) – is an ex-officio member of the Steering Committee. It is supported by a Technical Secretariat, hosted within the Development Coordination Office (DCO). Annual narrative and financial reports are shared with donors and published on the MPTFO Gateway. Several other formal engagements with donors have taken place since the launch of the Fund.

Since its establishment, the participating UN organisations have included: OHCHR, UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNICEF, ILO, the UN Staff System College and WHO. Current Participating UN Organisations are: OHCHR, UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNICEF and UN Women. Of these, the first four entities have been the most active entities, and have participated in the Fund since its inception. ILO, the Staff System College and WHO participated for shorter times and/or specific projects. UNICEF has not been a Participating UN Organisation of the Fund throughout the full term of the Fund. UN Women joined for the first time in February 2020.

The Fund has allocated some USD 16 million to initiatives under the primary components of the Terms of Reference since it commenced. The average annual expenditure has been USD 2-3 million, with fluctuations based on the availability of funds. Fund contributors are the Governments of Sweden, Norway, Germany, Denmark, Finland, and Ireland. Donor support for the continuation of the HRM MDTF, and the scaled up ambition for 2020, was clearly

---

4 Substantive amendments to the governance structures of the Fund were made in 2012 and 2019. The 2012 amendment established the Resource Management Committee under the Steering Committee. The 8 February 2019 amendment abolished the Resource Management Committee, revised the role of the UNSDG inter-agency coordination mechanism on human rights in relation to the Fund, and updated the language of the Terms of Reference to bring references to UNSDG mechanisms into line with the new terminology and structures implemented as part of the UNDS reforms.

5 In 2016, it was envisaged that the HRM MDTF would be replaced by the DOCO Delivering Together Facility (DTF). Accordingly, donors were encouraged to contribute to the DTF to support the work previously funded under the HRM MDTF. In late 2018, reflecting on the changes in the UNDS and planned closure of the DOCO DTF, a decision was made to continue the HRM MDTF, to serve as the primary mechanism for providing additional support to strategic, inter-agency human rights mainstreaming efforts in the reformed UNDS.
demonstrated in 2018 and 2019, with new contributions of over USD 13 million. With the Fund now extended to 31 December 2024, this evaluation will provide a valuable evidence base for further strengthening the impact and sustainability of the Fund going forward.

Initiatives have been implemented at HQ, regional and country levels. The majority of the Fund’s resources have been directed towards the deployment of human rights advisors to the field, and the HQ-level policy coherence work. During the period of the evaluation, the Fund supported HRAs deployed in 26 countries and 2 regions with some variations depending on the year, at a total value of approximately 10.4 million (87% of all Fund transfers). Several of the deployments were also funded through UNCTs, OHCHR and other sources during the period under review. Small, country-specific programmes were also implemented in Costa Rica, Guinea Bissau, Indonesia, Morocco, Myanmar, Turkey, Uruguay, and Zambia during 2013-2015. Annual and financial progress reports from 2011 onwards are available on the MPTFO Gateway. Since 2011, the Steering Committee and Participating UN Organisations have applied lessons learned to increase the efficiency and impact of the Fund. However, an independent evaluation of the full programme of initiatives has not been undertaken.

3. **RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES**

This evaluation will enable the Fund partners to benefit from a deeper understanding of the achievements, as well as areas where implementation could be improved, so as to strengthen the overall impact of the Fund going forward. The overall objectives of the evaluation are: (i) enhanced accountability of the partners involved in the implementation of the Fund; and (ii) a broadened evidence based for the design and implementation of the next multi-year results framework and for effective governance, management and operational processes of the Fund in the current development context. The specific objectives are to:

1. **Demonstrate accountability to stakeholders by assessment of the progress and contributions of the Fund towards mainstreaming of human rights in the UN development system, and in particular the towards the stated objectives and primary components of the Fund;**
2. **Assess the Fund’s governance and management to identify if they can be improved in terms of efficiency and effectiveness;**
3. **Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the operational aspects of the Fund, and impact on coherence between UNSDG entities on human rights mainstreaming;**
4. **Given the evolution of the UNSDG and reforms in the UN development system, in particular at country level, (including the funding landscape), what opportunities exist for the next phase of the Fund?**
5. **Document lessons learned to improve programme design and provide evidence to inform the multi-year results framework for the Fund for 2021-2024.**

4. **SCOPE AND FOCUS AREAS**

The evaluation will cover the period from 1 December 2010 to 31 December 2019. It will include all initiatives supported through the Fund at country, regional and HQ levels, as well as management, financial aspects, governance structures and processes including the Technical Secretariat and Steering Committee, and implementation by Participating UN Organisations and roles played by Fund
partners. Besides the intended effects of the initiatives, the evaluation will identify any key unintended effects. The evaluation will pay particular attention to the impact on the Fund of the broader context, including the evolving status of the Fund throughout the period of the evaluation, changes to the UNDG/UNSDG architecture and inter-agency platform/s to which it has been linked since its establishment, and fluctuations in funding and agencies’ participation.

Primary and secondary data from HQ/global level will be particularly critical in assessing the substantive work of the Fund on global policy coherence and coordinated approaches to human rights mainstreaming. The evaluation will also include field surveys and more in-depth data collection for case studies in 5-6 countries where the RC/UNCT has benefited from one or more activities supported by the Fund to compliment other data (detailed country selection criteria will be provided to the Consultants by the Technical Secretariat in advance). The emphasis will be to conduct a pragmatic, low-cost evaluation that compliments existing information including structured feedback processes, reporting and assessments. The findings and recommendations will inform the future operations of the Fund.

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PRELIMINARY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will focus on the following key questions, and be guided by the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, coherence, efficiency, sustainability, effectiveness and impact):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation objective</th>
<th>Preliminary evaluation questions(^6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (i) Demonstrate accountability to stakeholders by assessment of the progress and contributions of the Fund towards mainstreaming of human rights in the UN development system, and in particular the towards the objectives and primary components of the Fund; | • To what extent have the initiatives supported by the Fund been consistent with the main objectives and the four primary components of the Fund? (relevance, sustainability)  
• To what extent have the different types of activities supported by the Fund contributed to progress towards the objectives and primary components of the Fund? (effectiveness, impact)  
• To what extent has the Fund contributed towards the objectives and priorities of the UNSDG (as formulated by the relevant UNSDG inter-agency human rights mainstreaming coordination mechanism operating at the time) and of the UNDS reform? (impact, coherence)  
• To what extent has the Fund facilitated closer collaboration and more joined-up work by UN agencies at the country, regional and HQ levels? (impact, coherence) |
| (ii) Assess the Fund’s governance and management to identify if they can be improved in terms of efficiency and effectiveness; | • Taking into account the changes in the external environment (UNDG/UNSDG and funding available), how effective and efficient have the governance processes of the Fund been in enabling the Fund to deliver on its objectives, including strategic utilization of resources? (effectives, efficiency, sustainability).  
• Taking into account the changes in the external environment (UNDG/UNSDG, country level reforms and funding available) how effective and efficient have the management processes |

\(^6\) To be further refined during the inception phase as necessary.
| (iii) Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the operational aspects of the Fund, and impact on coherence between UNSDG entities on human rights mainstreaming. | of the Fund been in enabling the Fund to plan and deliver on its objectives? (effectiveness, efficiency) and what are the recommendations for improvement, given the changes in the external environment
- Is the current governance of the Fund suitable for effective and efficient operations in the current UNSDG context? (effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coherence)
- How has the governance structure ensured transparency and accountability towards donors and what is the room for improvement
- Taking into account the inter-dependent nature of the Fund with the broader UNDG/UNSDG system, and its Secretariat in DOCO/DCO, to what extent has the UNDG/UNSDG system supported and facilitated the work and impact of the Fund? To what extent have the participating UN organisations and other UNSDG entities supported the work and impact of the Fund?
- Is the operationalization of the Fund effective and efficient? (effectiveness, efficiency)
- Does the operationalization of Fund activities promote policy coherence on integrating human rights in development across the UNSDG the HQ, regional and country levels? (effectiveness, coherence, impact)
- Does the operationalization of the Fund activities enhance joint human rights-based analyses, programming and implementation by the UN Country Teams |

| (iv) Given the evolution of the UNSDG and UN development system, in particular at country level, (including the funding landscape), what opportunities exist for the next phase of the Fund? | To what extent have there been there synergies and interlinkages between the interventions of the Fund and the policies and activities of the UNSDG at HQ, regional and country levels, and how have these contributed to results? How does the work complement other structures and mechanisms of the broader UN system? (coherence, sustainability)What is the added value of the Fund for donors, the member entities and the UN Country Teams in the current environment?
- Is the current Fund structure, position/relationship within the UNSDG and relevant working mechanisms, and engagement with partners and other UN structures appropriate for maximum impact in the context of the UNDS reform, the Decade of Action and the potential for increased resources of the Fund? (coherence, sustainability, impact) |

| (v) Document lessons learned to improve | Taking into account the decision by Member States on UNDS reform and new priorities such as the Secretary-General’s Call |
programme design and provide evidence to inform the multi-year results framework for the Fund for 2021-2024.

| • to Action on Human Rights, are there other areas/opportunities for supporting mainstreaming of human rights in the UN development system that the Fund should consider addressing? (effectiveness, results) |
| • What are the key lessons learned to improve the design, substantive results, operationalization, management and governance of the Fund to make the impact more sustainable in the context of the UNSDG? (impact, sustainability) |
| • What are the key elements that should be included in the multi-year results framework? |

6. METHODOLOGY, PROCESS AND TIMEFRAME

**Methodology:**

The evaluation will be guided by the following standards: integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation, UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN system, the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. The evaluation will employ quantitative and qualitative methods as necessary.

The methodology will be further detailed by the evaluation team in the Inception report. **Primary data** will be collected through semi-structured interviews with key informants and appropriately tailored surveys to relevant stakeholders, including RCs and selected UNCTs and other constituencies, and the agency focal points from the Participating UN Organisations of the Fund. Through remote means, in-depth information will be gathered from stakeholders in 5-6 countries to develop case studies on the interventions at country level.

**Secondary data** will be collected through desk reviews of Fund documents, workplans, budgets, progress and annual reports, databases and various other relevant documents and research. The inception report will outline sampling methods for review of secondary data where not feasible to review all Fund documentation.

Key secondary data sources include:

- Fund documentation including Steering Committee and RMC minutes, project proposals, end of project reports, progress and annual reports, financial data (2011 – 2019)
- UNDG/UNSDG publications (policy documents, tools, guidance etc) (2011 – 2019)
- UNDG/UNSDG working arrangements; planning documents and outputs of the UNDG inter-agency human rights mainstreaming coordination mechanisms (2011 – 2019)
- Member State documents guiding the work of the UNDS (QCPR 2012, 2016, A/RES/72/279)

---

• UNSDG Information Management System (IMS) – annual human Rights-related reporting (quantitative and qualitative) by UNCTs, QCPR indicators
• HRA evaluation (OHCHR, 2016)
• Informal HRA assessments carried out by DOCO in 2016 under ASG Kate Gilmour.
• Available analytics on use of key knowledge management tools (HuriTALK and HRBA Portal)

Validation: all evaluation findings should be supported with evidence. The evaluation team will use a variety of validation mechanisms to ensure quality of data collected. Data must be triangulated across sources and methods where possible. The evaluation team will validate the data with key stakeholders and ensure there are no factual errors or errors of interpretation and no missing evidence that could materially change the findings.

Process and timeframe

1. Finalise the draft Terms of Reference
2. Terms of Reference reviewed and approved by the Reference Group
3. Evaluation team engaged
4. Evaluation (total 3-4 months):
   a. Inception Report submitted to the Reference Group and other key stakeholders for feedback
   b. Inception Report approved by Reference Group
   c. Undertake data collection and analysis including HQ and field level
   d. Document key findings from country level case studies in PowerPoint presentations (1 per country)
   e. Submit draft report to Reference Group for feedback
   f. Submit final report to the Reference Group
5. Steering Committee briefed on evaluation
6. Management response to evaluation developed and approved by the Steering Committee.

A Reference Group will be established, consisting of up to 6 representatives of the Fund Steering Committee including the Chair of the Steering Committee, the MPTFO, two (largest) donors and DCO (a stakeholder and host of the Technical Secretariat). The Reference Group will have the following responsibilities:

• Review, comment on and approve the Terms of Reference for the evaluation;
• Review, comment on and approve the Inception Report;
• Review and comment on the draft Evaluation Report;
• Acknowledge the final evaluation report as compliant with the Terms of Reference and submit it to the Fund Steering Committee.

The Technical Secretariat will have the following responsibilities:

• Support administrative functions for the evaluation including preparing Terms of Reference and engaging and managing the evaluation team
• Convene and Chair the meetings of the Reference Group; consolidate the comments of the Reference Group and submit these to the evaluation team. [The Chair function does not entail any additional authority for decision-making within the Reference Group]
• Facilitate access to all relevant and available information required to perform the scope of work
• Facilitate introductions to countries and other stakeholders as appropriate
• Lead the consultative process of drafting the Management Response (in consultation with and based on the substantive lead/input and guidance from the implementing agencies)

The **Steering Committee** will have the following responsibilities:

• Supports identification of evaluation team
• Approves the Management Response

7. **EVALUATION PROCESS AND INDICATIVE TIMELINE:**

The evaluation team will consist of 2 consultants over a 3-4 month period. The proposed start date is 15 June 2020 and completion date is 30 September 2020. The main responsibilities will be to carry out the evaluation as per the process outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activities included</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Phase</td>
<td>- Initial desk review of all relevant documents available</td>
<td>Consultant to propose/Will被讨论并分配 upon initial orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stakeholder mapping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Summarise the intervention logic of the Fund with reference to relevant documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- of the Fund and UNDG/UNSDG inter-agency coordination mechanisms on human rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- mainstreaming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Develop the Evaluation Matrix; finalise the list of evaluation questions, identify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- related assumptions and indicators to be assessed, and identify data sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Develop data collection, sampling and analysis strategy, with appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- tailoring of field surveys and interview questions for stakeholders that have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- been involved in Fund interventions and those with more limited understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- (for forward looking elements)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identify countries for case studies based on criteria provided by the Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Develop a concrete work plan with timelines for all remaining phases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Finalise an Inception report, approved by the Reference Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and review</td>
<td>Collect primary and secondary data, including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of secondary data (estimate 10 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and issue field surveys to—RCs⁸, Human</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rights Advisors, UNCTs and other constiuences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(estimate 5 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct HQ and regional-level interviews (estimate 5 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct field-level interviews (RC/RCO, UNCT members, external partners) and analyse additional documentation from country level (5-6 countries) and document key findings in powerpoint presentations (max. 25 slides per country) (estimate 15 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct donor interviews (estimate 2 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synthesis and report writing</th>
<th>Generate relevant quantitative and qualitative analyses and findings, combining/triangulating data from different sources as necessary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft evaluation report including findings, conclusions and recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Present draft report to Reference Group for discussion (1day, remote)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submit draft evaluation report to the Reference Group for formal review and comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The comments from the Reference Group will be addressed by the evaluation team in revising the draft report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalise data sources where relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submit final report to the Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of final report to the Steering Committee (remote)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Response, dissemination and follow up</th>
<th>Technical Secretariat to lead the consultative process of drafting the Management Response (in consultation with and based on the substantive lead/input and guidance from the implementing agencies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[After completion of work by evaluation team]

### 8. EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team will produce the following deliverables:

1. **Inception report** to include, as a minimum:
   - Stakeholder map
   - Evaluation matrix (including final list of evaluation questions and indicators)

---

⁸ Questions relating to the operations and past activities of the Fund should only be addressed to the current and former RCs with experience of the Fund.
- Overall evaluation design and methodology, a detailed description of the data sources and data collection and analysis strategy.
- Roles and responsibilities of the team members and a work plan

2. **5-6 powerpoint presentations** documenting the key findings from the country level case studies

3. A **debriefing presentation document** (ppt format or max 5 pages), synthesizing the main preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation, to be presented and discussed with the Reference Group during the debriefing meeting foreseen at the end of the Synthesis stage

4. A **draft evaluation report** for the Reference Group (Maximum 40 pages plus annexes)

5. A **final report** (addressing comments from the Reference Group) to be submitted to the Reference Group

6. Summary **presentation of the evaluation** report (ppt slides) for the Steering Committee

All deliverables will be drafted in English and shall follow the general structure and outlines as recommended by the UNEG except where otherwise instructed by the Steering Committee.

Due to current travel restrictions and social distancing requirements, the consultant team is expected to organise and lead online engagement with stakeholders, including: presentation and discussion of preliminary findings and recommendations to the Reference Group; and presentation of final evaluation to the Steering Committee.

**9. COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM**

The evaluation team should be familiar with the UN development system, the UNDG/UNSDG and have some substantive understanding of human rights mainstreaming within the UN development system.

The Evaluation Team Leader will have the overall responsibility during all phases of the evaluation to ensure the timely completion and high quality of the evaluation process, methodologies and outputs. In close collaboration with the second evaluator, and with the Reference Group and Technical Secretariat, she/he will lead the design of the evaluation, guide the methodology and application of the data collection instruments and lead the consultations with stakeholders. The Team Leader will delegate appropriate activities to the second evaluator to maximise efficiency of the Team. At the reporting phase, she/he is responsible for putting together the draft evaluation report, based on inputs from other members of the evaluation team, and finalizing the report based on inputs from the Reference Group.

The consultancy team will comprise a lead consultant and second consultant, with the following profiles:

**LEAD CONSULTANT:**

**CORPORATE COMPETENCIES**
• Demonstrates integrity and fairness, by modeling UN values and ethical standards;
• Promotes the vision, mission and strategic goals of the UN system; and
• Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

FUNCTIONAL COMPETENCIES

• Strong quantitative and qualitative analytical skills with conceptual understanding;
• Proven skills in information synthesis and analytical writing
• Excellent demonstrated ability to be flexible and work under tight deadlines in an independent working environment;
• High level of communication and interpersonal skills and experience in working effectively in a multi-cultural environment;
• Excellent technical writing skills;
• Computer literacy.

EDUCATION

• Post graduate degree or equivalent in a relevant discipline.

EXPERIENCE

• At least 15 years of professional experience in development and human rights-related work at the international level
• Demonstrated expertise and experience in evaluations of complex global programmes in the field of development for UN agencies or other international organisations
• Experience in evaluation of human rights programmes desirable.
• A good knowledge of the UN development system, and the UNDG/UNSDG
• Knowledge related to UN reform at the country level
• Good technical knowledge of human rights and human rights-based approach to programming;
• Good understanding of UN programming processes
• Experience working with UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes at the field level is desirable.
• Ability to conduct basic quantitative data analysis (pivot tables) in Excel
• Fluency in English

DURATION

This evaluation will be performed over a four-month period for 50 working days

JUNIOR/SECOND CONSULTANT:

CORPORATE COMPETENCIES

• Demonstrates integrity and fairness, by modeling UN values and ethical standards;
• Promotes the vision, mission and strategic goals of the UN system; and
• Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

**FUNCTIONAL COMPETENCIES**

• Strong quantitative and qualitative analytical skills with conceptual understanding;
• Proven skills in information synthesis and analytical writing
• Excellent demonstrated ability to be flexible and work under tight deadlines in an independent working environment;
• High level of communication and interpersonal skills and experience in working effectively in a multi-cultural environment;
• Excellent technical writing skills;
• Computer literacy.

**EDUCATION**

• Graduate degree in law, social sciences or other relevant discipline.

**EXPERIENCE**

• At least 7 years of professional experience in development and human rights-related work at the international level
• Experience in conducting evaluations in the field of development
• A good knowledge of the UN development system
• Knowledge related to UN reform at country level desirable
• Understanding of UN programming processes
• Ability to conduct quantitative data analysis (eg. pivot tables) in Excel
• Fluency in English

**DURATION**

This evaluation will be performed over a four month period for 40 working days.

**10. APPLICATION PROCEDURE**

The application package containing the following (to be uploaded as one file):

• Online application with brief description of why the Offer considers her/himself the most suitable for the assignment; and timelines associated with the deliverables
• Personal CV or P11, indicating all past experience from similar projects and specifying the relevant assignment period (from/to), as well as the email and telephone contacts of at least three (3) professional references.

**Note:** The above documents need to be scanned in one file and uploaded to the online application as one document.

**Shortlisted candidates (ONLY) will be requested to submit a Financial Proposal.**

• The financial proposal should specify an all-inclusive daily fee (based on a 7-hour working day - lunch time is not included)
The financial proposal must be all-inclusive and take into account various expenses that will be incurred during the contract, including: the daily professional fee; cost of travel from the home base to the duty station and vice versa, where required; living allowances at the duty station; communications, utilities and consumables; life, health and any other insurance; risks and inconveniences related to work under hardship and hazardous conditions (e.g., personal security needs, etc.), when applicable; and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services under the contract.

In the case of travel requested by UNDP, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between UNDP and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

If the Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under a Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

The Financial Proposal is to be emailed as per the instruction in the separate email that will be sent to shortlisted candidates.

11. EVALUATION

Applicants are reviewed based on Required Skills and Experience stated above and based on the technical evaluation criteria outlined below. Applicants will be evaluated based on cumulative scoring. When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- Being responsive/compliant/acceptable; and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation where technical criteria weighs 70% and Financial criteria/Proposal weighs 30%.

**Technical Criteria Total 70% (700 points):**

- Relevant background in terms of educational and professional experience per the TORs; (20%)
- Experience in evaluation (15%)
- Experience of working with the UN development system and knowledge of UN reform; (10%)
- Demonstrated understanding of the thematic content of this assignment including human rights; (10%)
- Interview scoring (15%)
Having reviewed applications received, UNDP will invite the top three/four shortlisted candidates for interview. Please note that only shortlisted candidates will be contacted. Candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% (490 points) of the maximum obtainable points for the technical criteria (70 points) shall be considered for the financial evaluation.

- Technical Criteria weight overall: 70%;
- Financial Criteria weight overall: 30%.

**Financial Evaluation: Total 30% (300 points)**

The following formula will be used to evaluate financial proposal:

\[ p = y \left( \frac{\mu}{z} \right) \]

Where:
- \( p \) = points for the financial proposal being evaluated
- \( y \) = maximum number of points for the financial proposal
- \( \mu \) = price of the lowest priced proposal
- \( z \) = price of the proposal being evaluated

**12. CONTRACT AWARD**

Candidate obtaining the highest combined scores in the combined score of Technical and Financial evaluation will be considered technically qualified and will be offered to enter into contract with UNDP.

**13. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT**

The Consultants will report to the Human Rights Policy Specialist at the MPTF office.

**14. PAYMENT SCHEDULE**

Payments will be made following certification by the Technical Secretariat of the satisfactory delivery of the outputs as per the following terms:

- 20% upon satisfactory delivery of an Inception Report;
- 20% upon delivery of a satisfactory draft evaluation report;
- Remaining 60% will be payable upon satisfactory delivery of the final report

**Annexes (click on the hyperlink to access the documents):**

- **Annex 1:** [UNDP P-11 Form for ICs](#)
- **Annex 2:** [IC Contract Template](#)
- **Annex 3:** [C General Terms and Conditions](#)
- **Annex 4:** [RLA Template](#)
- **Annex 5:** [Individual Consultant General Terms & Conditions](#)

Any request for clarification must be sent by email to [procurement.mptfo@undp.org](mailto:procurement.mptfo@undp.org)
The MPTF office will respond by email and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all applicants.
Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix

UNSDG HRM MDTF 2011-2019

Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION CRITERION: RELEVANCE AND COHERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An assessment of the extent to which the intervention’s design and objectives respond to the needs of beneficiaries (including rights holders and duty bearers) and are coherent across the global, regional and country levels, within changing contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Evaluation Sub-Question(s)</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Data Collection Methods and Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. To what extent has the Fund responded to the needs and priorities of beneficiaries, including rights holders and duty-bearers? | • What are the needs of rights holders (i.e. women and men rights holders who demand the protection of their HR), and to what extent does the Fund address these needs?  
• What are the needs of Duty Bearing Member Governments who are promoting national HR protection systems, and to what extent does the Fund address these needs?  
• What are the needs of Duty Bearing UN staff at the country level (particularly RCs and UNCTs) to promote and mainstream HR, and to what extent does the Fund address these needs?  
• What are the needs of the organisational members of the UNSDG to promote and mainstream HR, and to | • Extent to which the Fund’s activities align with the needs of rights holders, member governments, UN staff at the country level, and organisational members of the UNSDG identified through documentation and self-reported needs. | • Document Review  
• KII and FGDs with the organisational members of the UNSDG, RCs and UNCTs, and national stakeholders.  
• Case Studies  
• Online Surveys with RCs and HRAs |
**2. To what extent is the Fund’s change logic (including activities, outputs and outcomes) aligned with the achievement of its goal to institutionalize the mainstreaming of human rights into UN operational activities for development so as to have a transformational impact on human rights at the country level?**

- To what extent are Fund’s activities, outputs, and outcomes logically aligned to achieve the Fund’s overall goal?
- Are there any gaps or untapped opportunities that the Fund could explore to better achieve its overall goal?

**Degree of alignment between the Fund’s activities, outputs, outcomes, and goal in the reconstructed Theory of Change.**

- Missing elements in the reconstructed Theory of Change.

**Document Review**
- KIIs with members of the Fund’s Steering Committee, UN Agency Focal Points, current and former members of the Secretariat, and members of the inter-agency mechanism.
- KIIs and FGDs with the organisational members of the UNSDG, RCs and UNCTs, and national stakeholders.
- Case Studies

---

**EVALUATION CRITERION: EFFECTIVENESS**

An assessment of the extent to which the Fund has achieved or is expected to achieve its planned results and objective, including any differential results across vulnerable groups.

**3. To what extent have the Fund’s activities contributed towards the achievement of outputs and outcomes, as outlined in the reconstructed ToC, taking into consideration any differences between female and male rights holders/duty bearers and other vulnerable groups?**

- To what extent have the Fund’s outputs been achieved?
- To what extent have the Fund’s outcomes been achieved?
- To what extent have results been achieved for female and male rights holders/duty bearers and other vulnerable groups?

**Outcome 1 (and its outputs):**

- Degree of strengthened inter-agency collaboration to promote and mainstream HR at the country, regional, and HQ levels.

**Outcome 2 (and its outputs):**

- Degree of HR mainstreaming throughout country-level programming, including joint HRB analyses, programming, and implementation by the UNCTs.

**Document Review**
- KIIs and FGDs with members of the Fund’s Steering Committee, UN Agency Focal Points, current and former members of the Secretariat, and members of the inter-agency mechanism.
- KIIs and FGDs with the organisational members of the UNSDG, RCs and UNCTs, and national stakeholders.
any other vulnerable groups?

| Outcome 3 (and its outputs): | • Degree to which the Fund’s strengthening of a coordinated UN HR response supports the strengthening of national HR protection systems. |
| | Outcome 4 (and its outputs): |
| | • Degree of improved policy coherence that mainstreams HR across global, regional and country levels. |
| Gender Equality and Equity | • Differences in results among women, men, and vulnerable groups. |

4. To what extent has the Fund contributed towards the objectives and priorities of the UNSDG (as formulated by the relevant UNSDG inter-agency human rights mainstreaming coordination mechanism operating at the time) and of the UNDS reform?

| • To what extent has the Fund’s activities and results contributed towards the objectives of the UNSDG inter-agency HRM mechanisms (as outlined in their ToRs) over time? |
| • To what extent has the Fund’s activities and results supported the UNDS reform? |
| • Contributions by the Fund towards the objectives of the UNSDG inter-agency HRM mechanisms over time. |
| • Contributions by the Fund towards results supported by the UNDS reform. |

5. Taking into account the inter-dependent nature of the Fund with the

| • To what extent have UN organisations engaged in the Fund’s activities? |
| • Degree of engagement and participation of UN organisations in the Fund (i.e. through Steering |

| • Document Review |
| • KIIIs and FGDs with members of the Fund’s Steering Committee, UN Agency Focal Points, current and former members of the Secretariat, and members of the inter-agency mechanism. |
| • KIIIs and FGDs with the organisational members of the UNSDG, RCs, and UNCTs. |
| • Case Studies |
| • Online Surveys with RCs and HRAs |
broader UNDG/UNSDG system, and its Secretariat in DOCO/DCO, to what extent has the UNDG/UNSDG system and participating UN organisations and other UNSDG entities supported and facilitated the work and impact of the Fund?

