



**2010 ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT FOR PROJECT  
IRFFI/UNDG IRAQ TRUST FUND (UNDG ITF)**

**Participating UN Organization:**  
UNOPS, UNAMI HRO

**Old Cluster:**

**New Sector:** Protection Sector Outcome Team

**Project No. and Project Title:**  
F8-09  
*Programme Title: Support to Iraq's preparations for the Universal Periodic Review*

**Report Number:**  
ATLAS Project Number: (71108)  
ATLAS Award Number: (57519)

**Reporting Period:**  
1 January – 31 December 2010

**Project Budget** 1,700,000 USD

**List Implementing Partners:**  
UNOPS  
UNAMI HRO  
OHCHR  
MoHR

**Geographic Coverage/Scope:**  
Baghdad and communities served by 25 selected CSOs from different governorates (Kirkuk, Muthanna, Missan, Ninewa, Erbil, Anbar, Wassit, Kerbala, Babil, Basrah, Diyala and Salah Al-Din).

**Abbreviations and Acronyms:**  
UPR: Universal Periodic Review  
HRC: Human Rights Council  
UNOPS: United Nations Office for Project Services  
UNAMI HRO: United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq Human rights Office  
OHCHR: Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights  
MoHR: Ministry of Human Rights  
ICI: International Compact with Iraq  
NDS: Iraqi National Development Strategy  
POT: Protection Outcome Team  
CSO: Civil Society Organisation  
NGO: Non Governmental Organisation

**Project Status: On going**  
Duration: 24 months  
Start date: 27/05/2009  
Original end date: 27/11/2010  
Revised end date: 27/05/2011  
Budget Revisions/Extensions:

- 1<sup>st</sup> Extension up to 27 May 2011

## **NARRATIVE REPORT FORMAT**

### **I. Purpose**

The UPR project focuses on developing the capacity of the Government of Iraq (GoI) to meet its human rights treaty obligations under international law and to successfully participate in the UN Human Rights Council (HRC) Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process. The project, also aims to build capacity among Iraqi civil society organizations (CSOs) in human rights monitoring and reporting so that they can effectively contribute to the UPR stakeholder report and other human rights treaty body monitoring mechanisms.

Sector Team Outcome:

1. Improved protection of civilians throughout Iraq and creation of an environment which contributes to the observance of human rights for all Iraqis and mitigates the effects of forced displacement.

Joint Programme Outcome:

1. Transparent and accountable institutional mechanisms in place to report and respond to human rights situation in Iraq.

Key outputs:

1. MOHR and CSOs have the capacity to report on the HR situation in Iraq based on UPR mechanism
2. Improved dialogue between government and civil society on human rights issues

The outputs are to be achieved through the following activity areas:

1. GoI Report to UPR produced and reviewed
2. CSO report to UPR produced and included for consideration by the UPR
3. Support for increased awareness on UPR mechanism and other international human rights mechanisms
4. A lessons learned review is conducted and the results shared with all stakeholders
5. The content of the reports will be widely and publicly disseminated, contributing to trust building through enhanced transparency and accountability
6. A network of relevant civil society entities will be formed and trained on human rights reporting to the UPR and human rights treaty bodies.

**National priority or goals (NDS 2007- 2010 and ICI):**

**NDS:**

*8.3 Human Rights*

Goal: Uphold and protect human rights, establish the rule of law, and overcome the legacy of the recent and distant past

8.3.1 Establish a comprehensive human rights regime country wide

**ICI:** Although there is not a specific benchmark, the project supports section 3.3 regarding Human Rights:

Goal: Uphold and protect human rights, establish the rule of law, and overcome the legacy of the recent and distant past.

### 3.3.1 Establish a comprehensive human rights regime country wide

- The Government's capacity to report on its international human rights treaty obligations will be strengthened [...];
- The role of civil society will be strengthened [...]

## II. Resources

### *Financial Resources:*

- **Budget revisions approved by the Iraq Trust Fund Steering Committee**

In October 2010, the project requested a six month no cost extension from the ITF. The request was made in order to be able to complete the final activities of the project, which include the completion of information activities training for the MoHR on reporting skills and the project's final conference on the UPR. The final conference in particular required more time in order for the aims and content of the conference to be planned with the MoHR.

Although the extension was no cost, some minor revisions were made to the existing budget in order to extend staff costs for national staff to cover them during the extension period. An amount of 21,000 USD was moved from contracts to personnel. In addition, some minor adjustments were made within the categories for 'supplies' and for 'other direct costs' respectively. (See attached copy of extension document and budget revision for details.)