- To what extent have UN organisations demonstrated ownership of the Fund (through actions or financial contributions)?
- How have the Fund’s governance and management structures and processes facilitated and/or hindered engagement and ownership of UN organisations towards the Fund?
- To what extent have UNSDG entities demonstrated an understanding of the importance of HR mainstreaming and a willingness to further mainstream HR throughout their work?
- How have structural changes within the UNSDG and the UN at large (i.e. through the UN Reform) influenced the effectiveness of the Fund?

Committee meetings, RMC meetings, proposal submissions, etc.)
- Examples of ownership of the fund by UN organisations (including in-kind and financial contributions)
- Degree of understanding of HR mainstreaming and willingness to mainstream HR throughout the work of UNSDG entities.
- Impact of structural changes within the UNSDG on the Fund’s governance structure, management and implementation processes, strategic positioning, and financial capacities.

Committee, UN Agency Focal Points, current and former members of the Secretariat, and members of the inter-agency mechanism.
- KIIs and FGDs with the organisational members of the UNSDG, RCs, and UNCTs.
- Case Studies
- Online Surveys with RCs and HRAs

6. To what extent have there been synergies and inter-linkages between the interventions of the Fund and the policies and activities of the UNSDG at HQ, regional and country levels, and how have these contributed to results? How does the work complement other structures and mechanisms of the broader UN system?

- To what degree have there been synergies between the interventions of the Fund and the policies and activities of the UNSDG to promote and mainstream HR within the UNDS?
- To what extent has the Fund supported linkages between efforts to mainstream HR at the global, regional, and country levels?
- To what extent has the Fund supported and/or complemented other structures and mechanisms of the broader UN system?

Examples of synergies between the interventions of the Fund and the policies and activities of the UNSDG to promote and mainstream HR within the UNDS.
- Examples of coherence policies, effective communication channels and flows of information, etc. between global, regional, and country levels.
- Examples of mutually reinforcing approaches that support linkages between the global, regional, and country levels.
- Examples of synergies between the Fund’s work and other structures

- Document Review
- KIIs and FGDs with members of the Fund’s Steering Committee, UN Agency Focal Points, current and former members of the Secretariat, and members of the inter-agency mechanism.
- KIIs and FGDs with the organisational members of the UNSDG, RCs, and UNCTs.
- Case Studies
- Online Surveys with RCs and HRAs
7. What are the key factors contributing to the achievement and/or non-achievement of results?

- What are the key factors that have contributed to the achievement of results at the global, regional, and country levels?
- What are the key factors that have contributed to the non-achievement of results at the global, regional, and country levels?

8. What unexpected results (if any) has the Fund achieved?

- Has the Fund created any positive or negative results that were unplanned for in within its change logic?
- Instances of unplanned results

**EVALUATION CRITERION: EFFICIENCY**

- Structural, financial, and implementation factors.
- Document Review
- KII and FGDs with members of the Fund’s Steering Committee, UN Agency Focal Points, current and former members of the Secretariat, and members of the inter-agency mechanism.
- KII and FGDs with the organisational members of the UNSDG, RCs, and UNCTs.
- Case Studies
- Online Surveys with RCs and HRAs

- Instances of unplanned results
- Document Review
- KII and FGDs with members of the Fund’s Steering Committee, UN Agency Focal Points, current and former members of the Secretariat, and members of the inter-agency mechanism.
- KII and FGDs with the organisational members of the UNSDG, RCs, and UNCTs.
- Case Studies
- Online Surveys with RCs and HRAs

**An assessment of the extent to which the Fund delivers results in an economic and timely way, using efficient governance, management and implementation structures.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. To what extent has the operationalization of the Fund facilitated the effective and efficient delivery of results?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Are decision-making mechanisms resource-efficient?  
- Do the Fund’s implementation mechanisms promote the efficient use of resources?  
- What factors have affected the timeliness of activities?  
- How have any delays affected the achievement of results? |
| Level of resource investment required for decision-making mechanisms in comparison with other similar UN mechanisms  
- Examples of efficient structures and processes within the Fund’s implementation mechanisms.  
- Factors facilitating or hindering timeliness  
- Impact of delays on the achievement of results |
| - Document Review  
- KIIIs and FGDs with members of the Fund’s Steering Committee, UN Agency Focal Points, current and former members of the Secretariat, and members of the inter-agency mechanism.  
- KIIIs and FGDs with the organisational members of the UNSDG, RCs, and UNCTs.  
- Case Studies  
- Online Surveys with RCs and HRAs |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Taking into account the changes in the external environment (UNDG/UNSDG structures, country level reforms, and availability of funding), how effective and efficient have the management and governance processes of the Fund been in enabling it to deliver on its objectives, including the strategic utilization of resources?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - How have external changes in the environment (UNDG/UNSDG structures, country level reforms, and availability of funding) influenced the Fund’s governance structure and management processes?  
- To what extent has the governance structure facilitated the effective and efficient delivery of the Fund’s results?  
- To what extent has the governance structure supported the strategic utilization of resources?  
- To what extent have the management processes facilitated the effective and efficient delivery of the Fund’s results?  
- To what extent are the current Fund’s governance structure and management processes as a result of external changes in the environment.  
- Relationship between the governance structure and the effective and efficient delivery of results and the strategic utilization of resources.  
- Relationship between the management processes and the effective and efficient delivery of results.  
- Degree to which the current governance structure and management processes support HR |
| - Document Review  
- KIIIs and FGDs with members of the Fund’s Steering Committee, UN Agency Focal Points, current and former members of the Secretariat, and members of the inter-agency mechanism.  
- KIIIs and FGDs with the organisational members of the UNSDG, RCs, and UNCTs. |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11. How has the governance structure of the Fund ensured transparency and accountability towards donors and where could there be room for improvement? | - What elements of the Fund’s structure and processes facilitate transparency and accountability towards donors?  
- What elements of the Fund’s structure and processes hinder transparency and accountability towards donors?  
- How have structures and processes that facilitate and/or hinder transparency and accountability towards donors changed or evolved over time and what effect has this had on transparency and accountability towards donors?  
- In what ways could transparency and accountability towards donors be improved? | - Extent to which the Fund’s structure and processes have facilitated transparency and accountability towards donors throughout the evolution of the Fund’s existence.  
- Instances of weak transparency and accountability towards donors.  
- Comparison between the Fund’s structure and processes and those of other similar UN multi-partner trust funds such as the Joint SDG Fund, Spotlight, etc.. |
| EVALUATION CRITERION: IMPACT                                               |                                                                                              |                                                                                         |
| An assessment of the extent to which results are likely to contribute towards the Fund’s goal and have a lasting impact on the lives of rights holders. |                                                                                              |                                                                                         |
| 12. What is the added value of the Fund for donors, member entities, and RCs and UNCTs to HR mainstreaming within the current context of the UN system? | - What added value (i.e. what has been achieved with the support of the Fund as opposed to without it) does the Fund provide to donors who are interested in supporting the mainstreaming of HR within the current UN system (including within the context of the UN Reform)?  
- What added value does the Fund provide to member entities that are interested in supporting the | - HR results derived from the Fund that are in addition to those generated by other UN HR initiatives, from the perspectives of donors, member entities, and RCs and UNCTs. |
|                                                                          |                                                                                              |                                                                                         |
|                                                                          |                                                                                              | Document Review  
- KII and FGDs with members of the Fund’s Steering Committee, UN Agency Focal Points, current, former members of the Secretariat, donors, and members of the inter-agency mechanism. |
| 13. Is the current structure, positioning, and relationship of the Fund within the UNSDG and relevant working mechanisms as well as engagement with partners and other UN structures appropriate for maximum impact in the context of the UNDS reform, the Decade of Action and the potential for increased resources of the Fund? | • How appropriate is the current structure of the Fund for maximum impact in the context of the UNDS reform, the Decade of Action and the potential for increased resources of the Fund?  
• How appropriate is the current strategic positioning of the Fund for maximum impact in the context of the UNDS reform, the Decade of Action and the potential for increased resources of the Fund?  
• How appropriate is the relationship between the Fund and the UNSDG, including relevant working mechanisms, for maximum impact in the context of the UNDS reform, the Decade of Action and the potential for increased resources of the Fund?  
• How appropriate is the Fund’s engagement with partners and other UN structures for maximum impact in the context of the UNDS reform, the Decade of Action and the potential for increased resources of the Fund? | • Extent to which the structure of the Fund, its current strategic positioning, its relationship with the UNSDG and relevant working mechanisms, and its engagement with partners and other UN structures facilitate maximum impact in the context of the UNDS reform, the Decade of Action and the potential for increased resources of the Fund. | • KII and FGDs with the organisational members of the UNSDG, RCs, and UNCTs.  
• Case Studies  
• Online Surveys with RCs and HRAs  
• Document Review  
• KII and FGDs with members of the Fund’s Steering Committee, UN Agency Focal Points, current and former members of the Secretariat, and members of the inter-agency mechanism.  
• KII and FGDs with the organisational members of the UNSDG, RCs, and UNCTs.  
• Case Studies  
• Online Surveys with RCs and HRAs |
14. Taking into account the decision by Member States on UNDS reform and new priorities such as the Secretary-General’s Call to Action on Human Rights\(^1\), are there other areas/opportunities for supporting mainstreaming of human rights in the UN development system that the Fund should consider addressing?

| To what extent are the Fund’s strategic placement, partner engagement, and activities supportive of human rights mainstreaming within the UNDS reform and its new priorities? | Degree of alignment between the Fund’s strategic placement, partner engagement, and activities and of the UNDS reform and its new priorities with respect to human rights mainstreaming. |
| Are there any relevant areas with respect to human rights mainstreaming of the UNDS reform and new priorities that the Fund is currently not supporting or only partially supporting that could be addressed by the Fund? | Gaps in the Fund’s activities or priority areas with regards to full alignment with the UNDS reform and its new priorities with respect to human rights mainstreaming. |

**EVALUATION CRITERION: SUSTAINABILITY**

An assessment of the extent to which the Fund’s results are likely to be sustainable and the degree of sustainability of the Fund itself.

15. Where are the opportunities for the sustainability of the Fund and its results to be strengthened within the context of UN Reform?

| To what extent have the Fund’s results been sustainable? | Extent to which the Fund’s results demonstrate elements of sustainability. |
| What have been the primary challenges facing the sustainability of the Fund’s results? | Gaps in the Fund’s logic model with respect to sustainability |
| Where are the opportunities for the Fund to further promote sustainable change? | Degree of sustainability of the Fund’s strategic positioning, structure and processes, and financial viability. |
| In what ways could the sustainability of the Fund itself be strengthened to ensure continued support for HR mainstreaming within the context of the UN Reform? | Document Review |

16. What are the key elements that should be included to promote the sustainability of the Fund and its results in the Fund’s upcoming Multi-Year Results Framework?

• What elements should be included in the Fund’s upcoming Multi-Year Results Framework to promote the sustainability of the Fund’s results?
• What elements should be included in the Fund’s upcoming Multi-Year Results Framework to promote the sustainability of the Fund itself?

• Identification of key elements to promote sustainability in the Fund’s future work (both the sustainability of results and of the Fund itself).

• Online Surveys with RCs and HRAs
• Document Review
• KIIs and FGDs with members of the Fund’s Steering Committee, UN Agency Focal Points, current and former members of the Secretariat, and members of the inter-agency mechanism.
• KIIs and FGDs with the organisational members of the UNSDG, RCs, and UNCTs.
• Case Studies
• Online Surveys with RCs and HRAs
Key Evaluation Questions from the Evaluation ToRs

The following presents the original evaluation questions that were included in the Evaluation Terms of Reference and identifies where these questions have been placed within the Evaluation Matrix.

Relevance and Coherence

- To what extent have the initiatives supported by the Fund been consistent with the main objectives and the four primary components of the Fund? (Question 2)

Effectiveness

- To what extent have the different types of activities supported by the Fund contributed to progress towards the objectives and primary components of the Fund? (Question 3)
- To what extent has the Fund contributed towards the objectives and priorities of the UNSDG (as formulated by the relevant UNSDG inter-agency human rights mainstreaming coordination mechanism operating at the time) and of the UNDS reform? (Question 4)
- To what extent has the Fund facilitated closer collaboration and more joined-up work by UN agencies at the country, regional and HQ levels? (Indicator under Question 5)
- Taking into account the inter-dependent nature of the Fund with the broader UNDG/UNSDG system, and its Secretariat in DOCO/DCO, to what extent has the UNDG/UNSDG system supported and facilitated the work and impact of the Fund? To what extent have the participating UN organisations and other UNSDG entities supported the work and impact of the Fund? (Question 5)
- Does the operationalization of Fund activities promote policy coherence on integrating human rights in development across the UNSDG the HQ, regional and country levels? (Question 6)
- Does the operationalization of the Fund activities enhance joint human rights-based analyses, programming and implementation by the UN Country Teams (Indicator under Question 3)
- To what extent have there been there synergies and interlinkages between the interventions of the Fund and the policies and activities of the UNSDG at HQ, regional and country levels, and how have these contributed to results? How does the work complement other structures and mechanisms of the broader UN system? (Question 6).

Efficiency

- Taking into account the changes in the external environment (UNDG/UNSDG and funding available), how effective and efficient have the governance processes of the Fund been in enabling the Fund to deliver on its objectives, including strategic utilization of resources? (Question 10)
• Is the current governance of the Fund suitable for effective and efficient operations in the current UNSDG context? (Sub-Question under Question 10)
• How has the governance structure ensured transparency and accountability towards donors and what is the room for improvement? (Question 11)
• Taking into account the changes in the external environment (UNDG/UNSDG, country level reforms and funding available) how effective and efficient have the management processes of the Fund been in enabling the Fund to plan and deliver on its objectives? (Question 10)
• Is the operationalization of the Fund effective and efficient? (Question 9)

Impact (potential for Impact)

• What is the added value of the Fund for donors, the member entities and the UN Country Teams in the current environment? (Question 12)

• Is the current Fund structure, position/relationship within the UNSDG and relevant working mechanisms, and engagement with partners and other UN structures appropriate for maximum impact in the context of the UNDS reform, the Decade of Action and the potential for increased resources of the Fund? (Question 13)
• Taking into account the decision by Member States on UNDS reform and new priorities such as the Secretary-General’s Call to Action on Human Rights\(^2\), are there other areas/opportunities for supporting mainstreaming of human rights in the UN development system that the Fund should consider addressing? (Question 14)

Sustainability

• What are the key elements that should be included in the multi-year results framework? (Question 16)

---

## Annex 3: Stakeholder Mapping Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Participation and Role in the</th>
<th>Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</th>
<th>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</th>
<th>Role in the Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNSDG (Former UNDG)</td>
<td>Senior Leadership</td>
<td>HRM priorities should be aligned with the overall UNSDG strategic priorities.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSDG Mechanisms</td>
<td>Implementation Partner</td>
<td>Fund should align and coordinate work with UNSDG human rights inter-agency coordination mechanisms, which have the primary role in relation to the Fund. From inception until February 2019 the UNDG human rights coordination mechanism served as the Steering Committee of the Fund. When the HRWG was the UNG HR Mainstreaming Mechanism, it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Participation and Role in the Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</td>
<td>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</td>
<td>Role in the Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional UNDG Teams</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinated and established strategic linkages and partnerships with other UNSDG working groups and processes, in particular the Programme and Funding Working Group, Leadership Working Group, Communicating as One Working Group, UN Working Group on Transitions, and Post 2015/SDG Working Group, as well as other interagency mechanisms and networks, such as Human Rights up Front. The current UNSDG mechanism is the LNOB Task Team. Regional UNDG Teams had an active role in implementation of regional HRAs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Participation and Role in the Fund</td>
<td>Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</td>
<td>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</td>
<td>Role in the Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCs</td>
<td>Country-Level</td>
<td>RCs receive support for leadership development, provide ongoing oversight to the programmes at the national level to ensure that Participating UN Organizations are meeting their obligations; are entrusted with supporting the overall programme design, ongoing programmatic oversight of the UNDG-HRM activities and UN coordination; and facilitate M&amp;E at the CO level.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRAs</td>
<td>Implementation Partners</td>
<td>Deployed and funded through the Fund to provide technical support to RCs, UNCTs and UNDG Regional Teams.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Participation and Role in the Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</td>
<td>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</td>
<td>Role in the Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Stakeholders (NHRIs, Governments, HR bodies, CSOs, etc)</td>
<td>National/country-Level Duty Bearers</td>
<td>Receive support from HRAs and UN on human rights in development, e.g. to strengthen national human rights protection systems.</td>
<td>Evaluation results to improve the HR support received from the Fund</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDCO (Former DOCO)</td>
<td>UN Duty-Bearer, HRM MDTF Secretariat, Steering Committee Observer (2020)</td>
<td>Has two specific roles: 1) Host of the HRM MDTF Secretariat, with other agencies leading on specific components/tasks. Secretariat provides advice on UNSDG policies and guidelines, and ensures institutional linkages with other UNSDG Working Groups. As such, DCO is responsible for coordination of support to and communication with RCs and UNCTs and Regional UNSDG</td>
<td>Seeing that UNDCO, as the Secretariat of the UNSDG and has a role in managing the RC System - the evaluation results will serve to strengthen the support on HR mainstreaming to the RC System as its main beneficiary. Evaluation results could further improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization. Evaluation results will be used towards supporting the Fund further and contributing to strategic planning and direction.</td>
<td>Evaluation Reference Group Member; Participant; evaluation management; validation of results and formulation of lessons learnt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Participation and Role in the Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</td>
<td>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</td>
<td>Role in the Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP MPTFO</td>
<td>Implementation Partner; Ex-Officio member of the Steering Committee</td>
<td>Administrates the funds on behalf of the UNDG-HRM MDTF. Administrative host of the Secretariat since 2019.</td>
<td>Will use the results for planning and coordinating.</td>
<td>Evaluation Reference Group Member, Participant; validation of results and formulation of lessons learnt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Steering Committee Member; Participating UN Organization</td>
<td>Provides substantive support as lead (Chair) of the Steering Committee, leadership role in the MDTF set-up, Co-Chair of UNSDG human rights coordination mechanisms,</td>
<td>Evaluation results to be used for supporting the Fund further and contributing to strategic planning and direction. Evaluation results to improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization</td>
<td>Evaluation Reference Group Member, Participant; validation of results and formulation of lessons learnt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Participation and Role in the Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</td>
<td>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</td>
<td>Role in the Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Steering Committee Member; Participating UN Organization</td>
<td>including the Task Team on LNOB, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Steering Committee Member; Participating UN Organization</td>
<td>Steering Committee member, co-chair (2010), leading in MDTF set-up (Administration of the UNSDG HRM-MDTF is entrusted to the UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office) - 2019, SDG Policy Support Task team, Transitions &amp; Peacebuilding Task team, COVID-19 Socioeconomic Framework Implementation (2020); UNSDG SDG Implementation Strategic Results Group (SRG1) - Task Team 2: Leaving No One</td>
<td>Evaluation results to be used for supporting the Fund further and contributing to strategic planning and direction. Evaluation results to improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Steering Committee Member; Participating UN Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation Reference Group Member, Participant; validation of results and formulation of lessons learnt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Participation and Role in the Stakeholder</td>
<td>Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</td>
<td>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</td>
<td>Role in the Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer; Steering Committee Member; Participating UN Organization</td>
<td>Behind, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda</td>
<td>2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020</td>
<td>Evaluation results can be used for supporting the Fund further and contributing to strategic planning and direction. Evaluation results could improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization</td>
<td>Participant; validation of results and formulation of lessons learnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer; Steering Committee Member; Participating UN Organization</td>
<td>Steering Committee member, co-chair (2013), UNDG SDG Implementation Strategic Results Group (SRG1) - Task Team 2: Leaving No One Behind, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda</td>
<td>2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020</td>
<td>Evaluation results can be used for supporting the Fund further and contributing to strategic planning and direction. Evaluation results could improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization</td>
<td>Participant; validation of results and formulation of lessons learnt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholder Category
- Participation and Role in the Years of Active Engagement in the Fund
- Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results
- Role in the Evaluation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Participation and Role in the Stakeholder</th>
<th>Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</th>
<th>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</th>
<th>Role in the Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Steering Committee Member; Participating UN Organisation</td>
<td>Strategic Results Group (SRG1) - Task Team 2: Leaving No One Behind, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda, Transitions &amp; Peacebuilding Task team (2019-2020), Gender Equality &amp; Empowerment of Women task team (2020)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>Past Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **UNFPA**
  - UN Duty Bearer, Steering Committee Member; Participating UN Organisation
  - Strategic Results Group (SRG1) - Task Team 2: Leaving No One Behind, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda, Transitions & Peacebuilding Task team (2019-2020), Gender Equality & Empowerment of Women task team (2020)
  - Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results: Direction. Evaluation results could improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization
  - Role in the Evaluation: Steering Committee member, UNSDG SDG Implementation Strategic Results Group (SRG1) - Task Team 2: Leaving No One Behind, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda, Equality & Empowerment of Women task team (2020)

- **FAO**
  - UN Duty Bearer, Partner
  - Past Steering Committee
  - Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results: Evaluation results can be used for supporting the Fund further and contributing to strategic planning and direction
  - Role in the Evaluation: Participant;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Participation and Role in the Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</th>
<th>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</th>
<th>Role in the Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>Past Steering Committee member, UNDG- Human Rights Working Group</td>
<td>Evaluation results can be used for supporting the Fund further and improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization</td>
<td>Potential Participant;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner; Steering Committee member; Participating UN Organization</td>
<td>Past Steering Committee member (co-chair 2017), Team on LNOB, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda (co-chair - 2018-2020)</td>
<td>Evaluation results can be used for supporting the Fund further and improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization</td>
<td>Evaluation Reference Group Member, Participant; validation of results and formulation of lessons learnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner, former Participating UN Organization</td>
<td>Past Steering Committee member, UNSDG SDG Implementation Strategic Results</td>
<td>Evaluation results can be used for supporting the Fund further and improve HR mainstreaming</td>
<td>Potential Participant;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Participation and Role in the Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</td>
<td>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</td>
<td>Role in the Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>Group (SRG1) - Task Team 2: Leaving No One Behind, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda, SDG Policy Support Task team (2019-2020), Programming Task team (2020)</td>
<td>Evaluation results can be used for supporting the Fund further and improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization</td>
<td>Participant;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner, former Participating UN Organization</td>
<td>Past Steering Committee member, Task Team on LNOB, Human Rights and the</td>
<td>Evaluation results can be used for supporting the Fund further and improve HR mainstreaming</td>
<td>Potential Participant;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Participation and Role in the Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</td>
<td>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</td>
<td>Role in the Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDESA</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>Normative Agenda (co-chair 2018 - 2020)</td>
<td>processes within the organization</td>
<td>Potential Participant;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSSC</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner, former Participating UN Organization</td>
<td>Past Steering Committee member, Data &amp; Reporting TASK TEAM (2019-2020), UNSDG SDG Implementation Strategic Results Group (SRG1) - Task Team 2: Leaving No One Behind, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda</td>
<td>Evaluation results can be used for supporting the Fund further and improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization</td>
<td>Potential participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>Past Steering Committee member, UNSDG SDG Implementation Strategic Results Group (SRG1) - Task Team 2:</td>
<td>Evaluation results can be used for supporting the Fund further and improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization</td>
<td>Potential participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Participation and Role in the</td>
<td>Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</td>
<td>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>Past Steering Committee member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>Past Steering Committee member, UNSDG SDG Implementation Strategic Results Group (SRG1) - Task Team 2: Leaving No One Behind, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>UNSDG SDG Implementation Strategic Results Group (SRG1) - Task Team 2: Leaving No One Behind, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Habitat</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>UNSDG SDG Implementation Strategic Results Group (SRG1) - Task Team 2: Leaving No One Behind, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation results can be used for supporting the Fund further and improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization.
Potential participant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Participation and Role in the</th>
<th>Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</th>
<th>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</th>
<th>Role in the Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Participation and Role in the Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</td>
<td>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</td>
<td>Role in the Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>Leaving No One Behind, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda</td>
<td>processes within the organization</td>
<td>Potential participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>UNSDG SDG Implementation Strategic Results Group (SRG1) - Task Team 2: Leaving No One Behind, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda</td>
<td>Evaluation results may improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization</td>
<td>Potential participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>UNSDG SDG Implementation Strategic Results Group (SRG1); Task Team 2: Leaving No One Behind, Human Rights and the</td>
<td>Evaluation results may improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization</td>
<td>Potential participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Participation and Role in the Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</td>
<td>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</td>
<td>Role in the Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCWA</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>Normative Agenda, UNSDG SDG Implementation Strategic Results Group (SRG1) - Task Team 2: Leaving No One Behind, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda</td>
<td>Evaluation results may improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization</td>
<td>Potential participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECLAC</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>Data &amp; Reporting Task team (2019-2020)</td>
<td>Evaluation results may improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization</td>
<td>Potential participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBSO</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>Transitions &amp; Peacebuilding Task team (2019-2020)</td>
<td>Evaluation results may improve HR mainstreaming processes within the organization</td>
<td>Potential participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Duty Bearer, Donor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation results can be used for planning and future funding decision-making</td>
<td>Potential participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Duty Bearer, Donor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation results can be used for planning and future funding decision-making</td>
<td>Potential participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Participation and Role in the Evaluation</td>
<td>Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</td>
<td>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</td>
<td>Role in the Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of UN Peace Operations</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearer, Partner</td>
<td>Support on developing partnerships on national level with CSOs</td>
<td>2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020</td>
<td>Evaluation results may improve HR mainstreaming processes and potential collaboration</td>
<td>Potential participant (if relevant to country cases studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Staff</td>
<td>UN Duty Bearers</td>
<td>Implement the HRBA approach, receive human rights training and use the</td>
<td>2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020</td>
<td>Evaluation results may improve HR mainstreaming processes and capacity building</td>
<td>Potential participants as part of other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Participation and Role in the</td>
<td>Years of Active Engagement in the Fund</td>
<td>Primary Interest in the Evaluation Results</td>
<td>Role in the Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>online</td>
<td>tools/trainings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annex 4: Theory of Change**

**GOAL:**
Institutionalize the mainstreaming of human rights into UN operational activities for development so as to have a transformational impact on human rights at the country level.

---

**Outcome 1:** Strengthened inter-agency collaboration that promotes a coordinated and coherent UN system-wide approach towards the integration of human rights principles and international standards into UN operational activities for development

**Output 1.1:** Policy guidance and practical tools facilitate UNCTs to integrate human rights principles and standards, and mechanisms into UN development programmes

**Output 1.2:** The system-wide HRBA knowledge management system is strengthened

**Output 1.3:** UN System-wide capacity building and learning approaches incorporate the Improved and coordinated HRBA principles

**ACTIVITIES INCLUDE:**
- Development and dissemination of policy guidance and practical tools
- Supporting and enhancing UN system-wide knowledge management systems and tools (e.g. HURITALK and HRBA Portal)
- Provision of continued support to the UNDAF/cooperation frameworks rollouts and “Delivering as One” pilots on HRBA
- Provision of HRAs to support UNCTs in integrating HR into UN common programming processes

---

**Outcome 2:** Resident Coordinators and UN Country Teams effectively mainstream human rights throughout country-level programming

**Output 2.1:** RCs and UNCTs utilize updated guidance to guide human rights mainstreaming throughout country-level programming

**Output 2.2:** RCs and UNCTs leadership have access to learning opportunities on how to mainstream human rights

**Output 2.3:** RCs and UNCTs benefit from dedicated advisory services on human rights through Human Rights Advisors

---

**Outcome 3:** A coherent UN system-wide approach, through cooperation and collaboration among UN agencies, provides a coordinated UN response to national priorities and supports strengthened national human rights protection systems at the request of member governments

**Output 3.1:** UNCTs have the technical capacities to support national human rights bodies and other national stakeholders to improve the abilities of national human rights bodies and systems to protect and promote human rights

**Output 3.2:** National dialogue and awareness of the centrality of human rights in development, and the unique role of the UN in this regard is promoted

---

**Outcome 4:** Improved policy coherence that contributes to the integration of human rights issues in the overall UNSDG advocacy and development agenda and global issues

**Output 4.1:** Advocacy tools highlight human rights dimensions of global development priorities and issues, such as the SDGs and other internationally agreed development goals, and contribute to overall UNSDG advocacy on the global development agenda and policy support to national priorities

**Output 4.2:** Policies are developed to address strategic human rights issues that are of relevance to UN operational activities for development

**ACTIVITIES INCLUDE:**
- Building national capacity to effectively interact with and/or follow-up on key recommendations of international HR mechanisms
- Supporting the establishment of national protection systems
- Development of a UN system-wide inventory of resources, tools, and expertise available to support national HR capacity building (also linked to the knowledge management system under Outcome 1)
- Provision of technical advice and support to the UNCT coordination mechanisms (e.g. theme group on HR) (also contributing towards Output 2.3)
- Increased systematic engagement with the international HR machinery, through the provision of user-friendly guidelines, updates on their work
- Promoting HR in national development dialogues for the SDGs and poverty reduction

---

**ACTIVITIES INCLUDE:**
- Developing key messages on the linkages between HR and development issues
- Conducting research and analysis on strategic HR issues
- Facilitating the collaborative development of policies
- Providing technical expertise to review and update policies
- Supporting the policy forums of the HR inter-agency working groups
Risks:
- Changes in the political climates in member countries (i.e. change in government or priorities) that reduce the political commitment to upholding human rights
- Events that shift the focus away from HR within the UN and among donors (i.e. health crises)
- Over-extension of the Fund, leading to the dilution of its effectiveness and stakeholder confidence in the Fund
- Lack of sustainable multi-year funding
- Significant and unpredictable fluctuations in funding
- Restructuring of the UNDG, UNSDG, interagency coordination mechanisms may shift priorities

Assumptions:
- UN agencies and staff members develop a trusting relationship with the HRAs
- UNCTs and staff understand the need for further human rights mainstreaming, and are willing to implement the mainstreaming of human rights by building their capacities and working together
- National governments are willing and eager to promote human rights at the country level
- The Fund has sufficient operational capacity to influence UN policy, inter-agency collaboration mechanisms, and actors at the country-level
- Inter-agency HR mechanisms are functional
- Capacity building initiatives translate into practice
- The UN Reform facilitates the Fund's work and HR mainstreaming efforts
- The global regional and national-level efforts are closely interlinked

Factors that Hinder Change:
- Reluctance from member governments to uphold HR
- Reductions in funding and resources to mainstream HR throughout the UN system and to respond to HR violations/crisis
- Resistance or disengagement from UN entities and staff to mainstream HR throughout their work
- Overly complex processes result in 'fatigue' among staff resulting in reluctance to incorporate novel processes
- High staff turnover

Factors that Facilitate Change:
- Commitment from member governments to uphold human rights throughout activities and to support governments in strengthening national human rights protection systems
- Available funding and resources to mainstream HR throughout the UN system and to respond to HR violations/crises
- Willingness and engagement from UN entities to mainstream HR throughout their work
- Collaboration between agencies through the Inter-agency HR mechanisms
- Collaboration between agencies through the Steering Committee and UN Focal Points
- UNDS Reform (e.g. RCs focus on the bigger picture)
Implementation Modalities:

- MDTF funding provided towards projects/activities (including through joint programming) implemented by participating UN Organizations
- Deployment of Human Rights Advisors to support RCs and UNCTs
- Secretariat support, including support to the inter-agency HR mechanisms that have existed at different times: Human Rights Mainstreaming Mechanism; HRWG; Results Group on Give Voice to Common Values and Norms; and Task Team on LNOB, Human Rights and the Normative Agenda

Cross-cutting issues:

- Leave No One Behind
- Human Rights Based Approach
- Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment
- Environmental rights
- Youth rights and engagement
- Knowledge management strategy

Footnote: Risks are considered factors that can change abruptly while factors that inhibit change are more systemic in nature.
Annex 5: Country Case Study Selection Criteria

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF COUNTRIES FOR IN-DEPTH CASE STUDIES

Evaluation Terms of Reference:

The evaluation will also include field surveys and more in-depth data collection for case studies in 5-6 countries where the RC/UNCT has benefited from one or more activities supported by the Fund to compliment other data (detailed country selection criteria will be provided to the Consultants by the Technical Secretariat in advance).

Criteria for all countries selected:

- UNCT and RC has engaged directly in at least one initiative supported by the Fund (ie. Human Rights Adviser deployment; Regional HRA support; country projects; or LNOB pilot projects).

Across the 5-6 countries selected:

- At least 4 countries that currently have an HRA and have had an HRA position for at least 2 years, and where both the HRA/s and the supervising RC/s are easily accessible for consultation\(^1\)
  - At least one of those involves a humanitarian context
  - At least one involves a national HRA
  - At least one country with an HRA deployed for at least 4 years
  - HRAs have been primarily supported by the Fund
- 1 country that did not have an in-country HRA but benefited from direct support from a regional HRA, and where the RC and at least 1 member of UNCT that benefited from the engagement are easily accessible for consultation.\(^2\)
- Regional balance (at least 4 regions covered)
- All countries selected are eligible for ODA as per the OECD DAC list for reporting in 2020 (http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/DAC-List-of-ODA-Recipients-for-reporting-2020-flows.pdf)

---

\(^1\) If there has been a change in the RC or HRA, all staff in the posts should be interviewed where possible. Secretariat to advise.

\(^2\) Secretariat to advise.
Annex 6: Interview Guides

KII and FGD Guides

Stakeholder Groups:

1. Steering Committee (KII)
2. UN Agency Focal Points (KII)
3. Current and Former Members of the Secretariat (KII)
4. Members of the UNSDG Human Rights Inter-Agency Mechanisms (FGD)
5. Organisational Members of the UNSDG (KII)
6. RCs (KIIs)
7. UNCTs (KIIs and/or FGDs)
8. National Stakeholders (KIIs and/or FGDs)

* The following discussion guides provide a framework for the KIIs and FGDs and are intended to be used with a certain degree of flexibility so as to allow the interviewer to prioritize some questions over others and to facilitate the inclusion of follow-up questions, if required.
Date of Interview:

Name of Interviewer:

Information on Interviewee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Professional Title</th>
<th>Relationship to the MDTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

- Thank the participant for their time and engagement.
- Provide an explanation of the purpose and objectives of the evaluation and how the information will be used.
- Explain that their participation is voluntary and that they can decide not to participate or end the discussion at any time.
- Inform the participant that all the information provided within the interview will be kept confidential and will only be shared among the evaluation team members. Only aggregate information will be shared as part of the evaluation and will be done in a way where it is not possible to trace the information provided directly to its source.
- Ask the participant if they are comfortable and would like to continue.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

1) Please begin by providing a brief overview of your engagement and experience with the Fund.

2) What are the key contributions that the Fund has made towards mainstreaming Human Rights within the UN development system?
3) Are there other areas/opportunities for supporting mainstreaming of human rights in the UN development system that the Fund is currently not or is only partially focusing on and should consider addressing?

4) What are some of the key challenges that the Fund has faced to mainstream human rights throughout the UN system?

5) How have changes in the UNDS (including shifting priorities and structural changes within the UNSDG) affected the Fund?

6) Is the level of engagement from UN organisations towards the Fund sufficient to facilitate effective human rights mainstreaming? In what ways could the engagement and accountability of UN agencies towards the Fund be strengthened?

7) What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Fund’s governance and management processes? How could they be strengthened to make the Fund more efficient and effective?

8) What is the Fund’s comparative advantage in relation to other development funds or initiatives within the UN? How should the Fund be positioned strategically to benefit from and further strengthen the UN Reform process?

9) What areas of operation or changes in priorities, structure, or strategic positioning should the Fund focus on to improve its impact within the context of the UN Reform?

10) To what extent are the activities of the Fund sustainable? What are some of the key challenges relating to the sustainability of the Fund?

Any other comments or suggestions?

THANK YOU very much for your time and participation. The evaluation should be ready to share with stakeholders in November.
FGD Guide for:

- Members of the UNSDG Human Rights Inter-Agency Mechanisms

Date of Interview:

Name of Interviewer:

Information on Interviewee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Professional Title</th>
<th>Relationship to the MDTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

- Thank the participant for their time and engagement.
- Provide an explanation of the purpose and objectives of the evaluation and how the information will be used.
- Explain that their participation is voluntary and that they can decide not to participate or end the discussion at any time.
- Inform the participant that all the information provided within the interview will be kept confidential and will only be shared among the evaluation team members. Only aggregate information will be shared as part of the evaluation and will be done in a way where it is not possible to trace the information provided directly to its source.
- Ask the participant if they are comfortable and would like to continue.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

1) Please begin by providing a brief overview of your engagement and experience with the Fund.

2) What are the key contributions that the Fund has made towards mainstreaming Human Rights within the UN development system? To what extent has the Fund supported the work of the UNDG human rights inter-agency mechanisms?
3) Are there other areas/opportunities for supporting mainstreaming of human rights in the UN development system that the Fund is currently not or is only partially focusing on and should consider addressing?

4) What are some of the key challenges that the Fund has faced to mainstream human rights throughout the UN system?

5) What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Fund’s governance and management processes? How could they be strengthened to make the Fund more efficient and effective?

6) What is the Fund’s comparative advantage in relation to other development funds or initiatives within the UN? How should the Fund be positioned strategically to benefit from and further strengthen the UN Reform process?

7) What areas of operation or changes in priorities, structure, or strategic positioning should the Fund focus on to improve its impact within the context of the UN Reform?

8) To what extent are the activities of the Fund sustainable? What are some of the key challenges relating to the sustainability of the Fund?

Any other comments or suggestions?

THANK YOU very much for your time and participation. The evaluation should be ready to share with stakeholders in November.
Country Case Studies - KII and FGD Guide for:

- Resident Coordinators (RCs)
- UN Country Teams (UNCTs)

Date of Interview:
Name of Interviewer:

Information on Interviewee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Professional Title</th>
<th>Relationship to the MDTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

- Thank the participant for their time and engagement.
- Provide a brief explanation of the role and primary activities of the Fund.
- Provide an explanation of the purpose and objectives of the evaluation and how the information will be used.
- Explain that their participation is voluntary and that they can decide not to participate or end the discussion at any time.
- Inform the participant that all the information provided within the interview will be kept confidential and will only be shared among the evaluation team members. Only aggregate information will be shared as part of the evaluation and will be done in a way where it is not possible to trace the information provided directly to its source.
- Ask the participant if they are comfortable and would like to continue.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

1) Please begin by providing a brief overview of your engagement and experience with the Fund and/or with human rights mainstreaming in the UN development system.
2) In what ways has the Fund supported human rights mainstreaming at the country level?\(^1\)

3) What kinds of support do Resident Coordinators and UNCTs need to fully promote and mainstream human rights throughout country-level programming? Has the Fund been able to provide this support or are there areas requiring further investment?

4) In what ways have UNSDG human rights mainstreaming guidance and policies developed at the global level been helpful at supporting the mainstreaming of human rights at the country level?\(^2\)

5) In what ways has the Fund supported inter-agency collaboration through the work of the UNCTs to better mainstream human rights at the country-level?

6) To what extent has technical and capacity development support provided by the Fund been useful at mainstreaming human rights at the country level? This could include Human Rights Advisers; RC human rights leadership dialogues; webinars run by the UNSDG human rights coordination mechanisms; and knowledge management platforms (HuriTALK, HRBA Portal, UNSDG Yammer group on LNOB, Human Rights and Gender), among others. Are there any ways in which technical and capacity development support could further strengthen human rights mainstreaming at the country level?

7) In what ways has the Fund’s support to strengthen a coordinated UN human rights response helped to strengthen national human rights protection systems?

8) In what ways could human rights mainstreaming be strengthened at the country level? Are there other areas/opportunities for supporting the mainstreaming of human rights at the country level that the Fund is currently not focusing on and should consider addressing?

9) To what extent are the activities of the Fund sustainable? What are some of the key challenges relating to the sustainability of the Fund?

---

\(^1\) Prompt with examples: Operational Guide on Leaving No One Behind for UN Country Teams, technical and operational advice received (from Human Rights Task Team and Human Rights Advisors) to mainstreaming human rights into the UNDAF, annual letter informing you of the opportunities for engagement with human rights mechanisms sent to RCs, Community of Practice Platform.

\(^2\) For example: RC Guidance Note, web-based guide on Strengthening Engagement with International Human Rights Machinery, Common Learning Package on the Human Rights Based Approach, Mainstreaming Human Rights in the Field – Country Case Studies, Policy and Operational Support for UNCTs on Human Rights in the SDGs; Operational Guide on LNOB for UNCTs (these are Key Outputs of the UNSDG Human Rights Mainstreaming in Evaluation documentation).
10) Within the context of the new UN Reform, including the new role of the Resident Coordinator and the new working arrangements of the UNCTs, what role should the Fund play to best support human rights mainstreaming at the country level? What areas of operation or changes in priorities, structure, or strategic positioning should the Fund focus on to improve its impact at the country level within the context of the UN Reform?

Any other comments or suggestions?

THANK YOU very much for your time and participation. The evaluation should be ready to share with stakeholders in November.
KII and FGD Guide for:

- National Stakeholders (i.e. governments, CSOs, etc.)

**Date of Interview:**

**Name of Interviewer:**

**Information on Interviewee:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Professional Title</th>
<th>Relationship to the MDTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction**

- Thank the participant for their time and engagement.
- Provide a brief explanation of the role and primary activities of the Fund.
- Provide an explanation of the purpose and objectives of the evaluation and how the information will be used.
- Explain that their participation is voluntary and that they can decide not to participate or end the discussion at any time.
- Inform the participant that all the information provided within the interview will be kept confidential and will only be shared among the evaluation team members. Only aggregate information will be shared as part of the evaluation and will be done in a way where it is not possible to trace the information provided directly to its source.
- Ask the participant if they are comfortable and would like to continue.

**DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:**

1) Please begin by providing a brief overview of your engagement and experience with the United Nations with respect to the promotion of human rights.
2) In what ways has the United Nations development system helped to strengthen national human rights protection systems at the country level?

3) What kinds of challenges do you face with respect to strengthening national human rights protection systems? How has the United Nations helped you to address these challenges and what further assistance is necessary?

4) Have you received any support from the United Nations Human Rights Advisors? If so, what kind of support?

5) Has assistance provided by the United Nations development system to strengthen national human rights protection systems resulted in sustainable changes? If so, how? If not, what is missing?

6) Over the past decade, has the UN development system provided more coherent support to national stakeholders to help promote and mainstream human rights at the country level? If so, how?

7) What is the comparative advantage of the United Nations as an entity to provide support to national stakeholders to help promote and mainstream human rights at the country level as opposed to that of other actors?

8) What role should United Nations Resident Coordinators and UN Country Teams play at the country level to promote human rights and strengthen national human rights protection systems?

9) What kinds of additional support do national governments and CSOs need to strengthen national human rights protection systems?

10) In what ways could the United Nations further increase its support to national stakeholders to help strengthen national human rights protection systems?

Any other comments or suggestions?

THANK YOU very much for your time and participation. The evaluation should be ready to share with stakeholders in November.
Annex 7: Survey for Resident Coordinators

Draft

Survey for Resident Coordinators

Email Introduction:

Dear RCs,

Ensuring that human rights remain at the front in our support to countries to achieve the 2030 Agenda is a collective responsibility of the UN Development System. As RCs, leading your UNCT, you have an important leadership role in promoting human rights, gender equality and leaving no one behind. To support you in these efforts, the UNSDG strives to ensure that coherent policies, guidance, and capacity development support initiatives are deployed, enabling UNCT to fully leverage human rights which is an integral part of the 2030 Agenda. For example, through the development of guidance material like the Operational Guide on LNOB for UN country teams; the organization of leadership dialogues and peer-to-peer discussions, and the deployment of Human Rights Advisers where feasible. Many of these initiatives are funded with resources from UNSDG Human Rights Mainstreaming Multi-Donor Trust Fund.

The Fund is currently undergoing an evaluation, which will inform its future direction and strengthen efforts to increase the resources available to you in support of this important function. As RCs and UNCTs are the primary beneficiaries of the UNSDG initiatives supported by the Fund, all RCs are strongly encouraged to participate in the consultation through completing the online questionnaire at the link below. Whether new to the RC system or a more experienced RC; whether you have benefited directly from this fund, or only indirectly; this is your opportunity to reflect on the value and contribution of these initiatives, and identify gaps and priorities for future UNSDG support to RCs and UNCTs in making human rights a defining feature of our development support to countries.

We count on your support. Please make sure you contribute to the consultation through completing the online questionnaire before 18 September 2020.

Thank you,

Robert
Survey Introduction

Dear Resident Coordinators,

The Technical Secretariat of the **UNSDG Human Rights Mainstreaming mechanism Multi-Donor Trust Fund** (HRM-MDTF) hosted by DCO has commissioned an external evaluation of the Fund to evaluate the extent to which the Fund has progressed towards its objectives, identify achievements and shortcomings or bottlenecks, and develop evidence-based recommendations for the next phase of the Fund’s operations. The evaluation covers the timeframe 2011-2019. An external evaluation team was selected to carry out this evaluation under the supervision of the Technical Secretariat.

As key stakeholders in the Fund’s efforts to mainstream human rights at country-level, the evaluation team kindly requests that you share your feedback regarding your experience with the Fund through a short anonymous questionnaire that is being shared with all current RCs. This will likely take no longer than 20 minutes of your time. To access the consultation questionnaire, please click the following link:

[insert link]

Your answers will be automatically submitted directly to the evaluation team and will be treated confidential. No answers will be associated with your name. The questionnaire survey includes some background questions to help the evaluators disaggregate data. We encourage you to provide honest feedback to assist the Fund in strengthening its future programming.

We would greatly appreciate it if you could please complete the questionnaire **by September 18, 2020**.

If you have any questions about the wording of the questionnaire or the completion process, please contact the RC consultation manager and independent evaluation team member: Natalia Voronova at natalia.voronova.nv@gmail.com

We thank you very much for your time and participation!

Evaluation Team
Survey (to be implemented using Google Forms)

The survey is designed for all current RCs. Familiarity or experience with the Fund is not a prerequisite for participation in the survey. Your answers will be automatically submitted directly to the evaluation team and information will not be directly shared with any members of the Fund or DCO. The survey includes some background questions to help the evaluators disaggregate data. Please be assured that the survey is confidential and your answers will not be associated with your name or country office. We encourage you to provide honest feedback to assist the Fund in strengthening its future human rights mainstreaming work.

Section I: Respondent’s Background

This section is designed to help the evaluation team to understand the profile of survey respondents in order to disaggregate survey data. The information will not be used to specifically identify you. Your responses will remain anonymous and confidential.

1. You are presently performing the duties of a RC in the following region
   - Africa
   - Arab States
   - Asia and the Pacific
   - Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States
   - Latin America and Caribbean

2. You identify with the following gender (optional question)
   - Female
   - Male
   - Other

3. Your overall experience in the UNDS is:
   - less than 5 years
   - between 5-10 years
   - between 10-15 years
   - between 15-20 years
   - more than 20 years

4. You have been performing the duties of a RC in your current duty station?
   - less than 1 year
   - 1 – 2 years
   - 2 – 3 years
   - 3 – 4 years
5. Your current assignment as a resident Coordinator is
- your first RC assignment
- not your first assignment (you have been an RC in a different country)

6. Is there a Human Rights Advisor currently working in your country?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unsure

7. [Only answer if the response to Q.6 was “yes”]. If there is a Human Rights Advisor currently working in your country, to what extent have you received support from this Advisor?
   - no support
   - a limited amount of support
   - a great deal of support

8. Do you have experience working with a Human Rights Advisor from a previous duty-station (either as a RC or in a non-RC position)?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unsure

Section II: Mainstreaming human rights at country-level: Sliding Scale Questions

RCs and UNCTs contribute directly to mainstreaming of human rights at country-level and may have some important insights. In the following section, we kindly invite you to share your views around the human rights mainstreaming mechanisms and their performance within your country of operation.

6. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your own awareness of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?
   [scale 1-5; 1- very low, 5-excellent]

7. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the average awareness of the UNCT (in your current country) of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?
   [scale 1-5; 1- very low, 5-excellent]

8. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the importance of promoting and mainstreaming human rights throughout the UN Development System?
9. On a scale of 1-5, to what extent do you feel that it is necessary to strengthen human rights mainstreaming within the UN Development System at the country level?

[1 – no need; 3- it is necessary but there are other more important priorities; 5- human rights mainstreaming should be the focus as top priority]

10. a. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the existing capacities of the current structure of the UNCT in your country to mainstream human rights on country-level?

[scale 1-5; 1- very low, 5-excellent]

10.b. What changes would need to be made to the current UNCT structure to better facilitate human rights mainstreaming?

[text input field]

11. On a scale of 1-5, to what extent to you think that you, as Resident Coordinator, need additional support to mainstream human rights at the country-level?

[scale 1-5; 1-low extent of additional support, 5-high extent of additional support]

12. On a scale of 1-5, to what extent to you think UNCTs need additional support to mainstream human rights at the country-level?

[scale 1-5; 1-low extent of additional support, 5-high extent of additional support]

13. Please select your top three needs, as Resident Coordinator, with respect to better mainstreaming HR throughout your work:

- Leading UNCT programming
- Increasing opportunities for dialogue between UNCT members and government counterparts
- Increasing engagement with international HR mechanisms
- Increasing technical capacities through capacity development/trainings of the UNCT to mainstream HR
- Increasing tools for communication about the importance of HR mainstreaming
- Increasing number/accessibility to tools for promotion of staff learning and the implementation of staff rules and policies
- Prevention of HR violations/address complex situations related to HR
14. Please select the top three needs of the UNCT with respect to better mainstreaming HR throughout their work.

- Increased technical capacities through capacity development / trainings of the UNCT to mainstream HR
- Funding to advance HR programming
- High-level advocacy support
- Coordination support to help organisations to collaboratively plan, implement, and report on HR programming
- Awareness and communication about the importance of HR mainstreaming
- Policy formulation support
- Support to promote engagement with national authorities
- Other [insert own]
- Other [insert own]
- Other [insert own]

15.a. On a scale of 1-5, to what extent do you think that support provided by Human Rights Advisers (HRAs) meets the needs of the RC and UNCTs identified above?

[Scale 1-5; 1-does not meet needs, 5—fully meets needs]

15.b. If you wish, please provide a short explanation for your previous answer.

[Text input field]

16.a. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the current effectiveness of mainstreaming of human rights throughout country-level programming by the UNCT (including through joint analyses, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, etc.)

[Scale 1-5; 1—low level of effectiveness, 5—high level of effectiveness]

16.b. If you wish, please provide a short explanation for your previous answer (for example, success stories or challenges observed).

[Text input field]

17.a. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the extent of inter-agency collaboration towards promoting and mainstreaing human rights at the country-level?
17.b. If you wish, please provide a short explanation for your previous answer (for example, success stories or challenges observed).

[Text input field]

18. On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with the “Operational Guide on Leaving No One Behind for UN Country Teams”?

[scale 1-5; 1- not aware of the guide; 5 – very familiar]

19. On scale of 1-5, how would you rate the technical and operational advice received (from Human Rights Task Team and Human Rights Advisors) to mainstreaming human rights into the UNDAF/Cooperation Framework?

[scale 1-5; 1- zero to no support; 5 – extremely high level of support]

20. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the annual letter informing you of the opportunities for engagement with human rights mechanisms?

[scale 1-5; 1- not useful; 5 – very useful; n/a- not aware of the letter]

21. On a scale of 1-5 how often do you use the Yammer Community of Practice on human rights, leaving no one behind and gender Platform?

[scale 1-5; 1- never; 2- used once, 3 – used once-twice, 4- used several times, 5 – regular user]

22. On scale of 1-5, how would you rate any other technical and operational advice received from the UNSDG to support the mainstreaming of human rights into the UNDAF/Cooperation Framework?

[scale 1-5; 1- zero to no support; 5 – extremely high level of support]

23. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the usefulness of the UNSDG Guidance Note on Human Rights for Resident Coordinators and UN Country Teams?

[scale 1-5; 1- not useful; 5 – very useful; n/a- not aware of the Guidance]
24.a. On a scale of 1-5 (1 - no contribution, 5 - UNCT being the driving force behind change), to what extent has the UNCT country-level human rights mainstreaming work contributed to the strengthening of national human rights protection systems?

[scale 1-5]

24.b. What additional support would the UNCT need to effectively contribute to the strengthening of national human rights protection systems?

[text input field]

25.a. On a scale of 1-5 (1 – never on time, 5 – always on time), are human rights mainstreaming activities typically delivered on time?

25.b. What are some of the factors that cause delays?

[text input field]

Section III: Performance of the Human Rights Mainstreaming Multi-Donor Trust Fund (HRM-MDTF) and HRAs

RCs and UNCTs contribute directly to mainstreaming of human rights at country-level and may have some important insights. In the following section, we kindly invite you to please share your views around the human rights mainstreaming mechanisms and their performance.

Instructions: For the following questions, please select a response ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Please select N/A if you are unsure or if you do not have an opinion.

1: Strongly Disagree
2: Disagree
3: Agree
4: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

26. I am familiar with the work of the HRM-MDTF

27. When I became a RC, I had less knowledge on how to mainstream human rights at the country-level than I do now.
28. At this moment in time, I feel that I have sufficient guidance and knowledge on how to mainstream human rights at the country-level.

29. The UNCT has sufficient tools to integrate human rights mechanisms into country-level programming.

30. Externally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on a regular basis. (i.e. at least yearly)

31. Internally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on regular basis (i.e. at least yearly)

32. Human rights mainstreaming is a regular agenda point at UNCT meetings

Please answer the following questions only if you are benefitting from advisory services of a Human Rights Advisor:

33. I work with the Human Rights Advisor on a regular basis.

34. The work of the Human Rights Advisor has helped me to take a stronger leadership role to promote and mainstream human rights at the country level.

35. The UNCT regularly meets with the Human Rights Advisor to discuss the promotion and mainstreaming of human rights throughout their work.

36. The work of the Human Rights Advisor has advanced the human rights mainstreaming work of the UN system at the country level.

37. The Human Rights Advisor has provided me and/or the UNCT with novel ways of supporting national human rights systems.

38. The support of the Human Rights Advisor has advanced the human rights situation in the country and has supported national human rights protection systems.

39. The Human Rights Advisor has been effective at promoting the engagement of government actors to strengthen human rights protection systems.

40. The Human Rights Advisor has been effective at promoting the engagement of civil society to strengthen human rights protection systems.

Section III: Mainstreaming human rights at the country-level: Open Ended Questions

RCs and UNCTs contribute directly to mainstreaming of human rights at country-level and may have some important insights. In the following section, we kindly invite you to share your views around the human rights mainstreaming mechanisms and their performance within your country of operation by completing a limited number of open-ended questions.
41. What are the current major strengths of human rights mainstreaming within the UN system at the country level?

42. What are the current major weaknesses of human rights mainstreaming within the UN system at the country level?

43. What are the primary challenges that you face to support human rights mainstreaming within the UN system at the country level?

44. What opportunities exist within the new UNDS Reform to strengthen human rights mainstreaming throughout the UN system? Within what areas should the MDTF place its greatest focus?
Annex 8: Survey for Human Rights Advisors

Draft

Survey for Human Rights Advisors

Introduction:

Dear colleagues,

The Technical Secretariat of the Human Rights Mainstreaming mechanism Multi-Donor Trust Fund (HRM-MDTF) – from hereinafter, the Fund, (hosted by the DCO) has commissioned an external evaluation of the Fund to evaluate the extent to which the Fund has progressed towards its objectives, identify achievements and shortcomings or bottlenecks, and develop evidence-based recommendations for the next phase of the Fund’s operations. The evaluation covers the timeframe 2011-2019. An external evaluation team was selected to carry out this evaluation under the supervision and guidance of DCO.