The extension was approved on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2010 and the project will now run until 27<sup>th</sup> May 2011.

- **Good practices and constraints in the mechanics of the financial process, times to get transfers, identification of potential bottlenecks, need for better coordination, etc.**

In general, the financial process with the UNDG-ITF is very well managed as funds for newly approved projects are transferred in a few days after the official signature of the Project Document. There are no real bottlenecks and currently budget revisions are processed quickly.

### *Human Resources:*

- **National Staff:**

The Project Manager (see below) is supported by a **full-time National Project Officer**, who manages the day to day project activities and follows up on administrative requirements.

A **part-time National Finance Assistant and a part-time Procurement Officer (50%)** based in Amman, Jordan work in close liaison with the **UNOPS Finance and Procurement Unit** in support of the project. These two part-time positions are only budgeted for 10 months each, based on the spread of project activities throughout the duration of the project and the need for administrative support.

UNOPS field staff, although not directly linked to the project, may provide in country support on occasion as is necessary,

- **International Staff:**

An international **Project Manager (60%)** has the responsibility of overseeing the overall management of the project in addition to preparing the stipulated financial and narrative reports.

### **III. Implementation and Monitoring Arrangements**

UNOPS is responsible for the overall implementation of the project. Capacity building activities, study tours and workshops are either conducted directly by UNOPS or by consultants subcontracted by UNOPS.

UNAMI HRO, with the assistance of OHCHR substantially contributes to the implementation of the activities by providing qualitative assessment and analysis of the activities and ensuring that they are in line with the UNAMI mandate and the requirements of the UN Human Rights Protection System, in particular the UPR process and Human Rights Council.

MoHR is the line ministry for the project and leads the project steering committee mechanism in order to make sure that outputs and achievements are fully in line with MoHR needs. MoHR also provides the staff to be trained for the report writing under the project.

- **The procurement procedures utilized and explain variances in standard procedures.**

UNOPS standard procurement rules are used for any subcontracting and procurement under the project, including the hiring of consultancies to implement training under the project outputs. UNOPS procures goods and services in close collaboration with its Clients (in this case UNAMI HRO is considered UNOPS Client for the project), and where necessary, the Iraqi authorities, and the project Beneficiaries.

Under the activities carried out in 2010, the main procurement activities included the hiring of consultancy services for the implementation of technical assistance and training workshops. The main method of evaluation of offers for these services was either desk review of CVs or public/open requests for proposals with a competitive evaluation process depending on price ceiling, in accordance with UNOPS procurement and human resources procedures.

UNOPS also has a Long Term Agreement (signed in accordance with its procurement rules) with a travel agency that has provided certain logistical support services to project workshops held in Iraq during the reporting period.

UNOPS utilizes standard procurement process according to its procurement manual\* and following principles

- a) Best value for money
- b) Fairness, integrity and transparency
- c) Effective competition
- d) The best interests of UNOPS and its clients

UNOPS procures goods and services in close collaboration with the Clients, Iraqi authorities, and the Beneficiaries. While the individual arrangements vary depending on the Client and the specific project requirements, the general modalities are:

### **Requirements**

- Upon request of Client, and together with the Iraqi counterparts, identify the goods and services for UNOPS to provide or contract.
- Preparation of detailed specifications of equipment and services and work plan, by UNOPS, based on input and with the support from the Client, the Iraqi authorities and the beneficiaries.
- UNOPS utilizes standard procurement process, including; Request for Quotations (RFQ), Invitation to Bid (ITB), Request for Proposal (RFP)

### **Short-listing**

- UNOPS has developed and maintains a database of known suppliers and service providers in Iraq (incl. performance assessment, capacity, registration in Iraq, etc.) and a roster of registered experts.
- Qualified and potentially interested vendors in the area can also be drawn from the local authority's relevant company registration offices.
- Alternatively, interested companies can be requested to submit their profiles in response to an Expression of Interest ad published in the Iraqi and/or international media (incl. internet).
- Where necessary and relevant, information on companies/vendors can also be drawn from other UN agencies and entities operating in Iraq.
- The short-list of companies selected to be included in the procurement exercise requires approval by the Regional Director, confirming that all relevant sources of information have been utilized for compiling the list.