As key stakeholders in the Fund’s efforts to mainstream human rights at country-level, the evaluation team kindly requests that you share your feedback regarding your experience with the Fund through a short anonymous survey that is being shared with all Human Rights Advisers (HRAs). The survey will likely take no longer than 20 minutes of your time.

The survey is being administered by an independent external evaluation team. To access the survey, please click the following link:

[insert link]

Your answers will be automatically submitted directly to the evaluation team and information will not be directly shared with any members of Fund. The survey includes some background questions to help the evaluators disaggregate data. Please be assured that the survey is confidential and your answers will not be associated with your name. We encourage you to provide honest feedback to assist the Fund in strengthening its future programming.

We would greatly appreciate it if you could please complete the survey by September 18, 2020.

If you have any questions about the wording of the survey or the survey completion process, please contact the survey manager and independent evaluation team member: Natalia Voronova at natalia.voronova.nv@gmail.com

We thank you very much for your time and participation!

Sincerely,

XXX (Antonio Cisneros)
Survey (to be implemented using Google Forms)

This survey is designed for Human Rights Advisers (HRAs). Your answers will be automatically submitted directly to the evaluation team and information will not be directly shared with any members of the Fund or DCO. The survey includes some background questions to help the evaluators disaggregate data. Please be assured that the survey is confidential and your answers will not be associated with your name or Country Office. We encourage you to provide honest feedback to assist the Fund in strengthening its future human rights mainstreaming work.

Section I: Respondent’s Background

This section is designed to help the evaluation team to understand the profile of survey respondents in order to disaggregate survey data. The information will not be used to specifically identify you. Your responses will remain anonymous and confidential.

1. You are presently a HRA in the following region
   - Africa
   - Arab States
   - Asia and the Pacific
   - Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States
   - Latin America and Caribbean

2. You identify with the following gender (optional question)
   - Female
   - Male
   - Other

3. Your overall experience as a HRA is:
   - less than 2 years
   - between 2-5 years
   - between 5-7 years
   - more than 7 years

4. Your current assignment as a HRA is
   - your first HRA assignment
   - not your first assignment (you have been a HRA in a different country)

Section II: Mainstreaming human rights at the country-level: Sliding Scale Questions
HRAs contribute directly to the mainstreaming of human rights at country-level and may have some important insights. In the following section, we kindly invite you to please share your views around the human rights mainstreaming mechanisms and their performance from your experience and perspective by answer questions using a 5-point scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high).

6. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the awareness of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols for mainstreaming human rights by the RC?
   [scale 1-5; 1- very low, 5-excellent]

7. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the average awareness of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols for mainstreaming human rights by the UNCT?
   [scale 1-5; 1- very low, 5-excellent]

8.a. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the existing capacities of the current structure of the UNCT to mainstream human rights at the country-level?
   [scale 1-5; 1- very low, 5-excellent]

8.b. What changes would need to be made to the current UNCT structure to better facilitate human rights mainstreaming?
   [text input field]

9. On a scale of 1-5, to what extent do you think UNCTs need additional support to mainstream human rights at the country-level?
   [scale 1-5; 1-low extent of additional support, 5-high extent of additional support]

10. Please select the top three needs of the UNCT with respect to better mainstreaming HR throughout their work.
    - Increased technical capacities through capacity development / trainings of the UNCT to mainstream HR
    - Funding to advance HR programming
    - High-level advocacy support
    - Coordination support to help organisations to collaboratively plan, implement, and report on HR programming
    - Awareness and communication about the importance of HR mainstreaming
    - Policy formulation support
    - Support to promote engagement with national authorities
10. Please select the **top three needs** of the RC with respect to better mainstreaming HR throughout his/her work.

- Leading UNCT programming
- Increasing opportunities for dialogue between UNCT members and government counterparts
- Increasing engagement with international HR mechanisms
- Increasing technical capacities through capacity development/trainings of the UNCT to mainstream HR
- Increasing tools for communication about the importance of HR mainstreaming
- Increasing number/accessibility to tools for promotion of staff learning and the implementation of staff rules and policies
- Prevention of HR violations/address complex situations related to HR
- Other [insert own]
- Other [insert own]
- Other [insert own]

11.a. On a scale of 1-5, to what extent do you think that the support provided by the HRAs **meets the needs identified above**?

[scale 1-5; 1-does not meet needs, 5-fully meets needs]

11.b. If you wish, please provide a short **explanation** for your previous answer.

[text input field]

12.a. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the current **effectiveness of mainstreaming** of human rights throughout country-level programming by the UNCT (including through joint analyses, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, etc.)

[scale 1-5; 1- low level of effectiveness, 5 – high level of effectiveness]

12.b. If you wish, please provide a short **explanation** for your previous answer (for example, success stories or challenges observed).

[text input field]

13.a. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the extent of **inter-agency collaboration** towards promoting and mainstreaming human rights at the country-level?
13.b. If you wish, please provide a short explanation for your previous answer (for example, success stories or challenges observed).

[text input field]

14.a. On a scale of 1-5 (1 - no contribution, 5 - UNCT being the driving force behind change), to what extent has the UNCT country-level human rights mainstreaming work contributed to the strengthening of national human rights protection systems?

[scale 1-5]

14.b. What additional support would the UNCT need to effectively contribute to the strengthening of national human rights protection systems?

[text input field]

15.a. On a scale of 1-5 (1 – never on time, 5 – always on time), are human rights mainstreaming activities typically delivered on time?

15.b. What are some of the factors that cause delays?

[text input field]

Instructions: For the following questions, please select a response ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Please select N/A if you are unsure or if you do not have an opinion.

1: Strongly Disagree
2: Disagree
3: Agree
4: Strongly Agree

N/A: Not sure or no opinion

16. The guidelines on human rights mainstreaming in the UN system that I have access to are user-friendly
17. Externally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on a regular basis. (i.e. at least yearly)

18. Internally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on regular basis (i.e. at least yearly)

19. I am a regular participant in UNCT meetings

20. Human rights mainstreaming is regularly discussed at UNCT meetings

21. The RC regularly appeals to me for information on the guidelines and tools on human rights mainstreaming in the UN system

22. The RC and UNCT is open to novel ways of supporting national human rights systems that I suggest

23. The RC is open to and understands the necessity to mainstream human rights throughout the UN system

24. The UNCT is open to and understands the necessity to mainstream human rights throughout the UN system

25. The technical capacities of national stakeholders (governmental) are at a sufficient level that allows them to effectively interact with and/or follow-up on key recommendations of international HR mechanisms

26. I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the RC and UNCT

27. I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with most UN staff in the country

28. I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the national governmental authorities in the country

29. I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the civil society organizations

30. I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the national human rights institutions (NHRIs)

31. The UNSDG global, regional and national human rights mainstreaming efforts are closely interlinked and aligned

32. Human rights mainstreaming within the UN development system relies on sustainable structures, processes, and activities.

Section III: Mainstreaming human rights at the country-level: Open Ended Questions

HRAs contribute directly to the mainstreaming of human rights at country-level and may have some important insights. In the following section, we kindly invite you to please share your views around the human rights mainstreaming mechanisms and their performance from your experience and perspective by completing a limited number of open-ended questions.
34. What are the current major strengths of human rights mainstreaming within the UN system at the country level?

35. What are the current major weaknesses of human rights mainstreaming within the UN system at the country level?

36. What are the primary challenges that you face to support human rights mainstreaming within the UN system at the country level?

37. What opportunities exist within the new UNDS Reform to strengthen human rights mainstreaming throughout the UN system? Within what areas should the MDTF place its greatest focus?
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<td>49</td>
<td>Costanza Farina</td>
<td>UNESCO Representative to Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Enshrah Ahmed</td>
<td>Head of Office, UNFPA Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Bushra Abushahout</td>
<td>Political Specialist on Participation, UN Women Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ettie Higgins</td>
<td>Deputy Representative, UNICEF Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Sara Ferrer Olivella</td>
<td>Resident Representative UNDP Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Ekkehard Strauss</td>
<td>Former Senior Human Rights Advisor in Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Natheer Awamleh</td>
<td>Governmental Coordinator for HR/HR FP in Government, Office of the Human Rights Focal Point, Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Monica Rispo</td>
<td>Programme Specialist, Norwegian Refugee Council ICLA (Information, Counselling and Legal Assistance) in Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Allegra Maria del Pilar</td>
<td>Resident Coordinator, UN Costa Rica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baiocchi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Yoriko Yasukawa</td>
<td>Former Resident Coordinator, UN Costa Rica (left post in 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Charaf Ahmimed</td>
<td>Senior Advisor in the Cabinet of the Director-General for Strategic Transformation in UNESCO and former Chair of the UNCT’s Inter-Agency Working Group on Gender in Costa Rica (during the human rights training for the UNCT financed by UNESCO and supported by the Fund in 2015), Costa Rica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Donald Rojas de Boruca</td>
<td>Indigenous Leader who engaged in the Mesa de Diálogo from 2013 - 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position and Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Pablo Sivar</td>
<td>Indigenous Leader who engaged in the Mesa de Diálogo from 2013 - 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Valeria Guerra</td>
<td>National Human Rights Advisor, Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Roberto Valent</td>
<td>Resident Coordinator, Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Alejandra Garcia</td>
<td>Leader of the UNCT’s Gender Working Group, Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Jessica Braver</td>
<td>Team Leader, RCO Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Juan José</td>
<td>Government Stakeholder (Representative from the Defensoría del Pueblo de la Nación), Argentina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 11: List of Findings

Relevance

1. The promotion and mainstreaming of human rights throughout the UN development system remains as relevant and important as ever. The Fund is currently at a critical point in history where reforms in the UN system and leadership from the Secretary General offer opportunities for increased mainstreaming of human rights.

2. The Fund has demonstrated its relevance by addressing important needs and priorities within the UN development system and among national stakeholders with respect to human rights promotion and mainstreaming, serving as an important funding tool to promote and mainstream human rights within the UNSD.

3. The inter-agency nature of the Fund’s support for Human Rights Advisors and the fact that Human Rights Advisors work directly in the Resident Coordinator’s Office has facilitated human rights support across UN organisations that make up UNCTs as well as in countries where OHCHR does not have a physical presence.

4. The Fund’s change logic and scope of work are missing important areas that are necessary to fully achieve its overall goal of “institutionalizing the mainstreaming of human rights into UN operational activities for development so as to have a transformational impact on human rights at the country level.”

5. While the Fund has conducted some regional level work, the UN Reform’s call for stronger regional mechanisms offers an opportunity for the Fund to strengthen its regional presence.

6. The Fund currently lacks some clarity with respect to its mandate and does not have a multi-year strategic plan to set priorities and guide its work. This lack of strategic clarity is largely due to structural changes within the UNDG/UNSDG and has hindered the Fund’s ability to target programming and support to those areas where its work is most relevant.

7. The Fund lacks visibility among UN staff at the global, regional, and country levels, which hinders the ability of UN staff to request support from the Fund and to engage in its services, thus reducing the Fund’s relevance among stakeholders.
Effectiveness

1. The Fund has made important contributions to institutionalizing and operationalizing human rights mainstreaming within the UNSDG.

2. While the Fund has historically made efforts to establish a knowledge management system around the HRBA, investment in this area has not continued in recent years.

3. The Fund has provided important support to strengthen inter-agency planning at the country level that has resulted in increased human rights mainstreaming throughout UNCT planning documents. However, the integration of human rights mainstreaming throughout country-level inter-agency programme implementation remains a weakness.

4. With a more empowered RC as part of the UN Reform, the Fund’s leadership support to RCs presents potential for scale-up, particularly with respect to interactive RC dialogue sessions.

5. The Fund has provided extensive support to Member States to strengthen their reporting on human rights and engagement with human rights mechanisms.

6. The Fund has been effective at supporting the mainstreaming of human rights at the country level particularly through the provision of HRAs, which is the most widely recognized and appreciated aspect of the Fund’s work. Human Rights Advisors have played and continue to play a larger role than simply advising on human rights issues that includes bringing national stakeholders together and advancing human rights priorities at the country level. However, the fact that these areas of work are not supported with a budget envelope limits the effectiveness of the HRAs.

7. The effectiveness of the Fund’s work has likely suffered due to the lack of a monitoring and evaluation framework to guide and assess the Fund’s results. The changing UNSDG architecture over the past decade has contributed to the Fund’s lack of monitoring and evaluation framework.

8. The Fund is well placed to take advantage of opportunities presented by the UN Reform and the transition from DOCO to DCO to strengthen inter-agency coordination around shared mandates such as human rights.

9. The Fund and its inter-agency mechanisms have supported the implementation of the Human Rights Upfront Initiative by promoting early warning and prevention work throughout their
activities. However, support for the initiative is not clearly seen in the Fund’s change logic, reflecting the lack of a strategic approach.

10. The Fund’s change logic makes a number of assumptions that are largely true or partially true. When these assumptions are not true, they have had a direct negative impact on the Fund’s effectiveness.

Efficiency

11. The Fund’s current governance structure does not facilitate strategic decision-making.

12. The current level of engagement of UN agencies towards the inter-agency Fund is low due to a number of factors that include the technical/administrative nature of the Steering Committee meetings; the Fund’s primary focus on the HRA programme; and limited staff capacity among agencies to work on human rights.

13. The selection criteria and processes used to identify and prioritize which countries will receive HRAs lack clarity, which casts doubt over whether HRAs are deployed to those countries where their services are most relevant and can be used most efficiently and effectively.

14. The Fund has found efficient ways to support human rights mainstreaming but its governance structure and management processes are less efficient than those of other similar UN Funds.

15. Information sharing among the Fund’s UN agencies and between the Fund and its donors is not optimal and has led to diminished trust between the UN organisations.

16. The Fund is achieving administrative efficiencies by transferring a minimum of 100,000 USD per project per agency. However, this limits the Fund’s degree of flexibility in meeting the needs and priorities of its stakeholders.

17. The Fund’s ToRs and the work plans of the UNSDG human rights mainstreaming inter-agency mechanisms contain RBM weaknesses that have hindered the Fund’s ability to plan and achieve results.

Sustainability

18. Mainstreaming human rights into four-year country plans (UNDAFs and UNSDCFs) has encouraged the sustainability of the integration of human rights into country planning and programming.
19. The Fund has experienced severe funding volatility and currently has a limited donor base. It also does not have structures or processes in place to regularly engage current donors or bring in new ones, thus raising concerns over the sustainability of the Fund.

20. The original intention of the HRA programme was for UNCTs to fully finance their HRA by the third year to ensure buy-in and sustainability. However, this hasn’t worked out as planned.

Impact

21. The Fund provides significant value-added to inter-agency coordination and cooperation around human rights by consisting of multiple UN agencies and by facilitating a space for UN agencies to work together to promote and mainstream human rights.

22. The Fund has a comparative advantage in linking global and regional inter-agency efforts to country-level work.

23. The Fund is currently not functioning to achieve maximum impact.

24. The Human Rights Advisor Programme shows potential for scale-up.

25. The Fund’s potential to generate a larger impact is currently hindered by few partnerships with non-UN actors, minimal synergies with other UN initiatives, and currently minimal knowledge sharing across countries and regions.

26. The UN Secretary General’s Call to Action for Human Rights outlines important areas of work where the Fund could increase its potential impact with respect to the promotion and mainstreaming of Human Rights throughout the UN Development System.
Annex 12: Results of Survey for Resident Coordinators

Profiles of respondents: location, gender, HRA deployed to RCO (y/n), experience with the UN (yrs), experience as RC in current country, experience working with a HRA (N=50)
RC Survey respondents by HRA deployment to RCO

- No HRA in RCO: 26
- HRA deployed to RCO: 24

RC Survey respondents by experience (years in the UN)

- > 20 years experience in the UN: 35
- 15 - 20 years experience in the UN: 5
- 10 - 15 years experience in the UN: 6
- 5 - 10 years experience in the UN: 4

RC Survey respondents by experience (years as RC in current duty station)

- 3 - 4 years as RC in current country: 14
- < 1 year as RC in current country: 7
- > 4 years as RC in current country: 9
- 2 - 3 years as RC in current country: 9
- 1 - 2 years as RC in current country: 11
RC Survey respondents by experience (RC assignments)

- First RC assignment: 27 respondents
- RC has been an RC in a different country: 23 respondents

RC Survey respondents by experience (working with HRA in a previous duty station)

- RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station): 26 respondents
- RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station): 23 respondents
- RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station): 1 respondent

RC Survey respondents by gender and location

- Female: 12 respondents
- Male: 5 respondents

Location: Africa: 3 respondents, Arab States: 1 respondent, Asia and the Pacific: 5 respondents, Europe and Central Asia: 10 respondents, Latin America and Caribbean: 7 respondents
RC Survey respondents by experience with a HRA and location

- **Africa**: 8 RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station), 6 with no prior experience working with a HRA, 5 with prior experience working with a HRA.
- **Arab States**: 11 RC unsure, 1 with no prior experience, 3 with prior experience.
- **Asia and the Pacific**: 3 RC unsure, 5 with no prior experience, 3 with prior experience.
- **Europe and Central Asia**: 8 RC unsure, 7 with no prior experience, 7 with prior experience.
- **Latin America and Caribbean**: 7 RC unsure, 7 with no prior experience, 3 with prior experience.

RC Survey respondents by HRA deployment and location

- **Africa**: 4 HRA deployed, 11 no HRA.
- **Arab States**: 1 HRA deployed, 1 no HRA.
- **Asia and the Pacific**: 5 HRA deployed, 3 no HRA.
- **Europe and Central Asia**: 7 HRA deployed, 8 no HRA.
- **Latin America and Caribbean**: 7 HRA deployed, 3 no HRA.

RC Survey respondents by experience in the UN and gender

- **Female**: 5 - 10 years experience: 3, 10 - 15 years: 19, > 20 years: 1.
- **Male**: 5 - 10 years: 5, 10 - 15 years: 2, > 20 years: 16.
RC Survey respondents by experience as RC in current duty station and gender

- < 1 year as RC in current country
- 1 - 2 years as RC in current country
- 2 - 3 years as RC in current country
- 3 - 4 years as RC in current country
- > 4 years as RC in current country

RC Survey respondents by experience as RC and gender

- first RC assignment
- RC has been an RC in a different country

RC Survey respondents by experience with HRA and gender

- RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
- RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
- RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
RC Survey respondents by years of experience in the UN and experience with HRA

- RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
- RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
- RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

RC Survey respondents by years of experience in the UN and HRA deployment

- HRA deployed to RCO
- No HRA in RCO

RC Survey respondents by experience as RC in current duty station and experience as RC

- < 1 year as RC in current country
- 1 - 2 years as RC in current country
- 2 - 3 years as RC in current country
- 3 - 4 years as RC in current country
- > 4 years as RC in current country
RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

RC Survey respondents by experience as RC in current duty station and experience with HRA

- <1 year as RC in current country
- 1 - 2 years as RC in current country
- 2 - 3 years as RC in current country
- 3 - 4 years as RC in current country
- >4 years as RC in current country

RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

RC Survey respondents by experience as RC in current duty station and HRA deployment

- HRA deployed to RCO
- No HRA in RCO

- <1 year as RC in current country
- 1 - 2 years as RC in current country
- 2 - 3 years as RC in current country
- 3 - 4 years as RC in current country
- >4 years as RC in current country

RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

RC Survey respondents by experience as RC and experience with HRA

- first RC assignment
- RC has been an RC in a different country
If there is a Human Rights Advisor currently working in your country, to what extent have you received support from this Advisor?

- a great deal of support
- a limited amount of support
- (blank)

Total: 26
If there is a Human Rights Advisor currently working in your country, to what extent have you received support from this Advisor?

- Africa
- Arab States
- Asia and the Pacific
- Europe and Central Asia
- Latin America and Caribbean

If there is a Human Rights Advisor currently working in your country, to what extent have you received support from this Advisor?

- Female
- Male

If there is a Human Rights Advisor currently working in your country, to what extent have you received support from this Advisor?

- RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
- RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
- RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
If there is a Human Rights Advisor currently working in your country, to what extent have you received support from this Advisor?

- **First RC assignment**
- **RC has been an RC in a different country**

If there is a Human Rights Advisor currently working in your country, to what extent have you received support from this Advisor?

- < 1 year as RC in current country
- 1 - 2 years as RC in current country
- 2 - 3 years as RC in current country
- 3 - 4 years as RC in current country
- > 4 years as RC in current country

If there is a Human Rights Advisor currently working in your country, to what extent have you received support from this Advisor?

- 5 - 10 years experience in the UN
- 10 - 15 years experience in the UN
- 15 - 20 years experience in the UN
- > 20 years experience in the UN
On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your own awareness of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your own awareness of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your own awareness of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your own awareness of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

- Total: 23 (5), 16 (4), 9 (3), 1 (1), 1 (1)
- Africa: 6 (5), 2 (4), 1 (3), 2 (2), 1 (1)
- Arab States: 4 (5), 2 (4), 1 (3), 1 (2), 1 (1)
- Europe and Central Asia: 1 (5), 2 (4), 4 (3), 1 (2), 1 (1)

- Female: 6 (5), 7 (4), 1 (3), 1 (2), 1 (1)
- Male: 10 (5), 6 (4), 6 (3), 1 (2), 1 (1)
On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your own awareness of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

**No HRA in RCO**

- Very low: 1
- Low: 8
- Fair: 11
- Good: 6
- Excellent: 1

**HRA deployed to RCO**

- Very low: 1
- Low: 1
- Fair: 12
- Good: 10
- Excellent: 0

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your own awareness of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

**RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**

- Very low: 1
- Low: 3
- Fair: 13
- Good: 9
- Excellent: 0

**RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**

- Very low: 1
- Low: 6
- Fair: 6
- Good: 6
- Excellent: 1

**RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**

- Very low: 3
- Low: 10
- Fair: 1
- Good: 6
- Excellent: 1

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your own awareness of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

**First RC assignment**

- Very low: 1
- Low: 8
- Fair: 10
- Good: 9
- Excellent: 1

**RC has been an RC in a different country**

- Very low: 1
- Low: 1
- Fair: 1
- Good: 7
- Excellent: 1
On a scale of 1-5 (1 - very low, 5 - excellent), how would you rate the average awareness of the UNCT (in your current country) of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your own awareness of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

On a scale of 1-5 (1 - very low, 5 - excellent), how would you rate the average awareness of the UNCT (in your current country) of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?
On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the average awareness of the UNCT (in your current country) of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

Africa
- 1 - very low
- 2 - low
- 3 - fair
- 4 - good
- 5 - excellent

Arab States
- 1 - very low
- 2 - low
- 3 - fair
- 4 - good
- 5 - excellent

Asia and the Pacific
- 1 - very low
- 2 - low
- 3 - fair
- 4 - good
- 5 - excellent

Europe and Central Asia
- 1 - very low
- 2 - low
- 3 - fair
- 4 - good
- 5 - excellent

Latin America and Caribbean
- 1 - very low
- 2 - low
- 3 - fair
- 4 - good
- 5 - excellent

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the average awareness of the UNCT (in your current country) of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

Female
- 1 - very low
- 2 - low
- 3 - fair
- 4 - good
- 5 - excellent

Male
- 1 - very low
- 2 - low
- 3 - fair
- 4 - good
- 5 - excellent

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the average awareness of the UNCT (in your current country) of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

No HRA in RCO
- 1 - very low
- 2 - low
- 3 - fair
- 4 - good
- 5 - excellent

HRA deployed to RCO
- 1 - very low
- 2 - low
- 3 - fair
- 4 - good
- 5 - excellent
On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the average awareness of the UNCT (in your current country) of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the average awareness of the UNCT (in your current country) of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the average awareness of the UNCT (in your current country) of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
On a scale of 1-5 (1 - no need, 5 - Human rights mainstreaming should be the focus as top priority), how would you rate the importance of promoting and mainstreaming human rights throughout the UN Development System?

![Chart 1](chart1.png)

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the average awareness of the UNCT (in your current country) of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

![Chart 2](chart2.png)

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the importance of promoting and mainstreaming human rights throughout the UN Development System?

![Chart 3](chart3.png)
On a scale of how would you rate the importance of promoting and mainstreaming human rights throughout the UN Development System?

- 3 - necessary but there are other more important priorities
- 4 - should be one of top priorities
- 5 - should be the focus as top priority

Female:
- 1: [3
- 9: [4
- 16: [5

Male:
- 1: [3
- 4: [4
- 19: [5

No HRA in RCO:
- 2: [3
- 5: [4
- 19: [5

HRA deployed to RCO:
- 16: [5

RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):
- 2: [3
- 4: [4
- 20: [5

RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):
- 9: [4
- 14: [5

RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):
- 1: [5
On a scale of how would you rate the importance of promoting and mainstreaming human rights throughout the UN Development System?

1. First RC assignment
   - 3 - necessary but there are other more important priorities
   - 4 - should be one of top priorities
   - 5 - should be the focus as top priority

2. RC has been an RC in a different country
   - 3 - necessary but there are other more important priorities
   - 4 - should be one of top priorities
   - 5 - should be the focus as top priority

3. On a scale of how would you rate the importance of promoting and mainstreaming human rights throughout the UN Development System?
   - 3 - necessary but there are other more important priorities
   - 4 - should be one of top priorities
   - 5 - should be the focus as top priority

4. On a scale of how would you rate the importance of promoting and mainstreaming human rights throughout the UN Development System?
   - 3 - necessary but there are other more important priorities
   - 4 - should be one of top priorities
   - 5 - should be the focus as top priority

5. On a scale of how would you rate the importance of promoting and mainstreaming human rights throughout the UN Development System?
   - 3 - necessary but there are other more important priorities
   - 4 - should be one of top priorities
   - 5 - should be the focus as top priority
On a scale of 1-5 (1 - not necessary, 5 - necessary), to what extent do you feel that it is necessary to strengthen human rights mainstreaming within the UN Development System at the country level?

For the total response:
- 3: necessary but there are other more important priorities
- 4: should be one of top priorities
- 5: should be the focus as top priority

Total response:
- 1: 2
- 3: 13
- 4: 35

By region:
- Africa: 1, 5
- Arab States: 9, 1
- Asia and the Pacific: 1, 3, 4
- Europe and Central Asia: 2, 3
- Latin America and Caribbean: 1, 5

By gender:
- Female: 2, 10
- Male: 3, 6, 15
On a scale of 1-5 to what extent do you feel that it is necessary to strengthen human rights mainstreaming within the UN Development System at the country level?

- 3 - necessary but there are other more important priorities
- 4 - should be one of top priorities
- 5 - should be the focus as top priority

**RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):**
- 3
- 14
- 15

**RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):**
- 2
- 1

**RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):**
- 6

---

On a scale of 1-5 to what extent do you feel that it is necessary to strengthen human rights mainstreaming within the UN Development System at the country level?

- 3 - necessary but there are other more important priorities
- 4 - should be one of top priorities
- 5 - should be the focus as top priority

**First RC assignment:**
- 3
- 12
- 12

**RC has been an RC in a different country:**
- 2
- 4
- 17
On a scale of 1-5 to what extent do you feel that it is necessary to strengthen human rights mainstreaming within the UN Development System at the country level?

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the existing capacities of the current structure of the UNCT in your country to mainstream human rights on country-level?

On a scale of 1-5 (1 - very low, 5 - excellent), how would you rate the existing capacities of the current structure of the UNCT in your country to mainstream human rights on country-level?
On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the existing capacities of the current structure of the UNCT in your country to mainstream human rights on country-level?

- Africa: 3, 5
- Arab States: 1, 1
- Asia and the Pacific: 2, 1
- Europe and Central Asia: 1, 1
- Latin America and Caribbean: 4, 3

1 - very low, 2 - low, 3 - fair, 4 - good, 5 - excellent

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the existing capacities of the current structure of the UNCT in your country to mainstream human rights on country-level?

- Female: 1, 6, 10, 8
- Male: 1, 4, 9, 9

1 - very low, 2 - low, 3 - fair, 4 - good, 5 - excellent

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the existing capacities of the current structure of the UNCT in your country to mainstream human rights on country-level?