### **Tendering Process**

- UNOPS issues an Invitation to Bid/Request for Proposal to all short-listed companies, requesting them to submit an Offer/Proposal in line with the specific requirements. The document also stipulates the exact process of submission, receipt, opening, and evaluation of bids and it informs on the nature of the contract/purchase order the selected bid could result in.
- Requests for clarification received from potential bidders are responded to by UNOPS, if necessary upon consultation with the Client, relevant Iraqi authorities, and/or Beneficiaries.
- After expiration of the submission deadline, all Bids received are opened by a UNOPS Bid Opening Committee. The opening ceremony is open to observers from the Client, relevant Iraqi authorities, the Beneficiaries, as well as for companies participating in the tender.

- The evaluation follows UNOPS standard procedure, varying on procurement type and value, and should result in a recommendation for award of contract to the lowest, compliant bid. This recommendation requires approval by the relevant authority within UNOPS.

\*<http://www.unops.org/english/whatwedo/services/procurement/Pages/Procurementpolicies.aspx>

- **The monitoring system**

Monitoring of the project is carried out using a number of methods. UNOPS closely follows all contractual obligations and works to ensure that all project outputs are achieved. To do this, regular written and oral communication between the UNOPS project manager and UNAMI HRO is used to follow up on project activities and carefully plan future activities under the project. Regular meetings are also held between UNOPS and UNAMI HRO to discuss the project activities and work plan.

In addition to meetings and correspondence, UNOPS field staff based in Iraq also provide monitoring support for the project by regularly attending project activities and providing feedback to the project manager and national project officer in Amman who also make frequent visits to Iraq to monitor project activities and meet with counterparts and civil society.

UNAMI HRO, in its advisory role, coordinates with MoHR and ensures monitoring and follow-up of any issues at the political level that may impact on the project implementation. Any issues raised are relayed to the UNOPS project manager for relevant action to be taken if needed.

#### **IV. Results**

- **Programme progress in relation to planned outcomes and outputs;**

The programme of activities for the UPR support project focuses on building the capacity of the government and civil society to meet reporting requirements for and successfully participate in the UPR process for Iraq. In 2009 the project supported the submission of the national UPR report and a contribution to the stakeholder report from civil society among its main activities (see 2009 annual report for further details).

With this important part of the UPR process completed, activities in 2010 have centred on the review and follow up of the UPR reports for Iraq and supporting the government to consider how it will implement the UPR recommendations. The project has also focused on the capacity of civil society to continue to monitor and report on the human rights situation in Iraq (for example through the UN treaty bodies) and raise awareness and monitor the implementation of the UPR recommendations.

Under output 1 the following activities were planned for implementation during the project timeframe. Items 1.1 to 1.6 were completed in 2009. Only activities under items 1.4 and 1.7 were planned for 2010.

- 1.1 Trainings on international human rights obligations
- 1.2 Study Tour to Iraq (replaced by a study tour from Iraq to Bahrain as reported in 2009)
- 1.3 Support to report writing
- 1.4 Participation to UPR working group session and OHCHR briefings
- 1.5 Information campaigns on UPR Mechanism
- 1.6 Selection of CSOs
- 1.7 Trainings for CSOs on UPR and reporting mechanisms

Under output 2 the following activities were planned for implementation during the project timeframe: Most of the activities were due to be implemented in 2010, with the exception of activity 2.1 and 2.3, which were

partially completed in 2009 with reporting skills training delivered to Iraqi human rights organisations in November 2009 and support given to set up a CSO network (see previous annual report).

- 2.1 Support to report writing
- 2.2 CSOs grants
- 2.3 Creation of CSOs network
- 2.4 Steering Committee meetings
- 2.5 Final Conference

Under output 1, 86% of activities have been achieved since the beginning of the project, of which 9% was completed in 2010. The majority of work in 2010 fell under output 2 under which 75% of activities have been completed since the start of the project, of which 50% were carried out in 2010.

In terms of variance in activities, the project was originally expected to close at the end of November 2010. However, (as explained under section II of this report) a 6 month no cost extension was granted in October 2010 so that certain activities could be moved forward to 2011. These activities were therefore not completed during this reporting period as was initially expected.

The extension was requested in particular to allow for the completion of the national conference, which could not be carried out in 2010 as planned. The planning of a national conference requires considerable input and consultation on objectives and content prior to implementation. By September 2010 it was felt that progress on the contents of the conference, and in particular on an MoHR draft UPR plan to be discussed at the event, was insufficient and required more work. In order to achieve a better result, it was decided that more time for planning and preparation work with the MoHR would be beneficial to the conference activity. Consequently, the extension request was made in order to move the conference into 2011 rather than holding it in November 2010 as originally planned.

Two planned training activities for MoHR were also pushed forward to 2011 to allow time for the new Iraqi government to be formed and to wait for clarity on the future of the MoHR, which came under debate during the post election period in 2010.

- **The key outputs achieved in the reporting period including # and nature of the activities (inputs), % of completion and beneficiaries.**

## **Output 1**

As mentioned above, 86% of activities have been achieved since the beginning of the project under output 1, of which 9% was completed in 2010. Under output 1 three main activities were implemented as detailed below.

The main focus of work under output 1 in 2010 was on supporting the government of Iraq to complete the UPR review process through their participation in the UPR sessions in Geneva. The main beneficiary under the output was the government of Iraq and specifically the delegation led by MoHR that attended the UN Human Rights Council review and final outcome sessions in February and June 2010 respectively. Civil society members also benefitted through project support that allowed 2 representatives from the team of CSOs that contributed to the stakeholder report to attend the Geneva review session in February.

### *UPR Session Briefing for the GoI*

Under the project, GoI participation in the UPR session for Iraq in Geneva was supported through a pre departure briefing for the delegation held in Amman from 8<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2010. The briefing was specifically requested by the GoI in order to assist the official UPR delegation to prepare for the review and

refresh their understanding of the review process. The delegation included the Minister of Human Rights, MoHR staff and representatives from the MoFA, MoEd and MoJ.

The briefing gave an overview of the review procedures and logistics and allowed the delegation to discuss their preparation of responses to potential review questions. The briefing was delivered by specialist consultants and included presentations from a representative of the government of Jordan who told the delegation about Jordan's UPR experience. In addition, the delegation discussed key issues from the Iraq national report with technical support from the consultant who assisted the MoHR drafting committee for the UPR report in 2009.

#### *CSO attendance of the UPR session for Iraq*

The project also provided support to two representatives from two Iraqi CSOs to attend the UPR review session in Geneva as observers. Their attendance of the review in Geneva allowed them to consolidate their knowledge of the UPR process and understand civil society's role in the UPR follow up process. In addition, CSOs attending the review and government representatives had the opportunity to meet on 19<sup>th</sup> February following the adoption session. During their meeting the two groups discussed the recommendations and shared ideas the way forward in terms of implementation and follow-up.

#### *The UPR Session for Iraq*

On 16<sup>th</sup> February 2010, Iraq was examined under the UPR mechanism at the 7<sup>th</sup> session of the UPR working group. A delegation headed by the Minister of Human Rights presented the report to the Human Rights Council (HRC) in Geneva. The review represented the successful culmination of work carried out by the GoI to prepare Iraq's submission to the UPR.

Following the review, the outcome report drafted by the UPR working group was adopted on 19<sup>th</sup> February. At the adoption the Iraqi government accepted 77% of the 176 recommendations proposed by the Member States in the country report, including the following:

- (i) to strengthen efforts to bring domestic human rights legislation into line with international human rights law, including constitutional legislation;
- (ii) to issue a standing invitation to all human rights special procedures;
- (iii) to improve cooperation with United Nations Treaty Bodies by submitting overdue reports;
- (iv) to promptly establish the Independent Higher Commission for Human Rights;
- (v) to advance the promotion of gender equality and equity including enacting legislation to combat domestic violence and sexual violence and ban female genital mutilation;
- (vi) to adopt measures to criminalize the recruitment of child soldiers;
- (vii) to consider enacting a specific law to combat trafficking of persons.

Among the recommendations not supported by the Iraqi government at the time of the adoption were the moratorium and abolition of the death penalty, the decriminalization of homosexuality and the increase of penal responsibility to the age of 18.

The UPR reports for Iraq and the Outcome report containing the recommendations are annexed to this report and can also be downloaded from the OHCHR website:



<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/Documentation.aspx> On 11<sup>th</sup> June 2010 the final outcome report for the UPR for Iraq was formally adopted in Geneva by the Human Rights Council (HRC) marking the last step in this cycle of the review process for Iraq. A delegation headed by the Minister for Human Rights attended the session; however, their attendance was not financially supported by the project. Following the acceptance of 135 out of 176 UPR recommendations in February, no further recommendations were officially accepted by the government at the final adoption stage in June, although the opportunity is given for states to do this.

### *Support to government information activities on the UPR*

In 2010, plans were made to support the GoI in its public information work on the UPR, this included training for the media unit of MoHR on developing messages on the UPR and publication of public information materials on the UPR. However, during the planning stages for these activities, the project was extended into 2011 and it was decided for scheduling purposes to complete the activities in 2011. In 2010 only preparatory and contractual arrangements were made for the activities. Implementation details will be covered in the next annual report.