- No HRA in RCO: 1, 6, 9, 9
- HRA deployed to RCO: 1, 4, 10, 8

1 - very low, 2 - low, 3 - fair, 4 - good, 5 - excellent
On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the existing capacities of the current structure of the UNCT in your country to mainstream human rights on country-level?

Chart:

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the existing capacities of the current structure of the UNCT in your country to mainstream human rights on country-level?

Title:

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the existing capacities of the current structure of the UNCT in your country to mainstream human rights on country-level?

Legend:

- 1 - very low
- 2 - low
- 3 - fair
- 4 - good
- 5 - excellent
On a scale of 1-5 (1 - Low extent of additional support, 5 - High extent of additional support), to what extent do you think that you, as Resident Coordinator, need additional support to mainstream human rights at the country-level?
On a scale of 1-5 to what extent do you think that you, as Resident Coordinator, need additional support to mainstream human rights at the country-level?

- 1 - low extent of additional support
- 2 - between moderate and low extent of additional support
- 3 - moderate extent of additional support
- 4 - between moderate and high extent of additional support
- 5 - high extent of additional support
On a scale of 1-5 to what extent do you think that you, as Resident Coordinator, need additional support to mainstream human rights at the country-level?

1 - low extent of additional support
2 - between moderate and low extent of additional support
3 - moderate extent of additional support
4 - between moderate and high extent of additional support
5 - high extent of additional support

- first RC assignment
- RC has been an RC in a different country

On a scale of 1-5 to what extent do you think that you, as Resident Coordinator, need additional support to mainstream human rights at the country-level?

1 - low extent of additional support
2 - between moderate and low extent of additional support
3 - moderate extent of additional support
4 - between moderate and high extent of additional support
5 - high extent of additional support

- < 1 year as RC in current country
- 1 - 2 years as RC in current country
- 2 - 3 years as RC in current country
- 3 - 4 years as RC in current country
- > 4 years as RC in current country

On a scale of 1-5 to what extent do you think that you, as Resident Coordinator, need additional support to mainstream human rights at the country-level?

1 - low extent of additional support
2 - between moderate and low extent of additional support
3 - moderate extent of additional support
4 - between moderate and high extent of additional support
5 - high extent of additional support

- 5 - 10 years experience in the UN
- 10 - 15 years experience in the UN
- 15 - 20 years experience in the UN
- > 20 years experience in the UN
On a scale of 1-5 (1 - Low extent of additional support, 5 - High extent of additional support), to what extent do you think UNCTs need additional support to mainstream human rights at the country-level?
On a scale of 1-5 to what extent do you think UNCTs need additional support to mainstream human rights at the country-level?

- 2 - between moderate and low extent of additional support
- 3 - moderate extent of additional support
- 4 - between moderate and high extent of additional support
- 5 - high extent of additional support

**For RCO: No HRA in RCO vs. HRA deployed to RCO**

- **No HRA in RCO**
  - 2: 4
  - 3: 8
  - 4: 12
  - 5: 2

- **HRA deployed to RCO**
  - 2: 7
  - 3: 8
  - 4: 7
  - 5: 9

**For RC: Experience with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**

- **RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**
  - 2: 2
  - 3: 4
  - 4: 8
  - 5: 12

- **RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**
  - 2: 6
  - 3: 8
  - 4: 8
  - 5: 9

- **RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**
  - 2: 10
  - 3: 11
  - 4: 8
  - 5: 7

**For UNCT: First RC assignment vs. RC has been an RC in a different country**

- **First RC assignment**
  - 2: 7
  - 3: 10
  - 4: 8
  - 5: 11

- **RC has been an RC in a different country**
  - 2: 2
  - 3: 6
  - 4: 6
  - 5: 11
On a scale of 1-5 to what extent do you think UNCTs need additional support to mainstream human rights at the country-level?

- 1 - very low extent of additional support
- 2 - between moderate and low extent of additional support
- 3 - moderate extent of additional support
- 4 - between moderate and high extent of additional support
- 5 - high extent of additional support

**Bar Chart 1:**
- < 1 year as RC in current country: 4
- 1 - 2 years as RC in current country: 4
- 2 - 3 years as RC in current country: 2
- 3 - 4 years as RC in current country: 8
- > 4 years as RC in current country: 3

**Bar Chart 2:**
- 5 - 10 years experience in the UN: 2
- 10 - 15 years experience in the UN: 2
- 15 - 20 years experience in the UN: 1
- > 20 years experience in the UN: 2
Please select your top three needs, as Resident Coordinator, with respect to better mainstreaming HR throughout your work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More empowerment of RC position from HQ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted support following a needs-assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to promote engagement with national authorities</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy formulation support</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness and communication about the importance of HR mainstreaming</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination support to help organisations to collaboratively plan, implement, and report on HR programming</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level advocacy support</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding to advance HR programming</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased technical capacities through capacity development / trainings of the UNCT to mainstream HR</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you receive support from a Human Rights Adviser (HRA) on a scale of 1-5 (1 - does not meet needs, 5 - fully meets needs), to what extent do you think that support provided by Human Rights Advisers (HRAs) meets the needs of the RC and UNCTs identified above?

![Support Evaluation Graph](image-url)

- 2 - to a poor degree
- 3 - average degree
- 4 - to a high degree
- 5 - fully meets needs
If you receive support from a HRA, on a scale of 1-5, to what extent do you think that support provided by Human Rights Advisers (HRAs) meets the needs of the RC and UNCTs identified above?

2 - to a poor degree
3 - average degree
4 - to a high degree
5 - fully meets needs
(blank)

Female
Male

Africa
Arab States
Asia and the Pacific
Europe and Central Asia
Latin America and Caribbean
If you receive support from a HRA, on a scale of 1-5, to what extent do you think that support provided by Human Rights Advisers (HRAs) meets the needs of the RC and UNCTs identified above?

- 1 - 2 years as RC in current country: 6
- 2 - 3 years as RC in current country: 6
- 3 - 4 years as RC in current country: 10
- > 4 years as RC in current country: (blank)

If you receive support from a HRA, on a scale of 1-5, to what extent do you think that support provided by Human Rights Advisers (HRAs) meets the needs of the RC and UNCTs identified above?

- 1 - 2 years as RC in current country: 2
- 2 - 3 years as RC in current country: 2
- 3 - 4 years as RC in current country: 3
- > 4 years as RC in current country: 4

If you receive support from a HRA, on a scale of 1-5, to what extent do you think that support provided by Human Rights Advisers (HRAs) meets the needs of the RC and UNCTs identified above?

- First RC assignment: 7
- RC has been an RC in a different country: 5

If you receive support from a HRA, on a scale of 1-5, to what extent do you think that support provided by Human Rights Advisers (HRAs) meets the needs of the RC and UNCTs identified above?

- RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station): 13
- RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station): 13
- RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station): (blank)

If you receive support from a HRA, on a scale of 1-5, to what extent do you think that support provided by Human Rights Advisers (HRAs) meets the needs of the RC and UNCTs identified above?

- RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station): 6
- RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station): 1
- RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station): (blank)
On a scale of 1-5 (low level of effectiveness, 5 - high level of effectiveness), how would you rate the current effectiveness of mainstreaming of human rights throughout country-level programming by the UNCT (including through joint analyses, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, etc.)

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the current effectiveness of mainstreaming of human rights throughout country-level programming by the UNCT (including through joint analyses, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, etc.)

- 2 - between low and moderate
- 3 - moderate level
- 4 - between moderate and high
- 5 - high level
On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the current effectiveness of mainstreaming of human rights throughout country-level programming by the UNCT (including through joint analyses, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, etc.)

- 2 - between low and moderate
- 3 - moderate level
- 4 - between moderate and high
- 5 - high level

- No HRA in RCO
- HRA deployed to RCO

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the current effectiveness of mainstreaming of human rights throughout country-level programming by the UNCT (including through joint analyses, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, etc.)

- 2 - between low and moderate
- 3 - moderate level
- 4 - between moderate and high
- 5 - high level

- RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
- RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
- RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the current effectiveness of mainstreaming of human rights throughout country-level programming by the UNCT (including through joint analyses, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, etc.)

- 2 - between low and moderate
- 3 - moderate level
- 4 - between moderate and high
- 5 - high level

- first RC assignment
- RC has been an RC in a different country
On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the extent of inter-agency collaboration towards promoting and mainstreaming human rights at the country-level?

On a scale of 1-5 (low, 5 - high), how would you rate the current effectiveness of mainstreaming of human rights throughout country-level programming by the UNCT (including through joint analyses, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, etc.)

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the current effectiveness of mainstreaming of human rights throughout country-level programming by the UNCT (including through joint analyses, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, etc.)

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the extent of inter-agency collaboration towards promoting and mainstreaming human rights at the country-level?
On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the extent of inter-agency collaboration towards promoting and mainstreaming human rights at the country-level?

- **Africa**: Low extent (2), Moderately low (6), Average extent (7), Moderately high (4), High extent (6)
- **Arab States**: Low extent (2), Moderately low (1), Average extent (1)
- **Asia and the Pacific**: Low extent (2), Moderately low (4), Average extent (1)
- **Europe and Central Asia**: Low extent (2), Moderately low (2), Average extent (6), Moderately high (4), High extent (1)
- **Latin America and Caribbean**: Low extent (1), Moderately low (6), Average extent (4), Moderately high (3), High extent (1)

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the extent of inter-agency collaboration towards promoting and mainstreaming human rights at the country-level?

- **Female**: Low extent (1), Moderately low (4), Average extent (3), Moderately high (11), High extent (9)
- **Male**: Low extent (12), Moderately low (7), Average extent (3), Moderately high (3), High extent (1)

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the extent of inter-agency collaboration towards promoting and mainstreaming human rights at the country-level?

- **No HRA in RCO**: Low extent (1), Moderately low (4), Average extent (11), Moderately high (10), High extent (12)
- **HRA deployed to RCO**: Low extent (3), Moderately low (8), Average extent (3), Moderately high (12), High extent (1)
On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the extent of inter-agency collaboration towards promoting and mainstreaming human rights at the country-level?

1. RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
2. RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
3. RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

- 1 - low extent
- 2 - moderately low
- 3 - average extent
- 4 - moderately high
- 5 - high extent

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the extent of inter-agency collaboration towards promoting and mainstreaming human rights at the country-level?

1. First RC assignment
2. RC has been an RC in a different country

- 1 - low extent
- 2 - moderately low
- 3 - average extent
- 4 - moderately high
- 5 - high extent

On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the extent of inter-agency collaboration towards promoting and mainstreaming human rights at the country-level?

1. < 1 year as RC in current country
2. 1 - 2 years as RC in current country
3. 2 - 3 years as RC in current country
4. 3 - 4 years as RC in current country
5. > 4 years as RC in current country

- 1 - low extent
- 2 - moderately low
- 3 - average extent
- 4 - moderately high
- 5 - high extent
On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the extent of inter-agency collaboration towards promoting and mainstreaming human rights at the country-level?

On a scale of 1-5 (not aware of the guide, 5 - very familiar), how familiar are you with the “Operational Guide on Leaving No One Behind for UN Country Teams”?
On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with the “Operational Guide on Leaving No One Behind for UN Country Teams”?

**Female**
- 1 - not familiar: 2
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 3
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 3
- 4 - mostly familiar: 5
- 5 - very familiar: 13

**Male**
- 1 - not familiar: 1
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 2
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 3
- 4 - mostly familiar: 9
- 5 - very familiar: 9

**No HRA in RCO**
- 1 - not familiar: 1
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 3
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 4
- 4 - mostly familiar: 6
- 5 - very familiar: 12

**HRA deployed to RCO**
- 1 - not familiar: 2
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 2
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 2
- 4 - mostly familiar: 10
- 5 - very familiar: 8

**RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**
- 1 - not familiar: 1
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 3
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 7
- 4 - mostly familiar: 10
- 5 - very familiar: 11

**RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**
- 1 - not familiar: 2
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 3
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 7
- 4 - mostly familiar: 8
- 5 - very familiar: 1

**RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**
- 1 - not familiar: 5
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 3
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 7
- 4 - mostly familiar: 1
- 5 - very familiar: 0
On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with the “Operational Guide on Leaving No One Behind for UN Country Teams”

- 1 - not familiar
- 2 - somewhat familiar
- 3 - average level of familiarity
- 4 - mostly familiar
- 5 - very familiar

**first RC assignment**
- 1 - not familiar: 3
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 4
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 1
- 4 - mostly familiar: 3
- 5 - very familiar: 1

**RC has been an RC in a different country**
- 1 - not familiar: 1
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 3
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 4
- 4 - mostly familiar: 9
- 5 - very familiar: 10

**< 1 year as RC in current country**
- 1 - not familiar: 3
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 4
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 4
- 4 - mostly familiar: 3
- 5 - very familiar: 3

**1 - 2 years as RC in current country**
- 1 - not familiar: 1
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 1
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 3
- 4 - mostly familiar: 6
- 5 - very familiar: 6

**2 - 3 years as RC in current country**
- 1 - not familiar: 4
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 4
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 2
- 4 - mostly familiar: 5
- 5 - very familiar: 3

**3 - 4 years as RC in current country**
- 1 - not familiar: 1
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 1
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 3
- 4 - mostly familiar: 3
- 5 - very familiar: 3

**> 4 years as RC in current country**
- 1 - not familiar: 1
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 4
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 3
- 4 - mostly familiar: 4
- 5 - very familiar: 4

**5 - 10 years experience in the UN**
- 1 - not familiar: 1
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 2
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 1
- 4 - mostly familiar: 1
- 5 - very familiar: 1

**10 - 15 years experience in the UN**
- 1 - not familiar: 2
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 3
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 1
- 4 - mostly familiar: 4
- 5 - very familiar: 4

**15 - 20 years experience in the UN**
- 1 - not familiar: 1
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 1
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 3
- 4 - mostly familiar: 3
- 5 - very familiar: 3

**> 20 years experience in the UN**
- 1 - not familiar: 1
- 2 - somewhat familiar: 4
- 3 - average level of familiarity: 4
- 4 - mostly familiar: 4
- 5 - very familiar: 4
If you are familiar with the "Operational Guide on Leaving No One Behind for UN Country Teams" how would you rate the usefulness of the Guide on a scale of 1-5?
If you are familiar with the "Operational Guide on Leaving No One Behind for UN Country Teams" how would you rate the usefulness of the Guide on a scale of 1-5?

If there is no HRA in the RCO:
- 1 - not very useful
- 2 - moderately useful
- 3 - mostly useful
- 4 - very useful
- 5 - very useful

If there is an HRA deployed to the RCO:
- 1 - not very useful
- 2 - moderately useful
- 3 - mostly useful
- 4 - very useful
- 5 - very useful

If the RC has prior experience working with an HRA in their previous duty station:
- 1 - not very useful
- 2 - moderately useful
- 3 - mostly useful
- 4 - very useful
- 5 - very useful

If the RC has no prior experience working with an HRA in their previous duty station:
- 1 - not very useful
- 2 - moderately useful
- 3 - mostly useful
- 4 - very useful
- 5 - very useful

If the RC is unsure about prior experience working with an HRA in their previous duty station:
- 1 - not very useful
- 2 - moderately useful
- 3 - mostly useful
- 4 - very useful
- 5 - very useful

If the RC's first assignment:
- 1 - not very useful
- 2 - moderately useful
- 3 - mostly useful
- 4 - very useful
- 5 - very useful

If the RC has been an RC in a different country:
- 1 - not very useful
- 2 - moderately useful
- 3 - mostly useful
- 4 - very useful
- 5 - very useful

If the RC is unsure about prior experience working with an HRA in their previous duty station:
- 1 - not very useful
- 2 - moderately useful
- 3 - mostly useful
- 4 - very useful
- 5 - very useful
On scale of 1-5 (1 - zero to no support, 5 - extremely high level of support), how would you rate the technical and operational advice received (from Human Rights Task Team and Human Rights Advisors) to mainstreaming human rights into the UNDAF/Cooperation Framework?
On scale of 1-5 how would you rate the technical and operational advice received (from Human Rights Task Team and Human Rights Advisors) to mainstreaming human rights into the UNDAF/Cooperation Framework?

- 1 - zero to no support
- 2 - low level of support
- 3 - average level of support
- 4 - high level of support
- 5 - extremely high level of support

**Total**

**Africa**

**Arab States**

**Asia and the Pacific**

**Europe and Central Asia**

**Latin America and Caribbean**

**Female**

**Male**
On scale of 1-5 how would you rate the technical and operational advice received (from Human Rights Task Team and Human Rights Advisors) to mainstreaming human rights into the UNDAF/Cooperation Framework?

**No HRA in RCO**

- 1 - zero to no support
- 2 - low level of support
- 3 - average level of support
- 4 - high level of support
- 5 - extremely high level of support

**HRA deployed to RCO**

- 1 - zero to no support
- 2 - low level of support
- 3 - average level of support
- 4 - high level of support
- 5 - extremely high level of support

**RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**

- 1 - zero to no support
- 2 - low level of support
- 3 - average level of support
- 4 - high level of support
- 5 - extremely high level of support

**RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**

- 1 - zero to no support
- 2 - low level of support
- 3 - average level of support
- 4 - high level of support
- 5 - extremely high level of support

**RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**

- 1 - zero to no support
- 2 - low level of support
- 3 - average level of support
- 4 - high level of support
- 5 - extremely high level of support

**first RC assignment**

- 1 - zero to no support
- 2 - low level of support
- 3 - average level of support
- 4 - high level of support
- 5 - extremely high level of support

**RC has been an RC in a different country**

- 1 - zero to no support
- 2 - low level of support
- 3 - average level of support
- 4 - high level of support
- 5 - extremely high level of support
How would you rate the usefulness of the UNSDG Guidance Note on Human Rights for Resident Coordinators and UN Country Teams? (scale 1-5; 1 - not useful; 5 – very useful; n/a - not aware of the Guidance)

On scale of 1-5 how would you rate the technical and operational advice received (from Human Rights Task Team and Human Rights Advisors) to mainstreaming human rights into the UNDAF/Cooperation Framework?

- 1 - zero to no support
- 2 - low level of support
- 3 - average level of support
- 4 - high level of support
- 5 - extremely high level of support

How would you rate the usefulness of the UNSDG Guidance Note on Human Rights for Resident Coordinators and UN Country Teams? (scale 1-5; 1 - not useful; 5 – very useful; n/a - not aware of the Guidance)
How would you rate the usefulness of the UNSDG Guidance Note on Human Rights for Resident Coordinators and UN Country Teams?

- 0 - not aware of the Guidance Note
- 1 - not useful
- 2 - somewhat useful
- 3 - moderately useful
- 4 - mostly useful
- 5 - very useful

**Region**

- **Africa**: 5, 4, 2, 1, 2, 1
- **Arab States**: 3, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
- **Asia and the Pacific**: 4, 3, 2, 1, 1, 1
- **Europe and Central Asia**: 6, 3, 2, 1, 1, 1
- **Latin America and Caribbean**: 4, 3, 2, 1, 1, 1

**Gender**

- **Female**: 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, 1
- **Male**: 10, 6, 3, 2, 1, 1

**HRA Deployment**

- **No HRA in RCO**: 6, 4, 3, 2, 1, 1
- **HRA deployed to RCO**: 10, 6, 3, 2, 1, 1
How would you rate the usefulness of the UNSDG Guidance Note on Human Rights for Resident Coordinators and UN Country Teams?

- **0** - not aware of the Guidance Note
- **1** - not useful
- **2** - somewhat useful
- **3** - moderately useful
- **4** - mostly useful
- **5** - very useful

### Experience Working with a Human Rights Advisor (HRA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>0 - not aware of the Guidance Note</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - not useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - somewhat useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - moderately useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - mostly useful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - very useful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Duration as Resident Coordinator (RC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First assignment</td>
<td>0 - not aware of the Guidance Note</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - not useful</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - somewhat useful</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - moderately useful</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - mostly useful</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - very useful</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 years</td>
<td>0 - not aware of the Guidance Note</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - not useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - somewhat useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - moderately useful</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - mostly useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - very useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3 years</td>
<td>0 - not aware of the Guidance Note</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - not useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - somewhat useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - moderately useful</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - mostly useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - very useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4 years</td>
<td>0 - not aware of the Guidance Note</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - not useful</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - somewhat useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - moderately useful</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - mostly useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - very useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4 years</td>
<td>0 - not aware of the Guidance Note</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - not useful</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - somewhat useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - moderately useful</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - mostly useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - very useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On a scale of 1-5 (1 - Not useful; 5 - Very useful. If not aware of the letter, select 0), how would you rate the annual letter informing you of the opportunities for engagement with human rights mechanisms?

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the annual letter informing you of the opportunities for engagement with human rights mechanisms?

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the annual letter informing you of the opportunities for engagement with human rights mechanisms?
On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the annual letter informing you of the opportunities for engagement with human rights mechanisms?

Female

- 0 - not aware of the Letter
- 2 - somewhat useful
- 3 - moderately useful
- 4 - mostly useful
- 5 - very useful

Male

- 0 - not aware of the Letter
- 2 - somewhat useful
- 3 - moderately useful
- 4 - mostly useful
- 5 - very useful

No HRA in RCO

- 0 - not aware of the Letter
- 2 - somewhat useful
- 3 - moderately useful
- 4 - mostly useful
- 5 - very useful

HRA deployed to RCO

- 0 - not aware of the Letter
- 2 - somewhat useful
- 3 - moderately useful
- 4 - mostly useful
- 5 - very useful

RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

- 0 - not aware of the Letter
- 2 - somewhat useful
- 3 - moderately useful
- 4 - mostly useful
- 5 - very useful

RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

- 0 - not aware of the Letter
- 2 - somewhat useful
- 3 - moderately useful
- 4 - mostly useful
- 5 - very useful

RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

- 0 - not aware of the Letter
- 2 - somewhat useful
- 3 - moderately useful
- 4 - mostly useful
- 5 - very useful
On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the annual letter informing you of the opportunities for engagement with human rights mechanisms?

- 0 - not aware of the Letter
- 2 - somewhat useful
- 3 - moderately useful
- 4 - mostly useful
- 5 - very useful

**First RC assignment**

- 9: 0
- 8: 2
- 3: 3
- 4: 6
- 1: 1
- 7: 4
- 5: 5

**RC has been an RC in a different country**

- 9: 3
- 8: 4
- 3: 3
- 4: 4
- 7: 7
- 5: 5

**< 1 year as RC in current country**

- 0: 1
- 2: 2
- 3: 3
- 4: 3
- 5: 4
- 6: 2

**1 - 2 years as RC in current country**

- 0: 2
- 2: 2
- 3: 3
- 4: 3
- 5: 4

**2 - 3 years as RC in current country**

- 0: 1
- 2: 2
- 3: 3
- 4: 3
- 5: 4

**3 - 4 years as RC in current country**

- 0: 2
- 2: 2
- 3: 3
- 4: 3
- 5: 4

**> 4 years as RC in current country**

- 0: 1
- 2: 2
- 3: 3
- 4: 3
- 5: 4

**5 - 10 years experience in the UN**

- 0: 2
- 2: 2
- 3: 3
- 4: 3
- 5: 5

**10 - 15 years experience in the UN**

- 0: 1
- 2: 2
- 3: 3
- 4: 3
- 5: 5

**15 - 20 years experience in the UN**

- 0: 1
- 2: 2
- 3: 3
- 4: 3
- 5: 5

**> 20 years experience in the UN**

- 0: 1
- 2: 2
- 3: 3
- 4: 3
- 5: 5
On a scale of 1-5 (1 - never used, 5 - regular user) how often do you use the Yammer Community of Practice on human rights, leaving no one behind and gender Platform?

No HRA in RCO
- 15: 1
- 12: 2
- 6: 3
- 5: 4
- 0: 5

HRA deployed to RCO
- 12: 1
- 7: 2
- 3: 3
- 1: 4
- 1: 5

Total
- 27: 1
- 12: 2
- 9: 3
- 1: 4
- 1: 5

Africa
- 9: 1
- 4: 2

Arab States
- 4: 1

Asia and the Pacific
- 3: 3

Europe and Central Asia
- 9: 1

Latin America and Caribbean
- 3: 1
- 5: 1
On a scale of 1-5 how often do you use the Yammer Community of Practice on human rights, leaving no one behind and gender Platform?

**Female**
- 1 - never: 16
- 2 - rarely: 2
- 3 - sometimes: 8
- 4 - often: 11
- 5 - regularly: 7

**Male**
- 1 - never: 2
- 2 - rarely: 4
- 3 - sometimes: 1
- 4 - often: 1
- 5 - regularly: 1

**On a scale of 1-5 how often do you use the Yammer Community of Practice on human rights, leaving no one behind and gender Platform?**

**RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**
- 1 - never: 12
- 2 - rarely: 5
- 3 - sometimes: 7
- 4 - often: 3
- 5 - regularly: 1

**RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**
- 1 - never: 15
- 2 - rarely: 3
- 3 - sometimes: 5
- 4 - often: 1
- 5 - regularly: 1

**RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**
- 1 - never: 17
- 2 - rarely: 3
- 3 - sometimes: 6
- 4 - often: 10
- 5 - regularly: 1
On scale of 1-5 how would you rate any other technical and operational advice received from the UNSDG to support the mainstreaming of human rights into the UNDAF/Cooperation Framework?

On a scale of 1-5 how often do you use the Yammer Community of Practice on human rights, leaving no one behind and gender Platform?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Regularly

5 - 10 years experience in the UN
10 - 15 years experience in the UN
15 - 20 years experience in the UN
> 20 years experience in the UN

RCs: On scale of 1-5 how would you rate any other technical and operational advice received from the UNSDG to support the mainstreaming of human rights into the UNDAF/Cooperation Framework?

- Zero to no support
- Low level of support
- Average level of support
- High level of support

Total
**RCs: On scale of 1-5 how would you rate any other technical and operational advice received from the UNSDG to support the mainstreaming of human rights into the UNDAF/Cooperation Framework?**

- No HRA in RCO
  - 1 - zero to no support
  - 2 - low level of support
  - 3 - average level of support
  - 4 - high level of support
- HRA deployed to RCO
  - 1 - zero to no support
  - 2 - low level of support
  - 3 - average level of support
  - 4 - high level of support

**On scale of 1-5 how would you rate any other technical and operational advice received from the UNSDG to support the mainstreaming of human rights into the UNDAF/Cooperation Framework?**

- Africa
  - 1 - zero to no support
  - 2 - low level of support
  - 3 - average level of support
  - 4 - high level of support
- Arab States
  - 1 - zero to no support
  - 2 - low level of support
  - 3 - average level of support
  - 4 - high level of support
- Asia and the Pacific
  - 1 - zero to no support
  - 2 - low level of support
  - 3 - average level of support
  - 4 - high level of support
- Europe and Central Asia
  - 1 - zero to no support
  - 2 - low level of support
  - 3 - average level of support
  - 4 - high level of support
- Latin America and Caribbean
  - 1 - zero to no support
  - 2 - low level of support
  - 3 - average level of support
  - 4 - high level of support

**On scale of 1-5 how would you rate any other technical and operational advice received from the UNSDG to support the mainstreaming of human rights into the UNDAF/Cooperation Framework?**

- Female
  - 1 - zero to no support
  - 2 - low level of support
  - 3 - average level of support
  - 4 - high level of support
- Male
  - 1 - zero to no support
  - 2 - low level of support
  - 3 - average level of support
  - 4 - high level of support
RCs: On scale of 1-5 how would you rate any other technical and operational advice received from the UNSDG to support the mainstreaming of human rights into the UNDAF/Cooperation Framework?

- RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
- RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
- RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

On scale of 1-5 how would you rate any other technical and operational advice received from the UNSDG to support the mainstreaming of human rights into the UNDAF/Cooperation Framework?

- First RC assignment
- RC has been an RC in a different country

On scale of 1-5 how would you rate any other technical and operational advice received from the UNSDG to support the mainstreaming of human rights into the UNDAF/Cooperation Framework?