## **Output 2**

Under output 2, 75% of activities have been completed since the start of the project, of which 50% were carried out in 2010. Under output 2, 16 main activities were implemented, including 4 training workshops and 10 grants.

The main activities in 2010 focused on further training for civil society in reporting and monitoring on human rights and awareness raising activities on the UPR and its recommendations for Iraq. Furthermore, technical assistance was provided to the MoHR to support them in their work to draft a UPR action plan in preparation for the planned national conference on the implementation of the UPR recommendations,

### *Steering Committee Meeting: focus on CSO dialogue*

On 28<sup>th</sup> April 2010 the project held its first steering committee meeting in Baghdad with video conference link to colleagues in Amman. The meeting was chaired by the MoHR, represented by the deputy Minister and attended by MoHR counterparts and representatives from UNAMI HRO, UNOPS and civil society participants to the project. The steering committee reviewed the project activities to date and noted in particular the need to further promote dialogue and networking among civil society and the government for the UPR process and for human rights work in general. In addition, it was agreed that in terms of CSO participation, further efforts should be made to try to ensure a better representation of women in project activities.

The meeting also discussed the implementation of the UPR recommendations and information activities on the UPR process. In order to further promote dialogue between government and civil society, it was agreed that a selected number of government officials would be invited to attend certain selected sessions of the upcoming training on shadow reporting (mentioned below) in order to share information and discuss Iraq's treaty obligations. In addition, it was agreed that CSOs would be provided with grants for information activities would be encouraged to coordinate and include government counterparts in their activities where they deem it appropriate.

### *Shadow reporting training package for civil society*

A series of four training courses were planned under the project with the objective of building the capacity of civil society to monitor and report on the human rights situation in Iraq through international mechanisms. The trainings were delivered between June and December 2010 by a specialist consultancy, which used Arabic

speaking human rights experts as trainers. 25 NGOs were selected to participate in all 4 consecutive trainings following a selection process carried out by UNAMI HRO and UNOPS. The original target for this training was 50 civil society participants, however the experience of this project is that the number of committed human rights NGOs with the basic human rights knowledge required for this type of training is relatively low. It was therefore decided to reduce the original target number by half and concentrate on providing in depth training to the most able NGO representatives. Selected participants included the most qualified members of the group of NGOs trained on the UPR under the project in 2009<sup>1</sup> and additional NGOs representative selected for their commitment and level of human rights work.

Geographical balance was considered in the selection, with representatives from the north, centre and south of the country selected. The project also aimed to improve female participation. While this proved difficult because in the Iraqi context NGO staff is predominantly male, six highly qualified women participated in the four workshops. Previous activities only managed to include 3-4 female participants, so a slight increase was achieved from 14% in 2009 to 24% in 2010.

A number of officials from MoHR were invited to attend each of the training workshops in order to share experience and promote dialogue between government and civil society. The presence of MoHR officials was welcomed by the NGO participants and fruitful exchange was made during each workshop. Although government presence was initially limited to selected sessions in order to allow space for civil society participants, the success of MoHR participation led to requests from the NGO participants that the officials attend all sessions in order to continue their discussions and exchange. This was done during the 3<sup>rd</sup> and fourth workshops.

The training series focused on the reporting mechanisms and the role of civil society in shadow reporting. Topics included legal frameworks, international standards for reporting and data collection, drafting skills and monitoring and advocacy work as follow up to treaty body observances. Each training course covered the human rights conventions signed or ratified by Iraq<sup>2</sup> in turn, allowing participants to become familiar with the specifics of each convention and understand how they as civil society members can work to help ensure the provisions of the conventions are observed and implemented by Iraq.

The overall assessment of participants by the trainers at the end of the training package was that the workshops had significantly increased participant knowledge of the treaty bodies and built their capacity to draft shadow reports. It was noted that all participants need to engage themselves in regular report writing as part of their NGO work in order to improve their skills and reap the full benefit of the training series.

#### *Technical Assistance to MoHR to develop a UPR Action Plan*

From July to August 2010, technical assistance was provided to the MoHR to develop an implementation plan for the UPR recommendations. The plan is intended to be presented for discussion at the national conference on the implementation of the UPR to be organized by the project in 2011. In addition, UNAMI HRO recommended that the plan should serve as a basis for developing a fuller human rights strategy for Iraq.

An international consultant was sent to Baghdad for 4 weeks to provide technical advice to the MoHR to facilitate their work on the plan. An initial draft was prepared in July by MoHR staff in consultation with relevant government ministries. During the last quarter of 2010, the plan was sent for internal discussion and review by the GoI. At this time, the project advised that the initial document required some additional work in

---

<sup>1</sup> Not all members of the previous group trained for the UPR stakeholder submission were selected for this training. This was decided by the project management team because the level of human rights knowledge and commitment to human rights work demonstrated during their participation in previous project activities was not considered sufficient for some to benefit from the shadow reporting training.

<sup>2</sup> ICCPR, ICESCR, CRC, CEDAW, CERD (plus an overview of CED, which has not yet entered into force)

order to fine tune it before finalization, and proposed that further technical advice could be provided by UNAMI HRO in order to have the final draft ready for presentation at the national conference. More details on the action plan will be reported in 2011.

### *10 CSO grants for awareness raising activities on the UPR*

In 2010 the project began work to award 10 small grants to civil society organisations. The purpose of the grants is for CSOs to raise public awareness of the UPR for Iraq and its implications.

A public request for proposals was launched in June 2010 in accordance with UNOPS internal rules for grant management. All CSOs that had participated in the UPR project were notified that they could apply. In addition, details of the request for proposals were sent to UNAMI HRO and UNOPS CSO mailing lists, in order to ensure eligible CSOs were aware of the grants.

34 grant proposals were received in total and were evaluated by the project management team. 10 proposals were selected to receive grant funding. However, the general quality of proposals received was not very high and although 10 were selected as suitable for funding, 6 of the proposals underwent further revisions at the contract negotiation stage in order to ensure that the full requirements of the terms of reference for the grants were met. It should be noted here that many of the CSOs trained under the UPR project failed to apply for the grants in spite of being informed of the request for proposals. The proposals selected therefore had to be carefully reviewed to ensure sufficient understanding of the UPR process. The few proposals coming from CSOs trained on the UPR were among the strongest and were selected in addition to other qualified NGOs.

Target groups ranged from specific groups such as active civil society members, youth, journalists and minorities, to the general public depending on the grant concerned. The grant activities and target groups were all designed and proposed by the organisations themselves during the proposal stage.

All grants were monitored by UNOPS field staff, who regularly attended grant activities and provided support to grant recipients on financial and reporting requirements.

Grant activities began in the final quarter of 2010 and continued into 2011. Further information on the final results of the grants will therefore be reported under the 2011 annual report. Grant activities carried out in this reporting period included information seminars and workshops as well as radio programmes, poster campaigns and other similar awareness activities.

Those grants that were fully implemented in the reporting period demonstrated some useful results. Most CSOs reported that a majority of participants to their awareness raising activities did not have a significant knowledge of the UPR prior to attending the events. However, they reported that a majority acquired at least a basic understanding of what the UPR was and what the recommendations involved as a result of their participation. Where the target groups involved members of the general public, awareness of basic human rights issues was not as high and the grants contributed to generally raising awareness of human rights and promoting dialogue on human rights issues in addition to focusing on the UPR.

Some granted NGOs working to raise awareness among other NGOs set up networks in their geographical areas and made plans to continue following the implementation of the UPR after their grants had finished. For example in Kirkuk a network of 10 local CSOs was set up and plans to carry out monitoring activities, meetings with local government and develop further project proposals linked to working on the UPR. Another, grant recipient in Erbil that had participated in the UPR training used the grant to train other active human rights organizations on the UPR and then supported them as a network to raise awareness in their home areas (across Iraq).

Following a request from the MoHR at the 2009 steering committee meeting, grant recipients were encouraged in the terms of reference for their activities to create space for dialogue with government. Many grant recipients took up this objective and either invited local government officials to attend their events or arranged direct meetings to discuss the UPR (for example in Erbil, Kirkuk and Missan). This approach was generally well received by local governments and a good level of dialogue was achieved, however, some grant recipients reported that local government awareness of the UPR was relatively low. The discussions held therefore served mainly to raise local government awareness, rather than allowing for more in depth dialogue on the implementation of the UPR.

Nevertheless, some grants achieved particularly successful results from engaging with local governments. For example, following the success and momentum of one UPR grant implemented in Missan, whose main activities were attended by key local government officials, the Missan Provincial Council held a conference on human rights in the governorate to commemorate Human Rights Day in December 2010. The conference involved local NGOs as well as local government and international stakeholders. It focused on a number of key human rights issues including security and violence, access to basic social services, women's rights and detainee rights. The Provincial Council intends to make the conference an annual event and has set up an official committee to follow up on conference recommendations.

In addition, one grant recipient's activities in Erbil raised much interest with local members of the Kurdistan Parliament and as a result a formal meeting between CSOs and MPs is planned for January 2011, to discuss the implementation of UPR recommendations.