- <1 year as RC in current country
- 1 - 2 years as RC in current country
- 2 - 3 years as RC in current country
- 3 - 4 years as RC in current country
- >4 years as RC in current country
On a scale of 1-5 (1 - no contribution, 5 - UNCT being the driving force behind change), to what extent has the UNCT country-level human rights mainstreaming work contributed to the strengthening of national human rights protection systems?
On a scale of 1-5, to what extent has the UNCT country-level human rights mainstreaming work contributed to the strengthening of national human rights protection systems?

1 - no contribution
2 - low contribution
3 - moderate contribution
4 - high contribution
5 - UNCT is the driving force behind change

---

On a scale of 1-5, to what extent has the UNCT country-level human rights mainstreaming work contributed to the strengthening of national human rights protection systems?

1 - no contribution
2 - low contribution
3 - moderate contribution
4 - high contribution
5 - UNCT is the driving force behind change

---

On a scale of 1-5, to what extent has the UNCT country-level human rights mainstreaming work contributed to the strengthening of national human rights protection systems?

1 - no contribution
2 - low contribution
3 - moderate contribution
4 - high contribution
5 - UNCT is the driving force behind change
On a scale of 1-5, to what extent has the UNCT country-level human rights mainstreaming work contributed to the strengthening of national human rights protection systems?

- First RC assignment
  - 1 - no contribution
  - 2 - low contribution
  - 3 - moderate contribution
  - 4 - high contribution
  - 5 - UNCT is the driving force behind change

- RC has been an RC in a different country
  - 1 - no contribution
  - 2 - low contribution
  - 3 - moderate contribution
  - 4 - high contribution
  - 5 - UNCT is the driving force behind change

On a scale of 1-5, to what extent has the UNCT country-level human rights mainstreaming work contributed to the strengthening of national human rights protection systems?

- Experience in the UN
  - 1 - no contribution
  - 2 - low contribution
  - 3 - moderate contribution
  - 4 - high contribution
  - 5 - UNCT is the driving force behind change

- Experience in the UN
  - 1 - no contribution
  - 2 - low contribution
  - 3 - moderate contribution
  - 4 - high contribution
  - 5 - UNCT is the driving force behind change

- Experience in the UN
  - 1 - no contribution
  - 2 - low contribution
  - 3 - moderate contribution
  - 4 - high contribution
  - 5 - UNCT is the driving force behind change
On a scale of 1-5 (1 - never on time, 5 - always on time), are activities provided by the UNSDG that support human rights mainstreaming typically delivered on time?
On a scale of 1-5 (1 - never on time, 5 - always on time), are activities provided by the UNSDG that support human rights mainstreaming typically delivered on time?

- No HRA in RCO:
  - 1: 1
  - 2: 1
  - 3: 5
  - 4: 1
  - 5: 1

- HRA deployed to RCO:
  - 4: 1
  - 5: 3

- RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):
  - 1: 1
  - 2: 2
  - 3: 3
  - 4: 1
  - 5: 6

- RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):
  - 1: 1

- RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):
  - 1: 1

- First RC assignment:
  - 1: 1
  - 3: 4
  - 4: 1

- RC has been an RC in a different country:
  - 5: 5
  - 2: 2
I am familiar with the work of the HRM-MDTF

On a scale of 1-5 (1 - never on time, 5 - always on time), are activities provided by the UNSDG that support human rights mainstreaming typically delivered on time?

- 1 - never on time
- 2 - rarely on time
- 3 - sometimes on time
- 4 - often on time
- 5 - always on time

Experience in the UN:
- 5 - 10 years
- 10 - 15 years
- 15 - 20 years
- > 20 years

I am familiar with the work of the HRM-MDTF

- 1: Strongly Disagree
- 2: Disagree
- 3: Agree
- 4: Strongly Agree
- N/A: Not sure or no opinion

Total:
- 9
- 8
- 17
- 3
- 13
I am familiar with the work of the HRM-MDTF

- Africa: 6
- Arab States: 4
- Asia and the Pacific: 2
- Europe and Central Asia: 4
- Latin America and Caribbean: 2

Bar chart showing the distribution of responses across different regions.

- 1: Strongly Disagree
- 2: Disagree
- 3: Agree
- 4: Strongly Agree
- N/A: Not sure or no opinion

I am familiar with the work of the HRM-MDTF

- Female: 6
- Male: 12

Bar chart showing the distribution of responses by gender.

- 1: Strongly Disagree
- 2: Disagree
- 3: Agree
- 4: Strongly Agree
- N/A: Not sure or no opinion

I am familiar with the work of the HRM-MDTF

- No HRA in RCO: 27%
- HRA deployed to RCO: 31%

Bar chart showing the distribution of responses by presence of HRA.

- 1: Strongly Disagree
- 2: Disagree
- 3: Agree
- 4: Strongly Agree
- N/A: Not sure or no opinion
RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

I am familiar with the work of the HRM-MDTF

1: Strongly Disagree
2: Disagree
3: Agree
4: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

first RC assignment
RC has been an RC in a different country

I am familiar with the work of the HRM-MDTF

1: Strongly Disagree
2: Disagree
3: Agree
4: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

< 1 year as RC in current country
1 - 2 years as RC in current country
2 - 3 years as RC in current country
3 - 4 years as RC in current country
> 4 years as RC in current country

I am familiar with the work of the HRM-MDTF

1: Strongly Disagree
2: Disagree
3: Agree
4: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not sure or no opinion
When I became a RC, I had less knowledge on how to mainstream human rights at the country-level than I do now.

I am familiar with the work of the HRM-MDTF

When I became a RC, I had less knowledge on how to mainstream human rights at the country-level than I do now.

When I became a RC, I had less knowledge on how to mainstream human rights at the country-level than I do now.

When I became a RC, I had less knowledge on how to mainstream human rights at the country-level than I do now.
When I became a RC, I had less knowledge on how to mainstream human rights at the country-level than I do now.

- **Female**
  - Strongly Disagree: 3
  - Disagree: 10
  - Agree: 9
  - Strongly Agree: 4
  - N/A: 2

- **Male**
  - Strongly Disagree: 2
  - Disagree: 7
  - Agree: 13
  - Strongly Agree: 1
  - N/A: 2

**No HRA in RCO**
- Strongly Disagree: 1
- Disagree: 13
- Agree: 8
- Strongly Agree: 3
- N/A: 2

**HRA deployed to RCO**
- Strongly Disagree: 1
- Disagree: 5
- Agree: 14
- Strongly Agree: 5
- N/A: 2

**RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**
- Strongly Disagree: 7
- Disagree: 4
- Agree: 2
- Strongly Agree: 3
- N/A: 1

**RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**
- Strongly Disagree: 4
- Disagree: 3
- Agree: 10
- Strongly Agree: 10
- N/A: 1
When I became a RC, I had less knowledge on how to mainstream human rights at the country-level than I do now.

- 1: Strongly Disagree
- 2: Disagree
- 3: Agree
- 4: Strongly Agree
- N/A: Not sure or no opinion

**First RC Assignment**
- 1 year as RC in current country: 9
- 1-2 years as RC in current country: 12
- 2-3 years as RC in current country: 4
- 3-4 years as RC in current country: 9
- >4 years as RC in current country: 10

**RC Has Been an RC in a Different Country**
- <1 year as RC in current country: 1
- 1-2 years as RC in current country: 12
- 2-3 years as RC in current country: 1
- 3-4 years as RC in current country: 3
- >4 years as RC in current country: 1

**Years of Experience in the UN**
- 5-10 years experience in the UN: 1
- 10-15 years experience in the UN: 5
- 15-20 years experience in the UN: 3
- >20 years experience in the UN: 4
At this moment in time, I feel that I have sufficient guidance and knowledge on how to mainstream human rights at the country-level.
At this moment in time, I feel that I have sufficient guidance and knowledge on how to mainstream human rights at the country-level.

**Experience with HRA in RCO:**
- **No HRA in RCO:** 11 Disagree, 11 Agree, 3 Strongly Agree, 1 N/A
- **HRA deployed to RCO:** 14 Disagree, 7 Agree, 2 N/A

**Prior Experience Working with an HRA:**
- **RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):** 5 Disagree, 10 Agree, 9 Strongly Agree, 2 N/A
- **RC with no prior experience working with an HRA (in previous duty-station):** 7 Disagree, 1 Agree, 1 Strongly Agree, 1 N/A
- **RC unsure about prior experience working with an HRA (in previous duty-station):**

**First Assignment:**
- **First RC assignment:** 9 Disagree, 12 Agree, 4 Strongly Agree, 2 N/A
- **RC has been an RC in a different country:** 13 Disagree, 6 Agree, 3 Strongly Agree, 1 N/A
The UNCT has sufficient tools to integrate human rights mechanisms into country-level programming in my country of operation.
The UNCT has sufficient tools to integrate human rights mechanisms into country-level programming in my country of operation.

1: Strongly Disagree  
2: Disagree  
3: Agree  
4: Strongly Agree  
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

Africa: 7 (1: 4, 2: 1, 3: 2, 4: 1, N/A: 0)  
Arab States: 3 (1: 1, 2: 1, 3: 1, N/A: 0)  
Asia and the Pacific: 4 (1: 2, 2: 2, N/A: 0)  
Europe and Central Asia: 9 (1: 5, 2: 3, 4: 1, N/A: 0)  
Latin America and Caribbean: 5 (1: 3, 2: 2, 4: 0, N/A: 0)

Female: 10 (1: 3, 2: 4, 3: 2, N/A: 1)  
Male: 13 (1: 2, 2: 7, 3: 4, N/A: 0)

No HRA in RCO: 8 (1: 1, 2: 1, 3: 3, 4: 3, N/A: 0)  
HRA deployed to RCO: 14 (1: 1, 2: 5, 3: 3, 4: 2, N/A: 0)
The UNCT has sufficient tools to integrate human rights mechanisms into country-level programming in my country of operation.

1: Strongly Disagree  
2: Disagree  
3: Agree  
4: Strongly Agree  
N/A: Not sure or no opinion
Externally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on a regular basis. (i.e. at least yearly).

The UNCT has sufficient tools to integrate human rights mechanisms into country-level programming in my country of operation.
Externally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on a regular basis. (i.e. at least yearly).

- Female
  - Strongly Disagree: 4
  - Disagree: 4
  - Agree: 5
  - N/A: 3

- Male
  - Strongly Disagree: 11
  - Disagree: 8
  - Agree: 2
  - N/A: 2

No HRA in RCO

- Strongly Disagree: 5
- Disagree: 4
- Agree: 2
- N/A: 3

HRA deployed to RCO

- Strongly Disagree: 12
- Disagree: 7
- Agree: 3
- N/A: 1

RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

- Strongly Disagree: 5
- Disagree: 2
- Agree: 3
- N/A: 1

RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

- Strongly Disagree: 10
- Disagree: 5
- Agree: 2
- N/A: 0

RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)

- Strongly Disagree: 9
- Disagree: 3
- Agree: 2
- N/A: 0
Externally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on a regular basis. (i.e. at least yearly).

**First RC Assignment vs. Time as RC in Current Country**

- **First RC Assignment**:
  - Strongly Disagree: 6
  - Disagree: 4
  - Agree: 5
  - N/A: 1

- **Time as RC in Current Country**:
  - < 1 year as RC in current country: 12
  - 1 - 2 years as RC in current country: 12
  - 2 - 3 years as RC in current country: 8
  - 3 - 4 years as RC in current country: 2
  - > 4 years as RC in current country: 2

**Experience in the UN**

- 5 - 10 years experience in the UN: 2
- 10 - 15 years experience in the UN: 1
- 15 - 20 years experience in the UN: 3
- > 20 years experience in the UN: 18

**Experience in the UN**

- 5 - 10 years experience in the UN: 10
- 10 - 15 years experience in the UN: 1
- 15 - 20 years experience in the UN: 3
- > 20 years experience in the UN: 2
Internally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on a regular basis (i.e. at least yearly).
Internally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on a regular basis (i.e. at least yearly).

- **No HRA in RCO**
  - 12: Strongly Disagree
  - 10: Disagree
  - 3: Agree
  - 1: Strongly Agree
  - 1: N/A

- **HRA deployed to RCO**
  - 10: Strongly Disagree
  - 8: Disagree
  - 4: Agree
  - 1: Strongly Agree
  - 1: N/A

Internally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on a regular basis (i.e. at least yearly).

- **first RC assignment**
  - 14: Strongly Disagree
  - 9: Disagree
  - 3: Agree
  - 1: Strongly Agree
  - 1: N/A

- **RC has been an RC in a different country**
  - 8: Strongly Disagree
  - 9: Disagree
  - 5: Agree
  - 1: Strongly Agree
  - 1: N/A
Human rights mainstreaming is a regular agenda point at UNCT meetings.

Internally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (e.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on a regular basis (i.e. at least yearly).

- Less than 1 year as RC in current country: 5, 6
- 1-2 years as RC in current country: 3, 4
- 2-3 years as RC in current country: 4, 4
- 3-4 years as RC in current country: 5, 5
- More than 4 years as RC in current country: 4, 3

Internally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (e.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on a regular basis (i.e. at least yearly).

- 5-10 years experience in the UN: 2, 1
- 10-15 years experience in the UN: 3, 1
- 15-20 years experience in the UN: 3, 2
- More than 20 years experience in the UN: 1, 1

Human rights mainstreaming is a regular agenda point at UNCT meetings.
Human rights mainstreaming is a regular agenda point at UNCT meetings

Africa: 6 Strongly Agree, 5 Agree, 2 Disagree, 2 Strongly Disagree, 1 N/A
Arab States: 5 Agree, 5 Strongly Agree, 1 Disagree
Asia and the Pacific: 5 Agree, 4 Strongly Agree, 3 Disagree, 3 Strongly Disagree
Europe and Central Asia: 6 Agree, 6 Strongly Agree
Latin America and Caribbean: 6 Agree, 6 Strongly Agree

Human rights mainstreaming is a regular agenda point at UNCT meetings

Female: 4 Strongly Agree, 4 Agree, 8 Disagree, 10 Strongly Disagree, 0 N/A
Male: 9 Strongly Agree, 8 Agree, 5 Disagree, 2 Strongly Disagree, 0 N/A

Human rights mainstreaming is a regular agenda point at UNCT meetings

No HRA in RCO: 2 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 4 Disagree, 2 Strongly Disagree, 0 N/A
HRA deployed to RCO: 6 Strongly Agree, 5 Agree, 5 Disagree, 2 Strongly Disagree, 0 N/A
Human rights mainstreaming is a regular agenda point at UNCT meetings

- **RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):**
  - Strongly Disagree: 3
  - Disagree: 8
  - Agree: 8
  - Strongly Agree: 7
  - N/A: 0

- **RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):**
  - Strongly Disagree: 8
  - Disagree: 10
  - Agree: 2
  - Strongly Agree: 2
  - N/A: 2

- **RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):**
  - Strongly Disagree: 1
  - Disagree: 2
  - Agree: 2
  - Strongly Agree: 1
  - N/A: 0

- **First RC assignment:**
  - Strongly Disagree: 5
  - Disagree: 6
  - Agree: 6
  - Strongly Agree: 4
  - N/A: 3

- **RC has been an RC in a different country:**
  - Strongly Disagree: 3
  - Disagree: 10
  - Agree: 8
  - Strongly Agree: 1
  - N/A: 0

- **Human rights mainstreaming is a regular agenda point at UNCT meetings:**
  - < 1 year as RC in current country:
    - Strongly Disagree: 3
    - Disagree: 3
    - Agree: 4
    - Strongly Agree: 2
    - N/A: 2
  - 1 - 2 years as RC in current country:
    - Strongly Disagree: 2
    - Disagree: 2
    - Agree: 3
    - Strongly Agree: 4
    - N/A: 1
  - 2 - 3 years as RC in current country:
    - Strongly Disagree: 1
    - Disagree: 1
    - Agree: 1
    - Strongly Agree: 2
    - N/A: 0
  - 3 - 4 years as RC in current country:
    - Strongly Disagree: 1
    - Disagree: 1
    - Agree: 1
    - Strongly Agree: 1
    - N/A: 0
  - > 4 years as RC in current country:
    - Strongly Disagree: 1
    - Disagree: 2
    - Agree: 1
    - Strongly Agree: 1
    - N/A: 2
I work with the Human Rights Advisor on a regular basis.

Human rights mainstreaming is a regular agenda point at UNCT meetings

I work with the Human Rights Advisor on a regular basis.
I work with the Human Rights Advisor on a regular basis.

1: Strongly Disagree
3: Agree
4: Strongly Agree

1. I work with the Human Rights Advisor on a regular basis.

2. I work with the Human Rights Advisor on a regular basis.

3. I work with the Human Rights Advisor on a regular basis.
The work of the Human Rights Advisor has helped me to take a stronger leadership role to promote and mainstream human rights at the country level.
The work of the Human Rights Advisor has helped me to take a stronger leadership role to promote and mainstream human rights at the country level.

- **Africa**: 1: Strongly Disagree, 2: Agree, 2: Strongly Agree
- **Arab States**: 1: Strongly Disagree, 1: Agree, 1: Not sure or no opinion
- **Asia and the Pacific**: 1: Strongly Disagree, 2: Agree, 2: Strongly Agree
- **Europe and Central Asia**: 1: Strongly Disagree, 2: Agree, 3: Not sure or no opinion
- **Latin America and Caribbean**: 1: Strongly Disagree, 3: Agree, 4: Not sure or no opinion

The work of the Human Rights Advisor has helped me to take a stronger leadership role to promote and mainstream human rights at the country level.

- **Female**: 2: Strongly Disagree, 7: Agree, 5: Strongly Agree
- **Male**: 1: Strongly Disagree, 3: Agree, 5: Strongly Agree

The work of the Human Rights Advisor has helped me to take a stronger leadership role to promote and mainstream human rights at the country level.

- **RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**: 5: Strongly Disagree, 6: Agree, 1: Not sure or no opinion
- **RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**: 1: Strongly Disagree, 3: Agree, 1: Not sure or no opinion
- **RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)**: 1: Strongly Disagree, 1: Agree, 1: Not sure or no opinion
The work of the Human Rights Advisor has helped me to take a stronger leadership role to promote and mainstream human rights at the country level.

- **First RC assignment**
  - 1: Strongly Disagree
  - 3: Agree
  - 4: Strongly Agree
  - N/A: Not sure or no opinion

- **RC has been an RC in a different country**
  - 2: Strongly Disagree
  - 3: Agree
  - 4: Strongly Agree
  - N/A: Not sure or no opinion

- **Years as RC in current country**
  - < 1 year: 2
  - 1 - 2 years: 2
  - 2 - 3 years: 3
  - 3 - 4 years: 1
  - > 4 years: 2

- **UN experience**
  - 5 - 10 years: 7
  - 10 - 15 years: 2
  - 15 - 20 years: 1
  - > 20 years: 1

- **Experience in current country**
  - > 20 years: 1
  - 15 - 20 years: 1
  - 10 - 15 years: 2
  - < 1 year: 2

- **Experience in current country**
  - > 4 years: 1
  - 3 - 4 years: 1
  - 2 - 3 years: 1
  - 1 - 2 years: 2
  - < 1 year: 2

- **Experience in current country**
  - > 4 years: 4
The UNCT regularly meets with the Human Rights Advisor to discuss the promotion and mainstreaming of human rights throughout their work.
The UNCT regularly meets with the Human Rights Advisor to discuss the promotion and mainstreaming of human rights throughout their work.

- **RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):**
  - 1: Strongly Disagree
  - 2: Disagree
  - 3: Agree
  - 4: Strongly Agree

- **RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):**
  - 1: Strongly Disagree
  - 2: Disagree
  - 3: Agree
  - 4: Strongly Agree

- **RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station):**
  - 1: Strongly Disagree
  - 2: Disagree
  - 3: Agree
  - 4: Strongly Agree

- **First RC assignment:**
  - 1: Strongly Disagree
  - 2: Disagree
  - 3: Agree
  - 4: Strongly Agree

- **RC has been an RC in a different country:**
  - 1: Strongly Disagree
  - 2: Disagree
  - 3: Agree
  - 4: Strongly Agree

- **Experience as RC in current country:**
  - < 1 year as RC in current country
  - 1 - 2 years as RC in current country
  - 2 - 3 years as RC in current country
  - 3 - 4 years as RC in current country
  - > 4 years as RC in current country

The work of the Human Rights Advisor has advanced the human rights mainstreaming work of the UN system at the country level.

The UNCT regularly meets with the Human Rights Advisor to discuss the promotion and mainstreaming of human rights throughout their work.
The work of the Human Rights Advisor has advanced the human rights mainstreaming work of the UN system at the country level.
The Human Rights Advisor has provided me and/or the UNCT with novel ways of supporting national human rights systems.
The Human Rights Advisor has provided me and/or the UNCT with novel ways of supporting national human rights systems.

1: Strongly Disagree
2: Disagree
3: Agree
4: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

The Human Rights Advisor has provided me and/or the UNCT with novel ways of supporting national human rights systems.

The Human Rights Advisor has provided me and/or the UNCT with novel ways of supporting national human rights systems.

The Human Rights Advisor has provided me and/or the UNCT with novel ways of supporting national human rights systems.

The Human Rights Advisor has provided me and/or the UNCT with novel ways of supporting national human rights systems.
The Human Rights Advisor has provided me and/or the UNCT with novel ways of supporting national human rights systems.

- **First RC Assignment:**
  - Strongly Disagree: 1
  - Disagree: 3
  - Agree: 3
  - Strongly Agree: 6
  - N/A: Not sure or no opinion

- **RC Has Been an RC in a Different Country:**
  - Strongly Disagree: 1
  - Disagree: 8
  - Agree: 2
  - Strongly Agree: 3
  - N/A: Not sure or no opinion

- **Experience in the UN:**
  - < 1 year as RC in current country: 1
  - 1 - 2 years as RC in current country: 1
  - 2 - 3 years as RC in current country: 1
  - 3 - 4 years as RC in current country: 1
  - > 4 years as RC in current country: 2
  - N/A: Not sure or no opinion

- **Experience in the UN:**
  - 5 - 10 years experience in the UN: 2
  - 10 - 15 years experience in the UN: 2
  - 15 - 20 years experience in the UN: 1
  - > 20 years experience in the UN: 7
  - N/A: Not sure or no opinion
The support of the Human Rights Advisor has advanced the human rights situation in the country and has supported national human rights protection systems.
The support of the Human Rights Advisor has advanced the human rights situation in the country and has supported national human rights protection systems

- 2: Disagree
- 3: Agree
- 4: Strongly Agree
- N/A: Not sure or no opinion

1. RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
   - 0: 1
   - 1: 2
   - 2: 7
   - 3: 3
   - 4: 2
   - N/A: 3

2. RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
   - 0: 2
   - 1: 1
   - 2: 5
   - 3: 2
   - 4: 1
   - N/A: 1

3. RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station)
   - 0: 1
   - 1: 2
   - 2: 5
   - 3: 4
   - 4: 3
   - N/A: 1

The support of the Human Rights Advisor has advanced the human rights situation in the country and has supported national human rights protection systems

1. First RC assignment
   - 0: 1
   - 1: 1
   - 2: 8
   - 3: 4
   - 4: 2
   - N/A: 1

2. RC has been an RC in a different country
   - 0: 1
   - 1: 1
   - 2: 5
   - 3: 4
   - 4: 3
   - N/A: 1

The support of the Human Rights Advisor has advanced the human rights situation in the country and has supported national human rights protection systems

1. < 1 year as RC in current country
   - 0: 1
   - 1: 2
   - 2: 4
   - 3: 1
   - 4: 2
   - N/A: 1

2. 1 - 2 years as RC in current country
   - 0: 1
   - 1: 2
   - 2: 5
   - 3: 1
   - 4: 2
   - N/A: 1

3. 2 - 3 years as RC in current country
   - 0: 1
   - 1: 1
   - 2: 1
   - 3: 1
   - 4: 2
   - N/A: 1

4. 3 - 4 years as RC in current country
   - 0: 1
   - 1: 1
   - 2: 1
   - 3: 1
   - 4: 2
   - N/A: 1

5. > 4 years as RC in current country
   - 0: 1
   - 1: 1
   - 2: 1
   - 3: 1
   - 4: 2
   - N/A: 1
The Human Rights Advisor has been effective at promoting the engagement of government actors to strengthen human rights protection systems.

The support of the Human Rights Advisor has advanced the human rights situation in the country and has supported national human rights protection systems.
The Human Rights Advisor has been effective at promoting the engagement of government actors to strengthen human rights protection systems.

- **Female**: 3: Agree (4), 4: Strongly Agree (1), N/A: Not sure or no opinion (2)
- **Male**: 3: Agree (4), 4: Strongly Agree (4), N/A: Not sure or no opinion (1)

The Human Rights Advisor has been effective at promoting the engagement of government actors to strengthen human rights protection systems.

- RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station): 2: Disagree (2), 3: Agree (3), 4: Strongly Agree (2), N/A: Not sure or no opinion (1)
- RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station): 2: Disagree (1), 3: Agree (2), 4: Strongly Agree (3), N/A: Not sure or no opinion (2)
- RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station): 2: Disagree (1), 3: Agree (2), 4: Strongly Agree (3), N/A: Not sure or no opinion (2)

The Human Rights Advisor has been effective at promoting the engagement of government actors to strengthen human rights protection systems.

- First RC assignment: 2: Disagree (2), 3: Agree (3), 4: Strongly Agree (4), N/A: Not sure or no opinion (1)
- RC has been an RC in a different country: 2: Disagree (2), 3: Agree (1), 4: Strongly Agree (3), N/A: Not sure or no opinion (1)
The Human Rights Advisor has been effective at promoting the engagement of civil society to strengthen human rights protection systems.

The Human Rights Advisor has been effective at promoting the engagement of government actors to strengthen human rights protection systems.

The Human Rights Advisor has been effective at promoting the engagement of government actors to strengthen human rights protection systems based on years of experience in the UN:

- 5 - 10 years experience: 1 (2: Disagree), 2 (3: Agree), 2 (4: Strongly Agree), 1 (N/A: Not sure or no opinion)
- 10 - 15 years experience: 2 (2: Disagree), 2 (3: Agree), 1 (4: Strongly Agree), 1 (N/A: Not sure or no opinion)
- 15 - 20 years experience: 1 (2: Disagree), 1 (3: Agree), 2 (4: Strongly Agree), 1 (N/A: Not sure or no opinion)
- > 20 years experience: 1 (2: Disagree), 2 (3: Agree), 3 (4: Strongly Agree), 2 (N/A: Not sure or no opinion)

Total:
- 2: Disagree: 10
- 3: Agree: 11
- 4: Strongly Agree: 2
- N/A: Not sure or no opinion: 2
The Human Rights Advisor has been effective at promoting the engagement of civil society to strengthen human rights protection systems.

- Africa: 2 Agree, 1 Strongly Agree
- Arab States: 2 Agree
- Asia and the Pacific: 3 Agree, 2 Strongly Agree
- Europe and Central Asia: 1 Agree, 2 Strongly Agree
- Latin America and Caribbean: 4 Agree, 1 Strongly Agree

- Female: 7 Agree, 6 Strongly Agree
- Male: 5 Strongly Agree

- RC with prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station): 4 Agree, 1 Strongly Agree
- RC with no prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station): 3 Agree, 1 Strongly Agree
- RC unsure about prior experience working with a HRA (in previous duty-station): 1 Strongly Agree

- 3: Agree
- 4: Strongly Agree
- N/A: Not sure or no opinion
The Human Rights Advisor has been effective at promoting the engagement of civil society to strengthen human rights protection systems

### First RC Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st RC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Has Been an RC in a Different Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Experience in the UN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Range</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;4 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Annex 13 – Results of Survey for Human Rights Advisers**

Profiles of respondents: gender, location, years of experience as HRA, number of assignments as HRA; N=22

**HRA Survey respondents by gender**

- Female: 12
- Male: 10

**HRA Survey respondents by region**

- Africa: 6
- Asia and the Pacific: 3
- Europe and Central Asia: 4
- Latin America and Caribbean: 9

**HRA Survey respondents by experience (years)**

- 2-5 years experience as an HRA: 7
- 5-7 years experience as an HRA: 4
- < 2 years experience as an HRA: 9
- > 7 years experience as an HRA: 2
On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the awareness of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols for mainstreaming human rights by the RC?