#### *Creation of a CSO Network*

Under the training activities implemented in 2009, the project had planned to support the creation of a network of human rights NGOs to follow up on the UPR process. The intention was that the 25 NGOs trained on submitting a contribution to the stakeholder report would form this network. However, as mentioned above, not all NGOs that participated in the training demonstrated significant commitment to human rights issues and to the UPR during the training and meetings to discuss the network. As a result, a group of 15 NGOs from the group broke off from the proposed network, mainly due to disagreement with the remaining members.

The breakaway group have since formed their own network and have been active in following the UPR process and other human rights issues in Iraq. Many of the members of this group have also continued to participate in the UPR support project activities including as participants to the shadow reporting training. The other NGOs from the original 25 have in general not been committed to forming a network and formal follow up from the project slowed down.

In 2010 the project discussed with members of the breakaway group and proposed that where necessary, the project can support their work. It was suggested that the network should contact UNAMI HRO and UNOPS for this purpose when they felt the need. Information on the network was sent to the project and some members applied for and received awareness grants under the project, which has partly supported their UPR work. The network will be kept informed of plans for the UPR conference in 2011 and is invited to attend.

- **The delays in programme implementation, the nature of the constraints, actions taken to mitigate future delays and lessons learned in the process.**

As detailed in previous sections, the project has been extended by a further six months into 2011. This extension was made because certain delays had been experienced in finalising preparations for the national conference planned to take place at the end of the project. In particular, time was lost in the preparation of a draft government plan for the implementation of the UPR recommendations, a task that requires considerable input and discussion from the MoHR and other government offices. During 2010 it was decided that progress

on the preparations for the conference were not sufficient to hold the event in 2010 and the activity was therefore delayed until 2011. In terms of lessons learned, it was agreed that more technical support from the project should be provided to MoHR to assist them in completing the plan. This will be followed closely by UNAMI Human Rights Office in 2011.

A general slowing of work in the ministries was also perceived by the project in the post election period 2010 while attempts were made to form the government (March-December 2010). Nevertheless, activities with civil society were able to continue at a regular pace during this period.

Constraints to the project were mainly caused by the security situation in Iraq. Tragically, after the UPR session in February, two officials from the 20 person government delegation that travelled to Geneva were targeted in Baghdad shortly after their return to Iraq. One was killed and the other seriously injured. Another member of the delegation was later killed in an indiscriminate bomb attack.

In general, CSO members and in particular human rights activists continue to face threats in Iraq due to the nature of their work. This affected some participants to project activities although no direct link between threats and their participation in the UPR project has been established. National staff working for the UN also continue to be subject to threats.

In addition, the steering committee meeting had to be rescheduled once (eventually held in April) due to security constraints that prevented UN staff from getting into Baghdad to attend the meeting. It also remains difficult to maintain regular meetings with MoHR counterparts because of movement constraints for project staff.

- **The key partnerships and collaborations, and their impact on the achievement of results.**

The project is implemented by UNOPS in close cooperation with UNAMI HRO. UNOPS is responsible for implementing the project in operational terms, while UNAMI HRO provides overall technical supervision for the project. OHCHR is also consulted in project activities and has provided training support to workshops for government officials on the UPR mechanism.

MoHR as the project's line ministry is regularly consulted on project activities and takes a lead role as chair of the project steering committee.

The relationship between all project partners is strengthened by regular communication, correspondence and meetings to discuss project implementation and progress. In general the project partnerships work well and have a positive impact on the project implementation. However, in general, the restrictions on UN international staff movement impact on relations with government counterparts because regular meetings and visits to the MoHR premises are not possible. Much of the communication is done by phone or pre planned meetings in the IZ, which is not ideal for this type of project.

- **Other highlights and cross-cutting issues pertinent to the results being reported on.**

**National Capacity:** The trainings, workshops and study tours provided for government officials and CSOs focused on developing the capacity of Iraq to meet its human rights reporting obligations and contributed to building CSOs' capacities to monitor the human rights situation in the country.

**Security:** The promotion of human rights and having well trained government officials and civil society organizations able to monitor and report on human rights violations in Iraq should, in the long term, have a positive impact on the security situation.

**Gender:** All objectives and activities for this project are formulated and planned according to principles of gender balance and gender equality. This should be reflected in a gender balance amongst participants at workshops and training sessions and in the distribution of grants to organizations (including those working on women's issues) to raise awareness on human rights under the project. To date, gender balance amongst participants has not been satisfactory and though nominations of representatives at workshops are made by the participating ministries and CSOs themselves, and is outside the direct control of UNOPS, the project has made efforts to increase female participation by encouraging female applicants for trainings and asking counterparts and CSO partners to consider female candidates when appointing people to take part in project activities. In the training activities carried out in 2010, female participation did increase slightly, up from 14% in 2009 to 24% in 2010.