- 5 - excellent
- 4 - good
- 3 - fair
- 2 - low

HRA Survey respondents experience (years and number of assignments)

- < 2 years of experience as an HRA: 9
- 2-5 years of experience as an HRA: 6
- 5-7 years of experience as an HRA: 1
- > 7 years of experience as an HRA: 2

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the awareness of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols for mainstreaming human rights by the RC?

- Female
- Male

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the awareness of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols for mainstreaming human rights by the RC?
On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the awareness of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols for mainstreaming human rights by the RC?

For participants with 1 HRA assignment:
- 2 - low: 1
- 3 - fair: 7
- 4 - good: 8
- 5 - excellent: 1

For participants with more than 1 HRA assignment:
- 2 - low: 2
- 3 - fair: 1
- 4 - good: 3
- 5 - excellent: 3

For regions:
- Africa: 2 - low: 3, 3 - fair: 3, 4 - good: 2, 5 - excellent: 1
- Asia and the Pacific: 2 - low: 1, 3 - fair: 3, 4 - good: 3, 5 - excellent: 5
- Europe and Central Asia: 2 - low: 3, 3 - fair: 3, 4 - good: 3, 5 - excellent: 1
- Latin America and Caribbean: 2 - low: 3, 3 - fair: 3, 4 - good: 3, 5 - excellent: 5

For experience:
- < 2 years of experience as an HRA: 2 - low: 1, 3 - fair: 1, 4 - good: 2, 5 - excellent: 1
- 2-5 years experience as an HRA: 2 - low: 4, 3 - fair: 4, 4 - good: 2, 5 - excellent: 1
- 5-7 years of experience as an HRA: 2 - low: 2, 3 - fair: 2, 4 - good: 2, 5 - excellent: 1
- > 7 years of experience as an HRA: 2 - low: 3, 3 - fair: 3, 4 - good: 3, 5 - excellent: 3
On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the average awareness of the UNCT (in your current country) of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?
On a scale of 1-5, to what extent do you think UNCTs need additional support to mainstream human rights at the country-level?

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the average awareness of the UNCT (in your current country) of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the average awareness of the UNCT (in your current country) of the human rights mainstreaming strategies, tools, policies and protocols at your disposal for mainstreaming human rights?
On a scale of 1-5, to what extent do you think UNCTs need additional support to mainstream human rights at the country-level?

- Africa
- Asia and the Pacific
- Europe and Central Asia
- Latin America and Caribbean

**Female**
- < 2 years of experience as an HRA: 1
- 2-5 years experience as an HRA: 2
- 5-7 years experience as an HRA: 1
- > 7 years experience as an HRA: 2

**Male**
- < 2 years of experience as an HRA: 1
- 2-5 years experience as an HRA: 2
- 5-7 years experience as an HRA: 2
- > 7 years experience as an HRA: 2
Please select the top three needs of the UNCT with respect to better mainstreaming HR throughout their work.

HRAs: Please select the top three needs of the UNCT with respect to better mainstreaming HR throughout their work

- Awareness and communication about the importance of HR mainstreaming
- Policy formulation support
- Support to promote engagement with national authorities
- Funding to advance HR programming
- High-level advocacy support
- Coordination support to help organisations to collaboratively plan, implement, and report on HR programming
- Increased technical capacities through capacity development / trainings of the UNCT to mainstream HR
Please select the top three needs of the RC with respect to better mainstreaming HR throughout his/her work.

On a scale of 1-5, to what extent do you think that the support provided by the HRAs meets the needs identified above?

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the current effectiveness of mainstreaming of human rights throughout country-level programming by the UNCT (including through joint analyses, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, etc.)
On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the current effectiveness of mainstreaming of human rights throughout country-level programming by the UNCT (including through joint analyses, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, etc.)

![Bar chart showing ratings by region:
- Africa: 5 (4), 3 (2), 1 (1)
- Asia and the Pacific: 3 (3)
- Europe and Central Asia: 2 (3), 1 (1)
- Latin America and Caribbean: 3 (3)]

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the current effectiveness of mainstreaming of human rights throughout country-level programming by the UNCT (including through joint analyses, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, etc.)

![Bar chart showing ratings by gender:
- Female: 3 (3), 5 (2), 1 (1)
- Male: 8 (4)]

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the current effectiveness of mainstreaming of human rights throughout country-level programming by the UNCT (including through joint analyses, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, etc.)

![Bar chart showing ratings by experience:
- < 2 years of experience as an HRA: 4 (5)
- 2-5 years of experience as an HRA: 1 (4)
- 5-7 years of experience as an HRA: 3 (3)
- > 7 years of experience as an HRA: 1 (1)]
On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the extent of inter-agency collaboration towards promoting and mainstreaming human rights at the country-level?

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the current effectiveness of mainstreaming of human rights throughout country-level programming by the UNCT (including through joint analyses, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, etc.)?
On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the extent of inter-agency collaboration towards promoting and mainstreaming human rights at the country-level?

Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Male

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1 - low extent
- 2 - moderately low
- 3 - average extent
- 4 - moderately high
- 5 - high extent

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the extent of inter-agency collaboration towards promoting and mainstreaming human rights at the country-level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience as an HRA</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 7 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - low extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - moderately low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - average extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - moderately high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - high extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the extent of inter-agency collaboration towards promoting and mainstreaming human rights at the country-level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - low extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - moderately low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - average extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - moderately high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - high extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On a scale of 1-5 (1 - no contribution, 5 - UNCT being the driving force behind change), to what extent has the UNCT country-level human rights mainstreaming work contributed to the strengthening of national human rights protection systems?
On a scale of 1-5 (1 - no contribution, 5 - UNCT being the driving force behind change), to what extent has the UNCT country-level human rights mainstreaming work contributed to the strengthening of national human rights protection systems?

- 2 - low contribution
- 3 - moderate contribution
- 4 - high contribution

Below are the bar charts showing the distribution of responses for different experience levels and number of HRA assignments.

On a scale of 1-5 are activities provided by the UNSDG that support human rights mainstreaming typically delivered on time?

- 2 - low contribution
- 3 - sometimes on time
- 4 - often on time

Total:

On a scale of 1-5 are activities provided by the UNSDG that support human rights mainstreaming typically delivered on time?
On a scale of 1-5 are activities provided by the UNSDG that support human rights mainstreaming typically delivered on time?

1 HRA assignment
- 3 - sometimes on time
- 4 - often on time

More than 1 HRA assignment
- 3 - sometimes on time
- 4 - often on time

Experience as an HRA
- < 2 years of experience as an HRA
- 2-5 years of experience as an HRA
- 5-7 years of experience as an HRA
- > 7 years of experience as an HRA

Female
- 3 - sometimes on time
- 4 - often on time

Male
- 3 - sometimes on time
- 4 - often on time
The guidelines on human rights mainstreaming in the UN system that I have access to are user-friendly

On a scale of 1-5 are activities provided by the UNSDG that support human rights mainstreaming typically delivered on time?

- 3 - sometimes on time
- 4 - often on time

The guidelines on human rights mainstreaming in the UN system that I have access to are user-friendly

- 2: Disagree
- 3: Agree
- 4: Strongly Agree
- N/A: Not sure or no opinion

The guidelines on human rights mainstreaming in the UN system that I have access to are user-friendly

- 2: Disagree
- 3: Agree
- 4: Strongly Agree
- N/A: Not sure or no opinion
The guidelines on human rights mainstreaming in the UN system that I have access to are user-friendly

- Female: 7 (Disagree), 3 (Agree), 2 (Strongly Agree), 1 (N/A)
- Male: 6 (Disagree), 3 (Agree), 1 (Strongly Agree), 1 (N/A)

Experience as an HRA:
- < 2 years: 4 (Disagree), 4 (Agree), 5 (Strongly Agree), 1 (N/A)
- 2-5 years: 4 (Disagree), 2 (Agree), 3 (Strongly Agree), 1 (N/A)
- 5-7 years: 1 (Disagree), 3 (Agree), 1 (Strongly Agree), 1 (N/A)
- > 7 years: 1 (Disagree), 1 (Agree), 1 (Strongly Agree), 1 (N/A)

Number of HRA assignments:
- 1 assignment: 1 (Disagree), 3 (Agree), 4 (Strongly Agree), 2 (N/A)
- > 1 assignment: 3 (Disagree), 3 (Agree), 1 (Strongly Agree), 1 (N/A)
Externally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on a regular basis. (i.e. at least yearly)
Internally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on a regular basis (i.e. at least yearly)

Externally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on a regular basis (i.e. at least yearly)

Internally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on regular basis (i.e. at least yearly)
Internally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on regular basis (i.e. at least yearly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia and the Pacific</th>
<th>Europe and Central Asia</th>
<th>Latin America and Caribbean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2: Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A: Not sure or no opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on regular basis (i.e. at least yearly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2: Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A: Not sure or no opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on regular basis (i.e. at least yearly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; 2 years of experience as an HRA</th>
<th>2-5 years of experience as an HRA</th>
<th>5-7 years of experience as an HRA</th>
<th>&gt; 7 years of experience as an HRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2: Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A: Not sure or no opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am a regular participant in UNCT meetings

Internally-driven UNCT-wide capacity building trainings on human rights mainstreaming (E.g. Human Rights Based Approach) are organized on regular basis (i.e. at least yearly)

- 1 HRA assignment
- more than 1 HRA assignment

I am a regular participant in UNCT meetings

Female
- Strongly Disagree: 1
- Agree: 3
- Strongly Agree: 9

Male
- Strongly Disagree: 1
- Agree: 2
- Strongly Agree: 9
Human rights mainstreaming is regularly discussed at UNCT meetings

- **Total**
  - Strongly Disagree: 1
  - Disagree: 9
  - Agree: 3
  - Strongly Agree: 1
  - N/A: Not sure or no opinion

- **Region**
  - Africa
    - Strongly Disagree: 1
    - Disagree: 5
  - Asia and the Pacific
    - Strongly Disagree: 1
    - Disagree: 3
    - Agree: 1
    - Strongly Agree: 1
  - Europe and Central Asia
    - Strongly Disagree: 1
    - Disagree: 2
  - Latin America and Caribbean
    - Strongly Disagree: 1
    - Disagree: 4

- **Gender**
  - Female
    - Strongly Disagree: 1
    - Disagree: 5
    - Agree: 1
    - Strongly Agree: 1
  - Male
    - Strongly Disagree: 2
    - Disagree: 3
    - Agree: 1
    - Strongly Agree: 1
    - N/A: Not sure or no opinion
The RC regularly appeals to me for information on the guidelines and tools on human rights mainstreaming in the UN system.
The RC regularly appeals to me for information on the guidelines and tools on human rights mainstreaming in the UN system.

- **Africa**
  - 2: Disagree
  - 3: Agree
  - 4: Strongly Agree

- **Asia and the Pacific**
  - 3: Agree

- **Europe and Central Asia**
  - 2: Disagree
  - 3: Agree
  - 4: Strongly Agree

- **Latin America and Caribbean**
  - 5: Strongly Agree

Gender:

- **Female**
  - 3: Agree
  - 6: Strongly Agree

- **Male**
  - 2: Disagree
  - 8: Strongly Agree

Experience:

- **< 2 years of experience as an HRA**
  - 2: Disagree
  - 6: Strongly Agree

- **2-5 years of experience as an HRA**
  - 3: Agree
  - 4: Strongly Agree

- **5-7 years of experience as an HRA**
  - 3: Agree
  - 1: Strongly Agree

- **> 7 years of experience as an HRA**
  - 1: Agree
  - 1: Strongly Agree
The RC and UNCT is open to novel ways of supporting national human rights systems that I suggest.
The RC and UNCT is open to novel ways of supporting national human rights systems that I suggest

2: Disagree  
3: Agree  
4: Strongly Agree  
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

Female

Male

The RC and UNCT is open to novel ways of supporting national human rights systems that I suggest

2: Disagree  
3: Agree  
4: Strongly Agree  
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

< 2 years of experience as an HRA  
2-5 years years of experience as an HRA  
5-7 years of experience as an HRA  
> 7 years of experience as an HRA

The RC and UNCT is open to novel ways of supporting national human rights systems that I suggest

2: Disagree  
3: Agree  
4: Strongly Agree  
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

1 HRA assignment  
more than 1 HRA assignment
The RC is open to and understands the necessity to mainstream human rights throughout the UN system

**Total**

- 1: Disagree
- 6: Agree
- 14: Strongly Agree
- 1: N/A: Not sure or no opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2 (Disagree)</th>
<th>3 (Agree)</th>
<th>4 (Strongly Agree)</th>
<th>N/A (Not sure or no opinion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2 (Disagree)</th>
<th>3 (Agree)</th>
<th>4 (Strongly Agree)</th>
<th>N/A (Not sure or no opinion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The UNCT is open to and understands the necessity to mainstream human rights throughout the UN system.

The RC is open to and understands the necessity to mainstream human rights throughout the UN system.

The UNCT is open to and understands the necessity to mainstream human rights throughout the UN system.
The UNCT is open to and understands the necessity to mainstream human rights throughout the UN system.
The technical capacities of national stakeholders (governmental) are at a sufficient level that allows them to effectively interact with and/or follow-up on key recommendations of international HR mechanisms.
The technical capacities of national stakeholders (governmental) are at a sufficient level that allows them to effectively interact with and/or follow-up on key recommendations of international HR mechanisms.

For gender:
- Female: 6 Strongly Disagree, 6 Disagree, 1 Agree
- Male: 6 Strongly Disagree, 3 Disagree

For years of experience as an HRA:
- < 2 years: 5 Strongly Disagree, 3 Disagree, 2 Agree
- 2-5 years: 3 Strongly Disagree, 3 Disagree, 4 Agree
- 5-7 years: 4 Strongly Disagree, 4 Disagree
- > 7 years: 2 Strongly Disagree

For number of HRA assignments:
- 1 HRA assignment: 1 Strongly Disagree, 8 Disagree, 9 Agree
- more than 1 HRA assignment: 4 Agree
I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the RC and UNCT

I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the RC and UNCT

I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the RC and UNCT
I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with most UN staff in the country.
I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with most UN staff in the country

1 HRA assignment

1: Disagree
2: Agree
3: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

More than 1 HRA assignment

1: Disagree
2: Agree
3: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with most UN staff in the country

< 2 years of experience as an HRA

1: Disagree
2: Agree
3: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

2-5 years experience as an HRA

1: Disagree
2: Agree
3: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

5-7 years experience as an HRA

1: Disagree
2: Agree
3: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

> 7 years of experience as an HRA

1: Disagree
2: Agree
3: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with most UN staff in the country

Female

1: Disagree
2: Agree
3: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

Male

1: Disagree
2: Agree
3: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not sure or no opinion
I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the national governmental authorities in the country

2: Disagree
3: Agree
4: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with most UN staff in the country

2: Disagree
3: Agree
4: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not sure or no opinion

I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the national governmental authorities in the country
I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the national governmental authorities in the country

- Africa: 2 Agree, 2 Strongly Agree, 3 N/A
- Asia and the Pacific: 3 Agree, 1 Strongly Agree, 1 N/A
- Europe and Central Asia: 1 Agree, 1 Strongly Agree, 1 N/A
- Latin America and Caribbean: 6 Agree, 3 Strongly Agree, N/A

I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the national governmental authorities in the country

- Female: 6 Agree, 4 Strongly Agree, 2 N/A
- Male: 5 Agree, 3 Strongly Agree, 2 N/A

I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the national governmental authorities in the country

- < 2 years of experience as an HRA: 4 Agree, 3 Strongly Agree, 2 N/A
- 2-5 years of experience as an HRA: 4 Agree, 2 Strongly Agree, 1 N/A
- 5-7 years of experience as an HRA: 2 Agree, 1 Strongly Agree, 1 N/A
- > 7 years of experience as an HRA: 1 Agree, 1 Strongly Agree, 1 N/A
I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the civil society organizations.

I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the national governmental authorities in the country.

- **I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the civil society organizations**
  - **Total**
    - **3: Agree**
    - **4: Strongly Agree**
  - **Africa**
    - 2: Agree
    - 4: Strongly Agree
  - **Asia and the Pacific**
    - 1: Agree
    - 2: Strongly Agree
  - **Europe and Central Asia**
    - 1: Agree
    - 3: Strongly Agree
  - **Latin America and Caribbean**
    - 3: Agree
    - 6: Strongly Agree

- **I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the national governmental authorities in the country**
  - **1 HRA assignment**
    - 9: Agree
    - 6: Strongly Agree
    - 3: Not sure
  - **more than 1 HRA assignment**
    - 2: Agree
    - 1: Strongly Agree
    - 1: Not sure
I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the civil society organizations

- **Female**
  - 4: Agree
  - 8: Strongly Agree

- **Male**
  - 3: Agree
  - 7: Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience as an HRA</th>
<th>Agree 3</th>
<th>Strongly Agree 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 7 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **1 HRA assignment**
  - 6: Agree
  - 12: Strongly Agree

- **More than 1 HRA assignment**
  - 1: Agree
  - 3: Strongly Agree
I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the national human rights institutions (NHRIs)

1. I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the national human rights institutions (NHRIs)

   3: Agree
   4: Strongly Agree
   N/A: Not sure or no opinion

   Total:

   - 12 Agree
   - 5 Strongly Agree
   - 5 N/A

2. I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the national human rights institutions (NHRIs)

   3: Agree
   4: Strongly Agree
   N/A: Not sure or no opinion

   By region:

   - Africa: 3 Agree, 2 Strongly Agree, 1 N/A
   - Asia and the Pacific: 2 Agree, 1 Strongly Agree, 1 N/A
   - Europe and Central Asia: 2 Agree, 1 Strongly Agree, 1 N/A
   - Latin America and Caribbean: 5 Agree, 3 Strongly Agree, 1 N/A

3. I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the national human rights institutions (NHRIs)

   3: Agree
   4: Strongly Agree
   N/A: Not sure or no opinion

   By gender:

   - Female: 4 Agree, 4 Strongly Agree, 4 N/A
   - Male: 8 Agree, 1 Strongly Agree, 1 N/A
The UNSDG global, regional and national human rights mainstreaming efforts are closely interlinked and aligned.

I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the national human rights institutions (NHRIs)

- **< 2 years of experience as an HRA**: 4 strongly agree, 3 agree, 2 disagree, 1 N/A
- **2-5 years of experience as an HRA**: 6 strongly agree, 1 agree, 1 disagree, 1 N/A
- **5-7 years of experience as an HRA**: 1 strongly agree, 1 agree, 2 disagree, 1 N/A
- **> 7 years of experience as an HRA**: 2 strongly agree, 1 agree, 1 disagree, 1 N/A

I have a relationship based on trust and mutual understanding with the national human rights institutions (NHRIs)

- **1 HRA assignment**: 11 strongly agree, 3 agree, 4 N/A
- **more than 1 HRA assignment**: 1 strongly agree, 2 agree, 1 N/A

The UNSDG global, regional and national human rights mainstreaming efforts are closely interlinked and aligned

- **2: Disagree**: 7
- **3: Agree**: 11
- **4: Strongly Agree**: 7
- **N/A: Not sure or no opinion**: 1

Total
The UNSDG global, regional and national human rights mainstreaming efforts are closely interlinked and aligned

---

**Africa**
- 3: Agree
- 1: Disagree
- 1: Strongly Agree
- 1: Not sure or no opinion

**Asia and the Pacific**
- 2: Agree
- 1: Disagree
- 1: Not sure or no opinion

**Europe and Central Asia**
- 2: Agree
- 1: Not sure or no opinion

**Latin America and Caribbean**
- 3: Strongly Agree
- 2: Not sure or no opinion

---

The UNSDG global, regional and national human rights mainstreaming efforts are closely interlinked and aligned

---

**Female**
- 8: Agree
- 2: Disagree
- 1: Not sure or no opinion

**Male**
- 5: Strongly Agree
- 3: Agree
- 1: Disagree
- 2: Not sure or no opinion

---

The UNSDG global, regional and national human rights mainstreaming efforts are closely interlinked and aligned

---

**< 2 years of experience as an HRA**
- 3: Agree
- 1: Not sure or no opinion

**2-5 years of experience as an HRA**
- 5: Strongly Agree
- 2: Agree

**5-7 years of experience as an HRA**
- 3: Agree
- 1: Not sure or no opinion

**> 7 years of experience as an HRA**
- 2: Not sure or no opinion
Human rights mainstreaming within the UN development system relies on sustainable structures, processes, and activities.
Human rights mainstreaming within the UN development system relies on sustainable structures, processes, and activities.

- **Gender**
  - Female: 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 5 agree, 1 strongly agree, 1 not sure or no opinion.
  - Male: 6 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 1 agree, 1 strongly agree, 2 not sure or no opinion.

- **Experience**
  - < 2 years: 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 2 agree, 1 strongly agree, 1 not sure or no opinion.
  - 2-5 years: 4 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 2 agree, 1 strongly agree, 1 not sure or no opinion.
  - 5-7 years: 1 strongly disagree, 3 disagree, 1 agree, 1 strongly agree, 1 not sure or no opinion.
  - > 7 years: 1 strongly disagree, 1 disagree, 1 agree, 1 strongly agree, 1 not sure or no opinion.

- **Assignments**
  - 1 HRA assignment: 1 strongly disagree, 3 disagree, 3 agree, 3 strongly agree, 1 not sure or no opinion.
  - More than 1 HRA assignment: 6 strongly disagree, 5 disagree, 3 agree, 3 strongly agree, 1 not sure or no opinion.
Annex 14: Case-study Results

1. Argentina

2. Costa Rica

3. Nigeria

4. Jordan

5. Malawi
Case-study:
1. Argentina
1.1. List of Stakeholders consulted as part of the Argentina Case Study

- Valeria Guerra, National Human Rights Advisor
- Roberto Valent, Current RC
- Alejandra Garcia, Leader of the UNCT’s Gender Working Group
- Jessica Braver, RCO Team Leader
- Juan José, Government Stakeholder (Representative from the Defensoría del Pueblo de la Nación)
1.2. Overview of the Human Rights Context in Argentina

Long-standing human rights problems in Argentina include police abuse, poor prison conditions, endemic violence against women, restrictions on abortion, difficulty accessing reproductive services, and obstacles keeping indigenous people from enjoying the rights that Argentine and international law afford them.

In 2017, Argentina created a federal agency to ensure access to official information. Argentina continues to make significant progress protecting lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) rights and prosecuting officials for abuses committed during the country’s last military dictatorship (1976-1983), although trials have been delayed.

Indigenous people in Argentina face obstacles in accessing justice, land, education, health care, and basic services. Argentina has failed to implement existing laws to protect indigenous peoples’ right to free, prior, and informed consent when the government adopts decisions that may affect their rights—a right provided for in international law.


HR Mainstreaming support provided by the Fund to Argentina included:

• Provision of a national Human Rights Advisor from 2018 – 2020. Some of the HRA’s work since 2018 has included:
  • Bringing attention to the situation of indigenous peoples in the country and the challenges they face in the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights.
  • Supporting the integration of the 2030 Agenda and its human rights basis into national and local policy-making.
  • Supporting the National Prosecutor’s Office adaptation of the Latin American Model Protocol for the investigation of gender-related killings of women (femicide) to Argentina’s legal context.
  • Contributing to the establishment of the National Mechanism for Reporting and follow-up human rights recommendations, and the online database called SIMORE PLUS.

• Access to global guidance documents, knowledge management, and capacity development support.
1.3. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Relevance/Coherence

The HRA has supported the continued capacity building of the RC and the UNCT with respect to mainstreaming human rights throughout the UNCT’s planning and reporting.

The RC and UNCT provided much needed technical support to identify human rights indicators to guide the work of the Defensoría del Pueblo de la Nación, which is the primary national human rights mechanism.

The HRA’s role goes beyond simply providing advice. She is perceived by the RCO as a strategic resource that helps to push the human rights agenda forward and to mainstream human rights throughout the UNCT processes.

Early warning systems and human rights monitoring are urgent country level needs that are not fully supported by the Fund.

There is a need for the Fund to support platforms for civil society to exchange information and hold discussions, and to strengthen the human rights civil society networks within countries.

“The UN organisations that make up the UNCT struggle to prioritize human rights work. There needs to be more support provided to UNCT members (especially to the leaders of UN agencies at the country level) to strengthen human rights programming and capacity within their individual organisations before they can effectively engage in inter-agency human rights work”.
1.4. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Effectiveness

The HRA has been able to achieve considerable effectiveness largely due to her close working relationship with the RC and UNCT and due to willingness by the RC and UNCT to work on human rights issues. This willingness is partly the result of years of prior support provided by the OHCHR regional office (as well as the UPR Advisor who later became the HRA) to build awareness and capacity with respect to human rights among the UNCT.

Increased human rights capacity within the UNCT has helped to ensure that human rights are mainstreamed throughout the country’s SDG Voluntary Reports.

The HRA worked closely with the RC and UNCT to raise awareness around a human rights access to water crisis involving indigenous and afro-indigenousdescents with government representatives and then facilitated important discussions between the government and rights holders to address the crisis.

“The Human Rights Advisor has helped ensure that the UNCT shares the same priorities with respect to human rights work”.

The RC and UNCT believe that the HRA could be even more effective with access to a budget envelope to support her work and to help leverage certain human rights topics into the national agenda (i.e. to conduct studies, execute LNOB vulnerability analyses, hire consultants, participate in and host events, etc.).

“The HRA has increased the professionalism and seriousness of integrating human rights at the country level”.

1.5. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Efficiency

While guidance documents produced at the global level have been very helpful at designing the Common Country Analysis (CCA), there is very limited communication between HQ and the country levels.

“*The Fund could better capitalize on the resources that already exist within UN organisations. There is scope for the Fund to further leverage existing resources within the UNCT to advance human rights at the country level*.”

Transitions between governments hinder efficiency, as the HRA and the RC and UNCT have to take several steps back to get the new government on board before being able to advance with important human rights work.

“The HRA is very capable and effective but is completely overstretched, resulting in a lack of time available to support some of the needs of country stakeholders.”
1.6. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Sustainability

Human rights are being integrated by the RC and the UNCT into the 2030 Agenda, which increases the potential for sustainable results.

The HRA, RC, and UNCT have organized dialogue sessions with civil society actors to discuss human rights to ensure that civil society participates in the 2025 National Development Plan.

“Turn-over among RCs negatively affects the continuity of human rights work”.
1.7. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Impact

« The Fund’s added value goes way beyond its current visibility ».
1.8. Overall Conclusions and Implications for the Global Evaluation

- The HRA has played an important role in supporting the continued capacity building of the RC and the UNCT with respect to mainstreaming human rights throughout the UNCT’s planning and reporting.

- The HRA’s role goes beyond simply providing advice and is a strategic resource that helps to push the human rights agenda forward. The HRA has been able to achieve considerable effectiveness largely due to her close working relationship with the RC and UNCT and due to willingness by the RC and UNCT to work on human rights issues. However, the HRA’s degree of effectiveness could likely be greater if she had a budget envelope to support her work.

- Some of the needs that the Fund is not currently supporting include:
  - Strengthening human rights capacity and promoting human rights leadership within the member agencies of the UNCT.
  - Supporting early warning mechanisms
  - Supporting platforms for civil society to exchange information and hold discussions, and to strengthen the human rights civil society networks within countries.

- The HRA, RC, and UNCT have worked closely together to address important needs of national stakeholders, including by providing technical support to the national human rights mechanism and by bringing government actors together with rights holders to address human rights crises.

- Factors that hinder efficiency include: poor communication between the HQ and country levels; transitions between governments; and challenges to leverage existing resources within the UNCT.

- The Fund is promoting sustainability by supporting the integration of human rights into the 2030 Agenda, and by engaging civil society in the development of the 2025 National Development Plan.

- The Fund’s impact may be much greater in reality than it is perceived to be due to its lack of visibility among stakeholders.
Case study:
2. Costa Rica
2.1 List of Stakeholders consulted as part of the Costa Rica Case Study

- **Allegra Maria del Pilar Baiocchi**, Current Resident Coordinator
- **Yoriko Yasukawa**, Former Resident Coordinator (left post in 2015)
- **Charaf Ahmimed**, Senior Advisor in the Cabinet of the Director-General for Strategic Transformation in UNESCO and former Chair of the UNCT’s Inter-Agency Working Group on Gender in Costa Rica (during the human rights training for the UNCT financed by UNESCO and supported by the Fund’s Regional Human Rights Advisor in 2015)
- **Donald Rojas de Boruca and Pablo Sivar**, Indigenous Leaders who engaged in the Mesa de Diálogo from 2013 - 2014
- **Margarita Uprimmy**, Regional Human Rights Advisor from July 2014 – 2016
2.2. Overview of the Human Rights Context in Costa Rica

- Costa Rica has ratified almost all universal and regional human rights instruments.
- The National Policy for De Facto Equality between Women and Men 2018–2030 is the cornerstone of the country’s strategy for implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals set under the 2030 Agenda.
- The State has recognized that it has a debt with indigenous populations and that land currently occupied by non-indigenous persons should be returned.
- Costa Rica experiences economic exclusion where approximately 20% of the population lives below the poverty line.

Types of support that the Fund has provided to the country include:

- Support for a UNCT human rights training workshop facilitated by the Regional Human Rights Advisor in 2015.
- Funding of 100,000 USD issued to the RC and the UNCT (OHCHR, UNICEF, ILO) to organize and convene a dialogue session (referred to as the Mesa de Diálogo) between Indigenous groups and the Government to discuss Indigenous rights.
- Access to human rights guidance documents, training materials, and dialogue platforms.
- Current financial support for a country-level Human Rights Advisor as of 2020.
2.3. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Relevance/Coherence

The HR and GEEW training workshop in Costa Rica in 2015 addressed important UNCT needs and priorities with respect to understanding and implementing human rights mainstreaming when these concepts were relatively new to the UNDS.

HRM MDTF project funding allowed the UN to act as an important and essential convener and facilitator between the government and diverse Indigenous groups, bringing together diverse civil society actors with government officials to establish an agreed-upon approach to advancing Indigenous rights, including land rights.

“The training workshop explored what mainstreaming really means and how to apply it to the UNCT work.”

“Civil society organisations need support to come together as a coalition on big ticket items with respect to human rights”.

2.4. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Effectiveness

The workshop on HR mainstreaming was effective at engaging Heads of Agencies in the training and at securing commitments from agencies to use a HRBA in their planning and programming.

HR Workshop participants used the knowledge and skills they had gained through the training by integrating a HRBA and GEEW perspective into their review of the UNDAF Mid-Term Review.

The Mesa de Diálogo resulted in concrete commitments and an established mechanism to further resolve issues affecting Indigenous communities.

Members of the UNCT stated that global guidance documents have been useful to help guide the implementation of human rights mainstreaming at the country level. However, due to the Fund’s limited visibility, they could not identify which documents were supported by the Fund.

While UN country-level stakeholders are largely aware of human rights platforms such as the Yammer group on LNOB, they do not necessarily participate in them.

Key UN stakeholders at the country level had never heard about the Fund, signaling a lack of visibility with respect to the Fund’s work.

“Strengthening human rights is largely done through dialogue to persuade governments to see what is missing and what needs to be done to help them to fulfill the rights of vulnerable people”.

“The country-level Human Rights Advisor needs to have a budget with seed money in order to be truly effective”.
2.5. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Efficiency

The Regional Advisor for LAC provided country-level support to those countries that were in the process of developing their UNDAF (this did not include Costa Rica during the time when the Regional Human Rights Advisor was present). This approach was quite efficient in that one Human Rights Advisor could support multiple UNCTs during their most important planning process. However, this also meant that the RC didn’t have much time for important regional-level work such as facilitating cooperation on cross-border priorities or engaging with regional human rights mechanisms.

The selection process for identifying which countries will receive Human Rights Advisors is unclear to some key stakeholders at the country level.

“Human rights issues tend to be very labour-intensive and it can be difficult to demonstrate results”.

2.6. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Sustainability

With a change in government, the new government officials did not continue dialogue efforts with Indigenous communities. Even though the RC and UNCT tried to facilitate a smooth transition between governments so as to continue the dialogue process, the lack of willingness on behalf of the new government resulted in an end to the initiative.

The Mesa de Diálogo advanced the “right to consultation”, which states that governments should be consulting Indigenous communities when they will be affected by a government process or initiative. The UNCT continued to advance this concept through awareness raising and training after the Mesa de Diálogo, which resulted in an Executive Decree about the Right to Consultation.

The training workshop was a single initiative that was not part of a larger series of capacity development events. However, stakeholders were able to use their skills to mainstream human rights throughout the UNDAF Mid-Term Review.

With the country-level Human Rights Advisor’s contract limited to an annual basis, it is unclear to UN stakeholders in the RCO and UNCT how long the advisor will be stationed in Costa Rica and whether the Advisor’s work should be project-oriented or designed for more long-term impact.
2.7. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Impact

• Due to the unsustainability of the Mesa de Diálogo as a result of the change in government, Indigenous issues were not advanced through constructive dialogue and land conflicts recently escalated into violence.

• The Human Rights Advisor is perceived by key UN stakeholders within the RCO and UNCT as working exclusively for OHCHR, which reduces the inter-agency impact of the Fund.
2.8. Overall Conclusions and Implications for the Global Evaluation

• The Fund has supported badly needed training among members of the UNCT to understand human rights mainstreaming and how to mainstream human rights throughout their work.

• The Fund supported the RC and the UNCT to play a crucial role at dialogue facilitation to meet key needs of government and civil society actors to come together to discuss and advance Indigenous Rights.

• Investments in targeted training led to concrete results with respect to mainstreaming human rights throughout the UNDAF.

• Dialogue efforts led to the advancement of important concepts such as the right to consultation.

• The Fund faces a lack of visibility at the country level with respect to its ability to support inter-agency collaboration, which may reduce its effectiveness at doing so.

• The lack of a seed budget associated with the Human Rights Advisors may be limited the extent of their effectiveness.

• The RCO and UNCT are unsure how to plan the Human Rights Advisor’s work without knowing how long the advisor will be in there to support the country.
Case-study: 3. Nigeria
3.1. List of Stakeholders consulted as part of the Nigeria Case Study

- Edward Kallon, UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator
- Gabriel Undelikwo, Community Mobilization Adviser, UNAIDS Country Office
- Rupa Bhadra, Advocacy Officer, UNAIDS Country Office
- Ulrich Garms, Terrorism Prevention Branch, UNODC
- Simon Ridley, Chief Technical Advisor Rule of Law and Human Rights, UNDP Nigeria
- Martin Ejidike, Senior Human Rights Advisor/ Head Human Rights Advisory Unit, Office of the UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator
- Joy Ezeilo, Dean Emeritus, University of Nigeria (UNN), Enugu Campus/Member, United Nations Civil Society Advisory Board on Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse/Founding Director, Women’s Aid Collective (WACOL)/Tamar Sexual Assault and Referral Centre/Chairperson, Sexual Assault Referral Network, Nigeria/Former United Nations Special Rapporteur on Trafficking in Persons, especially women and children (August 1, 2008 to July 31st 2014)
3.2. Overview of the Human Rights Context in Nigeria

The Nigeria National Human Rights Commission (NHRI) has been accredited with status “A” in accordance with the Paris Principles (from B in 2007) in 2011 and has maintained it in 2016.

The Nigerian Government has extended a standing invitation to all thematic special procedures since 25 October 2013.


Nigeria is a humanitarian context country.

HR Mainstreaming support provided by the Fund to Malawi included:

• Financial support for deployment country-level Human Rights Advisor since 2014.
• Access to human rights guidance documents, training materials, and dialogue platforms.
3.3. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Relevance/Coherence

HR are a core component of development and humanitarian coordination efforts in Nigeria because the development and humanitarian challenges are either rooted in or have HR-related implications.

The work of the HRA has focused on addressing UNCT needs in terms of mainstreaming HR into their programming but at the same time focused on strengthening HR systems at national level by engaging with national stakeholders at different levels.

The role of the RC is very critical in helping agencies realise their HR mainstreaming needs through ensuring common understanding of necessary steps towards mainstreaming HR. The HRA’s positioning within the RCO is advantageous to RC performing this role.

The comparative advantage of the person currently serving as an HRA is his understanding of the Nigerian context, which allows him to ensure that support provided to national HR structures is responsive to the needs of the context.

“All agencies have own national counterparts and own mandates; the HRA is necessary to bring everyone together. Having someone at RCO level benefits the cooperation between agencies where necessary.”
3.4. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Effectiveness

The UNCT efforts as a whole in Nigeria on HR have become more more strengthened over time. This can be observed in the fact that overall partnership on the UNCT with the NHRIs has significantly improved. Also, coordination on security sector has been more coherent and coordinated - there has been a larger presence seen in conflict areas at the peak of the conflict. However, the UNCT has still been struggling to address issues together on regular basis.

“While the HRA's presence at RCO is clearly beneficial to bringing agencies together on HR issues, a robust coordination mechanism is still missing - there is no platform for the agencies to come together on HR besides UNCT meetings. For e.g. there is an interagency-working group on gender and communication which is very effective. UNCT should have something similar on HR”

The HRA support during the UNCT planning processes – e.g. the CCA has contributed from inclusion of the prevention check-list (mainstreaming conflict prevention, human rights and gender) into the CCA. The UNSDPF 2018-2022 “is built on several vital principles and considerations. These include effective partnership and the UN programming principles of human rights”.

“Direct support to the RCO by the HRA in supporting advocacy and programme development and implementation has been a central function of the HRA and achievements In this area are because of HRA’s presence”

SR visits in the period of HRA’s deployment have increased two-fold and Nigeria has extended a standing invitation to all thematic special procedures since 2015.

HRA’s efforts have contributed to significant strengthening of national HR systems and institutions. For example, creation of the HR Desk at the Army, that aims to strengthen the army’s capacity to investigate and report human rights violations, has benefitted from a technical and advocacy-level contribution from the HRA as well as a collaboration with the UN Country Team on the Code of Conduct of its army to make it fully compliant with international human rights and humanitarian standards.

“The UN Reform aims to improve accountability. With this, the HRA deployments become even more critical because the function of the HRA in itself increases accountability”
3.5. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Efficiency

Lack of own funding of the HRA is one of the factors that hinders timeliness.

The HRA has successfully collaborated with the RC and UNCT to secure funding for programmatic efforts related to addressing HR in Nigeria through developing several projects: e.g. “Integrated Approach to Building peace in Nigeria’s Farmer-Herder Crisis, that secured majority of its funding (3m USD) from the PBF.

The additional funding, secured for HRA work in collaboration with the RC has allowed the HRA to increase the human resources around HR by creating the Human Rights Advisory Unit within the Office of the UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator. This has allowed the HRA to increase efficiency through delegation.

“One of the factors facilitating timeliness has been the close connection of HRA to OHCHR. The link provides the HRA access to HR mechanisms on a global level.

"The complexity of issues in the Nigerian context would require the HRA to be leading a team. And he would need a substantially larger team to follow-up on many things to assist agencies to mainstream HR and to manage upwards tools with the RC"
3.6. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Sustainability

“It is important to note that sustainability should be prioritized on basis of national capacities. National institutional capacity should be strengthened. If ownership of HR mainstreaming is given to the government and communities then sustainability will be re-enforced.”

Considering civil society as a key actor in HR mainstreaming and promoting the work of the HRA with them would be key to ensuring sustainability.

The HRA position is reliant on RC support of the role.

The fact that the HRA doesn't have own funding means the person relies on external funding sources.

The HRA's role in working with national authorities is an element contributing to sustainability.

The essence of the Humanitarian-Development Nexus is that efforts need to be sustainable. Ensuring that HR is at the centre of humanitarian-development efforts is key for sustainability.
3.7. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Impact

The projects and knowledge products created under the leadership, guidance and support of the HRA are almost all making reference to HRA’s affiliation with OHCHR and not the Fund: E.g. project document “Integrated Approach to Building peace in Nigeria’s Farmer-Herder Crisis from the PBF, mentions the HRA’s efforts in the context of OHCHR. The Brief 9 on the Covid-19 impacts on human rights in Nigeria is credited to separate agencies, including OHCHR and does not mention the HRA’s involvement on the brief. The OHCHR in Nigeria website states: ““OHCHR has a Human Rights Adviser (HRA) deployed in Nigeria to support and assist the Resident Coordinator and the UN Country Team” (https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Countries/AfricaRegion/Pages/NGSummary2019.aspx)

A significant contribution to HR mainstreaming on the Humanitarian-Development Nexus was made by joint analyses and assessments carried out under the leadership of the HRA. In the case of the Recovery and Peace Building Assessment, the HRA led the interagency team in the analysis – that in turn led to the deployment of a humanitarian team (UNCT).
3.8. Overall Conclusions and Implications for the Global Evaluation

• Contribution made by the Fund towards mainstreaming of HR has been responsive to the needs of the RC, UNCT and national stakeholders.

• The Fund has provided significant value-added to inter-agency coordination and cooperation around human rights through deployment of the HRA.

• HRA’s efforts, seen as representing OHCHR may have reduced the visibility and appreciation among stakeholders of the Fund.

• At the same time, HRA’s close collaboration with OHCHR has contributed to the effectiveness and efficiency of the results achieved by the HRA, especially in regards to strengthening national HR systems.

• Agencies’ individual HRBA guidance documents are still perceived as primary guiding tools and documents for them.

• The Fund’s support has resulted in strengthening of Nigeria’s reporting on human rights and engagement with human rights mechanisms as well as strengthening of national HR stakeholders’ capacities to work on HR.
Case-study: 4. Jordan
4.1. List of Stakeholders consulted as part of the Jordan Case Study

- Anders Pedersen, UN Resident Coordinator and Humanitarian Coordinator in Jordan
- Costanza Farina, UNESCO Representative to Jordan
- Enshrah Ahmed, Head of Office, UNFPA
- Bushra Abushahout, Political Specialist on Participation, UN Women
- Ettie Higgins, Deputy Representative, UNICEF
- Sara Ferrer Olivella, Resident Representative UNDP
- Ekkehard Strauss, Former Senior Human Rights Advisor in Jordan
- Natheer Awamleh, Governmental Coordinator for HR/HR FP in Government, Office of the Human Rights Focal Point
- Monica Rispo, Programme Specialist, Norwegian Refugee Council ICLA (Information, Counselling and Legal Assistance)
4.2. Overview of the Human Rights Context in Jordan

The Jordan National Centre for Human Rights has been accredited status “A” in accordance with the Paris Principles in 2007 and has maintained this status in 2016.

The Government of Jordan has extended a standing invitation to all thematic special procedures since 20 April 2006.

Jordan is a humanitarian context country.

HR Mainstreaming support provided by the Fund to Jordan included:

- Deployment of an HRA to Jordan has successfully culminated in 2020.
- Following departure of the HRA, the RC has requested another HRA to be deployed to support the RCO.
- Access to human rights guidance documents, training materials, and dialogue platforms.
4.3. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Relevance/Coherence

Having HR capacity in the RCO is very valuable to the RC.

The HRBA training for project staff (2018) organized by the HRA demonstrated interest in the topic, but at the same time highlighted continued discrepancies in the understanding the way HRBA should be mainstreamed at individual agencies as well as the need to continue efforts of strengthening HRBA at individual agency level as individual agencies’ capacities are very different.

The LNOB analysis, prepared by the HRA before leaving Jordan will be included in the CCA.

The Rule of Law consultation group was established by the HRA and UNDP in 2018 to respond to the need of the bilateral donors, international NGOs, UNCT for coordination of human rights efforts. The high level of attendance demonstrates the interest of actors in sharing information.

Where sensitive HR issues are concerned, local civil society actors may not be very outspoken. Civil society needs include advocacy support for the sensitive issues where the UN benefits from its authority, position and strong standing with the gov-nt. There is need to improve in this area.

“There is still a need to try to bring the objectives of the Fund – the aims, the general objectives of deploying the HRA to UNCT level and emphasize that HRA is there to support the UNCT.”
The global HR mainstreaming guidance served as a useful tool in preparing the CCA/UNDAF. The global guidance documents served as an institutional authority in the development and implementation of a process towards drafting a revised CCA.

The implementation of UPR and special procedures recommendations formed the main basis for the HRA cooperation with the UNCT, civil society and the government.

The work with the government centered around the establishment of a National Mechanism for reporting and Follow-Up (NMRF) and a related National Recommendations Tracking Database (NRTD).

“The HRA was involved in UNCT work as the reference for HR. UPR review for Jordan was great success of the HRA. The workshop put together for CSOs warranted lots of discussion. But unfortunately it stayed at discussion level and didn’t result in any further actions. However, the fact that it brought many people together around the UPR was a great success. HRA’s expertise gave authority to these meetings.”

The discrepancy between the own tools belonging to each agency for HR mainstreaming into the programming needs to be addressed.

The HRA organized a training on human rights mainstreaming for all members of the UNCT Result Groups in 2018, in cooperation with OCHA Regional Office for Middle East and North Africa (ROMENA).

The HRA used the SDGs and their underlying principle of LNOB as main vehicle for promoting the human rights agenda and find entry points with the UNCT, the government, civil society and international partners.

Efforts need to be made to improve collaboration with UNCT. Every agency has own mandate but there seems to be a lot of competition.
4.5. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Efficiency

HRA’s placement within the RCO created a comparative advantage to regular HR-focused advocacy efforts because the position within the RCO is stronger and has the potential to address more sensitive topics in a more timely manner.

Lack of own resources by the HRA can contribute to instances where processes take longer or where effectiveness is impacted negatively.

Lack of AWP/CP that would be reflecting HRA’s objectives and plans on how to achieve them has prevented coherent and comprehensive planning.

“The HRA comes with no resources. No travel budget – which makes it unnecessarily difficult to do or achieve anything”
4.6. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Sustainability

One of the challenges to sustainability of HRA’s work relates to work with the government. Lack of an institutional framework to collaborate with the government on human rights issues as well as lack of government buy-in towards deployment of the HRA may have affected the HRA’s ability to work on durable results.

HRA deployment is not measurable against a number of institutional goals (treaty body recommendations through existing database to follow these, Due Diligence Policy, Bi-annual discussions of HRUF, Regular reporting to treaty bodies, Functional standing invitation of the special procedures) – including such measures into the HRA deployment would be an important step towards promoting sustainability through the Fund’s Multi-tear Results Framework.

“If you are going to be serious about the HR agenda – it’s not something you do in your spare time – you have to put infrastructure and capacities in place. Building Infrastructure means prevention work.”

Engaging with national human rights mechanisms is critical to sustainability
4.7. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Impact

In 2019, two prevention-focused discussions based on the Secretary-General’s HRUF initiative, were organized by the HRA in close cooperation with the PDA aligning the Fund’s support to new priorities on HR mainstreaming.

RC and UNCT commitment are critical to HRA’s work and impact.

“There is limited degree of alignment of HRA’s placement with the strategic engagement with the government on HR issues. Due to lack of an institutional framework to work on HR with the government – most of the HR work is programming by agencies.

“Looking at the entire UNDS, some years ago there was complete lack of HR understanding. Nowadays most people would define themselves as supportive of HR. There has been a huge development in that regard.”
4.8. Overall Conclusions and Implications for the Global Evaluation

- Contributions made towards mainstreaming HR in Jordan are relevant and important
- The inter-agency nature of the HRA has allowed for increased work on HR mainstreaming especially in supporting strengthening of national HR systems
- Through the deployment of the HRA, the Fund has provided support to Jordan to strengthen their reporting on human rights and engagement with human rights mechanisms – in particular related to civil society engagement on the UPR
- The most recognized and appreciated aspect of the Fund’s work is deployment of the HRA
- HRA deployment has resulted in increased human rights mainstreaming throughout UNCT planning documents, however, the integration of human rights mainstreaming throughout country-level inter-agency individual programme implementation remains a weakness
- The HRA played a larger role than simply advising on human rights issues that includes improving collaboration between international partners. However, the fact that these areas of work are not supported with a budget envelope limits the effectiveness of the HRAs
Case-study:
5. Malawi
5.1. List of Stakeholders consulted as part of the Malawi Case Study

• Maria Jose Torres, Resident Coordinator, UN Malawi
• Nuha Ceesay, Country Director, UNAIDS Malawi
• Clara Anyangwe, Representative, UN Women Malawi
• Henok Ochalla Ogud, Senior Protection Officer (CRRF & Livelihoods), UNHCR Representation in Malawi
• Gift Trapence, Head of the Human Rights Defenders Coalition
• Martha Chizuma, Ombudsman
• Sabina Lauber, Senior Human Rights Advisor, RCO, UN Malawi
5.2. Overview of the Human Rights Context in Malawi

The Malawi Human Rights Commission was awarded “A” status accreditation against the Paris Principles in 2007 and has undergone several reviews where it was required to revise its internal governance procedures. With technical support from the SHRA, the Commission has maintained its accreditation status.

Malawi Government has extended a standing invitation to all thematic special procedures since 7 September 2015.

Within the period of 2010-2020, two successful country-visits of Special Procedures of the HRC have been concluded: SR on Food (2013) and IE on Albinism (2016).

Malawi is considered a humanitarian context country.

HR Mainstreaming support provided by the Fund to Malawi included:

- Financing the deployment of two consecutive HRAs in the RCO since 2014.
- Both HRAs demonstrated activity and results within the RCO, facilitating engagement with NHRIs and national stakeholders, as well as leading capacity building and collaborating with UNCT on HR programming.
- Access to human rights guidance documents, training materials, and dialogue platforms.
5.3. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Relevance/Coherence

The current HRA is a second deployment to Malawi, based on RC’s requests, which demonstrates that the function is filling gaps and is a useful instrument at RCO level.

The needs of the RC in terms of advocacy have been fulfilled by the presence of the HRA at the RCO.

The HRA deployed to Malawi has engaged on a number of various initiatives in response to the country-level needs pertaining to HR. Especially visible are those that pertain to supporting the RC and UNCT in responding to HR violations.

There has been and continues to be a growing interest from UNCT to collaborate on joint project proposals.

The proactive nature of the HRA has been of great support to the office of the Ombudsman, which has experienced positive collaboration with the HRA and RC together.

The HRA is seen by the UNCT as the person that is able to and has managed to bring UNCT agencies together under the HR framework. The HRA in Malawi has been very pro-active and this has been very welcome by the UNCT.

When it comes to mainstreaming HR, sometimes capacities are either unavailable or not existent to deal with the HR issues in general. It is then useful to have the support of an interagency mechanism.

"HRA is an Advisor - a messenger of the UN to national stakeholders. Without an HRA there may have been less engagement on HR by the UN"
5.4. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Effectiveness

HRA collaborated with UNFPA, UNDP, UNICEF and UN Women on a joint project proposal under the UN Partnership on the rights of persons with disabilities (UNPRPD) was effective and this work has been implemented over the past 2 years, to finish in March 2021. In 2020, UNCT agencies have started developing joint proposals. So far the proposals have pertained to rights of persons with disabilities.

The Malawi Human Rights Commission was awarded “A” status accreditation against the Paris Principles in 2007 and has undergone several reviews where it was required to revise its internal governance procedures. With technical support from the HRA, the Commission has maintained its accreditation status.

The engagement of the UN (HRA) has allowed for conversations on different int. reporting mechanisms - UPR. NGOs compiled their own reports but the UN supported engagement and participation of the NGOs in the review. to do so, the HRA has engaged different agencies as well, e.g. UNDP in the ICCPR in 2015.

Mainstreaming of HR (in particular, rights of persons with disabilities) into Malawi 2018 Census was ensured through deployment of the Human Rights Advisor.

Lack of financial and human resources supporting the HRA has had negative impact on HRA’s ability to engage on additional areas pertaining to HR.

“The UN agencies engage with the civil society on different levels, however most of the work is - with UNDP and HRA and UNW because engagement is based on projects and funding”

To increase capacity on HR of persons with disabilities, the HRA initiated and conducted four online trainings in September 2020, well attended by 20 – 35 UN staff per session, including heads of UNCT.

On HRBA - Agencies have own policies and tools on HRM which they find sufficient and logical as they are developed based on the specific international standards relevant to the mandate of each Agency, so they bring practice and theory closer to the mandate of the Agency.
5.5. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Efficiency

The Malawi UNCT agreed in 2020 to be part of the pilot phase for the UN Disability Scorecard, being rolled out by the Executive Office of the Secretary General. The HRA is leading the process in collaboration with a team of focal points from UNCT Agencies – utilizing agency Focal Points is an example of an efficient structure.

**Lack of human resources supporting the HRA have been considered to hinder timeliness an availability of support to UNCT on urgent HR issues.**

Comparing the efforts to mainstream HR to the SDGs, many stakeholders feel the SDGs receive more attention – there is a bigger push for the SDGs across the entire system and further. HR require a similar effort.

“OHCHR and DCO and UNSDG need to integrate the HR into the toolbox on SDGs. To avoid resistance from those who may feel this is too much”
5.6. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Sustainability

The sustainability of the results achieved by the HRA would depend on the specific UNCT composition and their willingness to work with the HRA. Currently the HRA is organizing trainings to transfer knowledge to agencies. And if there’s a very strong RCO to keep these agencies on track – then it will be sustainable. There must be a conscious effort to transfer knowledge from person level to systemic, agency level – HR should become part of the UNCT DNA.

The Fund’s visibility is closely related to visibility of results amongst donors. This is currently a gap – slow processes and results, such as mainstreaming HR institutionally should be made visible to donors in a systematic way – the importance of HR mainstreaming needs to be very clear.

Turnovers in UNCT international staff lead to loss of knowledge and capacities – this leads to gaps in potential sustainability.

Initiatives to promote UNCT capacities to mainstream HR in programming should be extended to national staff to address this gap.

UNCT buy-in is very important for promoting sustainability of the results already achieved on country-level.

“In strategic areas where the HRA intervenes - sustainability is evident. However, once the HRA leaves it is unclear who in the RCO will continue to provide similar level HR advise.”
5.7. Insights from the Case Study to the Global Evaluation with respect to Impact

HR need to be integrated into the toolbox on SDGs. This will help avoid resistance from those who may feel HR fatigue.

To national stakeholders - the UN has a comparative advantage compared to other actors due to the history and knowledge base in collaborating with the international HR mechanisms.

New UNDS priorities (in particular the HRUF) have been complementary and even instrumental to increased levels of attention to HR mainstreaming at country level.

The inclusion of HR mainstreaming function into ToRs of RCs is a result of conscious efforts to mainstream HR into UNDS better. The new RC ToR contributes to RCs understanding and commitment to mainstreaming HR – that is the minimum that’s needed to ensure HR mainstreaming has the attention it needs at country-level.

The vision of the role of the HRA from the Fund’s perspective may not always be shared amongst RCs and OHCHR and HRAs. Today this vision and resulting work is based on personalities. To maximise impact, RCs and UNCT need guidance on how to maximise the support provided by the HRAs.

The Fund needs to facilitate honest and frank discussions vs what the role of SHRAs would be with RCs. A short guidance note on role of SRAs in RC office given the new RC system. Robert Piper needs to have a discussion with RCs who have SHRAs - talk with RCs what’s working and what is not.

“Mainstreaming HR is much more than LNOB – it’s about strategic engagement, prevention”
5.8. Overall Conclusions and Implications for the Global Evaluation

• Contributions made towards mainstreaming HR in Malawi have been very relevant
• The inter-agency nature of the HRA has allowed for increased engagement and collaboration with the UNCT
• The HRA’s proactive attitude and RC’s personal devotion to HR has played an important role in the effectiveness of the HR mainstreaming in Malawi
• The Fund lacks visibility at country-level
• The most recognized and appreciated aspect of the Fund’s work is deployment of the HRAs
• The results achieved by the HRA are to be attributed to the Fund
• Support for Human Rights Advisors is good value for money
• The timeliness of deployment of the second HRA was reasonable
• The guidance and tools aimed at mainstreaming HR at country-level are of excellent quality but the fact that different agencies use different HRBA tools and are in common agreement over these remains a challenge to improved policy coherence