**Employment:** Activities may have a positive, although indirect, impact on employment both in the public and non-governmental sectors. Through strengthening the capacity of government and CSO officials it is hoped that these officials will be further supported in the execution of their current tasks but persons trained will benefit from their newly acquired abilities also in their continued careers. On the level of civil society, capacity building also strengthens CSOs ability to better perform and to receive funding from donors, which in turn enables them to grow and employ more staff in the future.

## **V. Future Work Plan (if applicable)**

The activities planned for 2011 are as follows:

- Support to report writing (for MoHR)
- Information campaigns on UPR Mechanism
- Continued support to CSOs network as required
- Finalisation of CSO grants
- Steering Committee meeting
- Continued technical support from UNAMI HRO to the MOHR for the UPR action plan
- Final Conference

The budget remaining for these activities amounts to 30% of the overall budget. The majority of the remaining budget will be spent on the completion of training for the MoHR and on the national conference to be held in Baghdad.

(As mentioned in the 2009 report, a request was made by the MoHR to use funds remaining from a cancelled study tour to provide additional training to MoHR on reporting skills. This activity was moved forward to 2011 under the project extension.)

- **Major adjustments in strategies, targets or key outcomes and outputs planned.**

Apart from the extension of project activities into 2011, there have been no major adjustments to the project strategy or planned outcomes.

In terms of outputs, a reduction in the number of CSOs trained on human rights treaty bodies and shadow reporting in 2010 was made from 50 to 25 (for reasons outlined above).

## I. Performance Indicators assessment

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baselines	Planned Indicator Targets	Achieved Indicator Targets	Means of Verification	Comments (if any)
IP Outcome 1 MOHR and CSOs have the capacity to report on the HR situation in Iraq based on UPR mechanism						
IP Output 1.1 MoHR have the capacity to report on the human rights situation in Iraq base on the UPR mechanism.	Indicator 1.1.1 # of government officials/CSOs participating in study tours	0	15 gov. officials	5 (incl. 1 woman)	Study tour report	Reported 2009
	Indicator 1.1.2 # of MoHR working group trained in reporting on treaty obligations (disaggregated by sex)	0	15	5 (incl. 1 woman)	Training reports	Reported 2009
	Indicator 1.1.3 % of MoHR working group satisfied with the quality of training in terms of relevance and usefulness	N/A	80%	100%	Training assessment report and Satisfaction assessment	A satisfaction survey was sent to all government participants in April 2010. All indicated being either satisfied or highly satisfied with the activities attended.
	Level of satisfaction of the working group with the technical support provided by project advisors on the UPR process	N/A	80%	100%	Satisfaction assessment	A satisfaction survey was sent to all government participants in April 2010. All indicated being either satisfied or highly satisfied with the activities attended.
	# of core human rights CSOs involved in the preparation of a UPR information report	0	25	25	Project progress report	Reported 2009
	# of human rights CSOs trained on reporting on treaty obligations (disaggregated by sex)	0	50	25		Following training experience and assessment of the general capacity level of CSO participants to human rights training, it was decided to reduce the number of CSOs trained on shadow reporting to a core group of highly qualified individuals to be trained in depth on all treaties signed by Iraq. (See main text for details)

	Network of human rights CSOs established from those working on the project	no	To be determined	1	Project progress report and monitoring of UNOPS staff	UNOPS staff have met with members of the network described under output 2 in the narrative sections above.
IP Outcome 2: Improved dialogue between government and civil society on human rights issues						
IP Output 2.1	Indicator 2.2.1 # of formalised meetings between MoHR officials and human rights CSOs	0	6 meetings	2	Project progress report and meeting minutes as well as presence of UNOPS management and/or field staff.	1 SC meeting, 1 meeting during the Geneva UPR Session. (further consultative meetings to be arranged in 2011 in the run up to the UPR conference)
	Indicator 2.2.2 # of CSOs represented in national dialogue	0	25		List of attendance and meeting minutes	Not yet achieved (expected 2011)
	Indicator 2.2.3 # number of CSOs represented in the final conference	0	25		Conference report	Conference due in 2011
	Indicator 2.2.4 CSOs recommendations included in the conference outcome document	No	Yes		Conference outcome document	Conference due in 2011